

IN THE NAVY
APPOINTMENTS

To be rear admirals, officers of the line

Maurice E. Curts
Dixwell Ketcham

Vice Adm. John L. McCrea, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of the Material Division, Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy.

Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet.

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, United States Naval Forces in the Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Vice Adm. Harold B. Sallada, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet.

Capt. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Earl E. Stone	Francis X. McInerney
Augustus J. Wellings	John P. Womble, Jr.
William S. Parsons	Byron H. Hanlon
James E. Maher	Robert F. Hickey
Leon S. Fiske	Ruthven E. Libby
Harry R. Thurber	Herbert E. Regan
John E. Whelchel	John P. Whitney
James H. Doyle	Hugh H. Goodwin
Clarence E. Olsen	Edgar A. Cruise
Lucian A. Moebus	

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY

Howard M. Shaffer	Alfred W. Chandler
William N. Thomas	Spry O. Claytor
Thornton C. Miller	

APPOINTMENTS TO THE TEMPORARY GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY

Herbert L. Pugh	Herbert C. Lassiter
Bertram Groesbeck, Jr.	John Ball
Howard M. Shaffer	Clemens V. Rault

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be ensigns

John C. Shannon	Jerry W. Bates
Charles R. Mischke	Edward F. Krueger
Charles B. Teal	

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Lowell K. Cuuningham	Robert W. Jessee
	Lee W. Stewart
James H. Harris	

To be ensigns

Marshall V. Perry	Charles R. E. Deily
Thomas H. Boothman	Earl F. Liebtag, Jr.
James C. Carroll	Harold H. Reichert
Fred L. Cofer, Jr.	William D. Warne

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert C. Doerpinghaus	
William E. Nims	

NURSE CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be ensign

Patricia L. Ratcliffe

APPOINTMENTS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY

To be commander

William L. Eagleton

To be lieutenant commanders

Roger VanN. Powelson
Gerald V. Reynolds

To be lieutenants

Harold M. Gutekunst
Dick M. Wheat

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commanders

Joseph A. Forte, Jr.
Henry W. Miller

To be lieutenants

Alfred J. DelRey
Dominic A. Kuljis

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Jay S. Broadbent	John M. Jones
Carleton J. Brown	James M. Keirman
David M. Butler	Jay R. Longley
Richard B. Connor	John S. Neill
Kevin A. Doyle	John M. Packard
Adolphus W. Dunn	Bernard H. Pender
John G. Esswein	Robert W. Ratton
Frederick L. Evans	Stanley E. Reese
Mack M. Hill, Jr.	Lawrence F. Smith

APPOINTMENTS IN THE DENTAL CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commanders

John E. Carson
John R. Wible

To be lieutenants

William J. Harrison	Grant A. MacLean
James F. Keenan	Joe A. Teaff

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Malcolm E. Boone	Charles E. Oxar
William J. Carter	Eugene P. Weigand, Jr.
B'ayne A. Gumm	

APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commander

William P. Briggs

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NURSE CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Gladys LaV. Kennedy
Ruth C. Vickers

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Clifton B. Cates to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from January 1, 1948.

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Watson to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, we pray that the people of America, who have made such progress in material things, may now seek to grow in spiritual understanding.

For we have improved means, but not improved ends. We have better ways of getting there, but we have no better places to go. We can save more time, but are not making any better use of the time we save.

We need Thy help to do something about the world's true problems—the problem of lying, which is called propaganda; the problem of selfishness, which is called self-interest; the problem of greed, which is often called profit; the problem of license, disguising itself as liberty; the problem of lust, masquerading as love; the problem of materialism, the hook which is baited with security.

Hear our prayers, O Lord, for the spiritual understanding which is better than political wisdom, that we may see our problems for what they are. This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FOREST C. DONNELL, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

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

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

GUY CORDON, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 23, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollingsworth, Jr.;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanedes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;
 S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;
 S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Well;
 S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;
 S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564);
 S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;
 S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;
 S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended;
 S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;
 S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;
 S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and
 S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gaudiaga.

ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that beginning next Monday, February 2, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on the Legislative Reorganization Act. We are conducting these hearings in connection with the performance of the duty laid upon us by the act itself of "evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government."

We have scheduled meetings for this purpose for Monday morning, February 2, Tuesday morning and afternoon, and Wednesday morning, and have invited a number of witnesses to appear because of their known special interest in the act, or because of the congressional offices which they hold. I am sure that there are many others, both Members of Congress and private citizens, who have followed closely the operation of the act, and whose comments on its effectiveness to date and suggestions for further improving congressional organization and procedure would be of great value to the committee. I wish to take this opportunity of inviting all such persons to make known to the committee their interest in testifying at this series of hearings. Our schedule for the first 3 days is fairly full, but we shall certainly give everyone who expresses an interest an opportunity to be heard before the hearings are concluded.

PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS ON S. 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to announce that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works will begin public hearings on Monday, February 2, 1948, at 10 a. m., on Senate bill 1954, "to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes." All interested parties will be afforded an opportunity to be heard on the provisions of the bill. Witnesses are requested to file with the com-

mittee written statements of their proposed testimony at least 1 day in advance of the hearings. The hearings will be held in the committee room of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 412 Senate Office Building.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee may be permitted to meet this afternoon, because unexpectedly a number of individuals came down from New York to give testimony before the subcommittee.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

TRAINING OF FOREIGN NATIONALS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on operations under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth annual report on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifteenth annual report of that Administration, covering reports of all its constituent units, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the

Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the State Water Resources Board of California, Sacramento, Calif., favoring an appropriation of \$52,181,000 for construction of federally authorized flood-control projects in California, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS—RESOLUTION OF ANCHORAGE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the directors of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, relating to Indian reservations, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas Senators H. BUTLER (Nebraska) and ARTHUR V. WATKINS (Utah) on December 4, 1947, introduced in the Eightieth Congress, first session, Senate Joint Resolution 162, which, if enacted, would rescind the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to establish Indian reservations at Akutak, Karluk, Wales, Unalakleet, and Venetie, or any other Indian reservation in the Territory of Alaska, and would also rescind the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to make Indian reservations in the future;

Whereas this resolution would settle, once and for all, the question of aboriginal titles in Alaska;

Whereas documents pertaining to the transfer of Alaska from Russia to the United States, and actions of the United States Government throughout the 80 years of American ownership of Alaska, have not and do not recognize the rights of natives based on the use and occupancy of lands in Alaska;

Whereas the development of Alaska has been and is now deterred and impeded in that no private interests will now risk the financing of any enterprise so long as Alaskan lands remain in their present uncertain condition of turmoil and confusion: Therefore be it

Resolved by the directors of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, acting for and in behalf of their members, That Senate joint resolution be endorsed and approved and the authors congratulated on their recognition of one of the foremost problems of the Territory and for their action in initiating legislation which should eliminate it.

_____, President.

C. J. ABEL, Secretary.

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. MAYBANK:

S. 2061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 2062, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2063. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2064. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to 25, inclusive, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2065. A bill to provide for the payment of national service life insurance benefits in the case of John J. Garot; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2066. A bill for the relief of Pasch Bros.; and

S. 2067. A bill for the relief of John F. McKenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2068. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benea Sih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2069. A bill for the relief of Elmer Bel-ler; and

S. 2070. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2072. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code entitled 'Copyrights,'" approved July 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2073. A bill to provide for a temporary embargo on petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT RELATING TO MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill dealing with the subject of the minimum wage, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief explanatory statement of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 2062) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in introducing this bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, I am not merely carrying out a routine legislative function. The Fair Labor Standards Act is a cornerstone of the social legislation for which Americans have fought for generations, and it occupies a special place in our history.

The principle behind the wage-hour law was stated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to the Congress on May 24, 1937. He said:

A self-supporting and self-respecting democracy can plead no justification for the existence of child labor, no economic reason for chiseling workers' wages, or stretching workers' hours.

When, Congress, almost 10 years ago, enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act, the representatives of all the people agreed for the first time in our history that there would be at least a bare minimum which a man must be paid for his work. They defined a general maximum working week and provided that work in excess of that maximum receive special compensation.

Today, the act is still on the books, but its purpose has been to a great degree negated. The passage of years, a war, and resulting inflation have combined to render the 40-cent minimum completely meaningless. Those 40 cents today will buy barely half as much food as they did when the law was passed. And over half of our working population is still excluded from the benefits of the act.

The time is long overdue for action to change this law from a historical landmark to a living reality. Wage-hour legislation was originally conceived as a continuous and expanding process. Standards set up were to be extended and improved to match the growth of the Nation. President Roosevelt said, and the Congress then agreed, that we must "take further action to extend the frontiers of social progress" for the benefit of those "who toil in factory and on farm." And it was recognized that the rudimentary standards set up in the act were but a first step.

We have hesitated and we have allowed the minimum wage to be slashed by inflation. To maintain the wage-hour law we must again make it meaningful. In the amendments I am introducing, I have sought to take the next steps in the continuous process by which we will approach not merely bare minimum standards but fair standards.

The bill I am proposing would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in a number of principal respects:

First. It would raise the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour 120 days after its enactment. It would again put into operation the procedure of the original act whereby industry committees composed of industry, labor, and the public may raise the wage to \$1 an hour where this is found feasible. The special procedure for determining wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are not changed.

Second. It would broaden the coverage of the minimum wage and overtime provisions by extending these provisions to workers engaged in any activity af-

fecting interstate or foreign commerce. The exemption for employees in retail selling and servicing enterprises is narrowed so that it would not apply to employees in chain stores or department stores. Seamen are granted protection under both the wage and hour provisions. Industries processing agricultural or horticultural commodities or fish are covered by the minimum wage and overtime provisions. Both the seasonal industry exemption and the unworkable area-of-production exemption provisions have been deleted. Employees of motor carriers are covered by the overtime-pay provisions, unless, at the time the work was performed, the Interstate Commerce Commission had set qualifications and maximum hours of service for the covered occupation. The newspaper exemption is the same as in the present act. The telephone-operator exemption is removed so that switchboard operators of all exchanges will be covered by the minimum-wage and overtime provisions. The agriculture exemption is narrowed so that workers on large, industrialized farms—those regularly employing eight or more, not including the children of the farmer—will have the protection of the wage provisions of the act.

Third. It would abolish the exploitation of children in industry and industrialized agriculture. It would do this by directly prohibiting the employment of children in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and by narrowing the agricultural exemption to the child-labor provisions so that this exemption would not apply to children in industrialized agriculture; that is, to children employed on farms with more than eight employees. I deem it a matter of national shame that we have for so long permitted the narrow coverage of section 12 in the present act to limit the so-called prohibition of child labor to service performed in and about plants producing goods for interstate commerce. By interpretation this has been held to exclude from protection of the act thousands of minors who need and are entitled to such protection. Now the weakest and most necessitous wage earners will be given protection equivalent to the protection which has, for 10 years, been given adults under this act.

Fourth. The definition of "wage" in section 3 (m) is changed to exclude the cost of food and lodging in the calculation of minimum wages for seamen and dining-car employees. This amendment is necessary in order to assure an adequate minimum wage for a group of employees who have no choice in the acceptance of certain subsistence facilities.

I recommend these amendments with the same pride and spirit which I felt when I came before this body years ago in recommending the original Fair Labor Standards Act. It is with a full understanding and thankfulness for the good that has come for the thousands and thousands of people who have benefited by this act that I urge this body to give serious consideration to these proposals which would take us another step toward assuring a secure and full life for our millions of working people.

REDUCTION IN INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—
AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes. The language of the amendment I am submitting is the same as that used by me in an amendment I submitted to the tax bill in 1944.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS—
RESIGNATION OF MR. TAFT AS
CONFeree

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it has been called to my attention that it appears in the RECORD of the 23d instant that I was appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate on House bill 4127, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I be relieved from service on the conference committee. I am not a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I do not think it is a wise precedent to go outside the membership of committees sponsoring bills in the appointment of conferees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's resignation is noted.

Subsequently, Mr. FLANDERS was appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in place of Mr. TAFT, resigned.

TIVOLI BREWING CO.—INDEFINITE
POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during a previous call of the calendar I moved for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 551, a bill for the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co. It is my information from the clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary that the subject matter of the bill has been settled by a Government department, and the Senator from Michigan is agreeable to having it indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill is indefinitely postponed.

ABBOT LOW MOFFAT—INDEFINITE
POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1336 for the relief of Abbot Low Moffat, introduced by me on May 26, 1947, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

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

DAYLIGHT SAVING FOR THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that at an appropriate time, either today or as soon after today as it may be in order, I shall move to have the Senate proceed to the

consideration of Senate bill 1481, Calendar No. 485, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 26, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;
- S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;
- S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanies;
- S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);
- S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;
- S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;
- S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;
- S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;
- S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;
- S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;
- S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;
- S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;
- S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;
- S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;
- S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Well;
- S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564);

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry; S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;

S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;

S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gaudiaga.

PEACE ON EARTH—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR
GAETH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Peace on Earth, broadcast December 24, 1947, by Mr. Arthur Gaeth, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT AND INSTALLATION OF
ARCHBISHOP O'BOYLE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Archbishop O'Boyle to the people and an excerpt from his installation address, as reported in the Catholic Review, which appear in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN AID PROGRAM—EDITORIAL
FROM JOPLIN (MO.) GLOBE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Would You Vote the Bonds?", published in the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of January 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORA-
TION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PAW-
TUCKET TIMES

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "HOLC Report," published in the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of January 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS' MAJOR SURGERY FOR TRU-
MAN'S BLOATED BUDGET—EDITORIAL
FROM THE SAN ANTONIO EXPRESS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress' Major Surgery for Truman's Bloated Budget," from the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of January 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate previously entered, it is provided, that on Monday, January 26, 1948, at the conclusion of morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 863. The clerk will state in order the bills on the calendar.

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

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

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

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarren	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on official State business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTED] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF MEAT RATIONING AND PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement on the subject of meat rationing and price controls.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Fred W. Heine, president, and Will J. Miller, secretary-treasurer of the Kansas Livestock Association, protesting against reimposition of meat rationing and price controls.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I want to say that I am in thorough agreement with the protest against meat rationing and price controls.

Both these things amount to deceiving the people as to actual facts in the food situation.

Price controls, which sooner or later again would require Government subsidies to secure needed production, deceive consumers as to the actual cost of the goods they buy.

Unless price controls are established all along the line, from prices on the raw materials to the finished product, they cannot be really effective.

Also, unless producers, handlers, and consumers cooperate in observing the controls, the real price of goods will be set in black markets operating more closely to the law of supply and demand. During the war emergency, the patriotic urge to help win the war helped price controls to work after a fashion. But everyone knows that toward the end of wartime controls, black markets set the prices in many lines.

Rationing of meat while other foods are left in a free market will tend to reduce still more the supply of meats available, when what is needed is more production, not less.

Incidentally, rationing can only be justified as an emergency measure when there is a real scarcity of the rationed article, and when only by rationing can such scarce article be made available to consumers in the markets.

Consumers this year, according to all reliable estimates, will have 20 pounds more meat per capita the coming 12 months than they had in the 5-year period before the war, and only about 10 pounds less than last year.

High prices are the effect of continued Government spending, continued high-dollar incomes, and the export of goods not in surplus supply. Price controls and rationing will simply add to and continue the inflation with a resultant worse collapse when the break does come.

I am opposed to programs calling for price controls and rationing, and wish to join especially in the protest of the Kansas Livestock Association against reimposition of meat rationing. I ask that the letter from officers of the Kansas Livestock Association be printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks.

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

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., January 20, 1948.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Press and radio reports indicate that meat rationing and price controls are being seriously considered in Washington.

The Kansas livestock interests are violently opposed to any action by Congress or Executive order by the President which would reestablish such regulations.

Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that our livestock production for 1948 will make 145 pounds of meat available per capita for the Nation's 143,000,000 consumers. This will be approximately 20 pounds more per person annually than was available for the period 1935-39.

The anticipated meat supply for 1948, given an opportunity to flow through regular channels without restriction will reach consumers on an equitable basis.

Meat rationing and price controls did not work under wartime regulations and certainly will not work now.

In the past they were responsible for black-market unequal distribution, meat shortages, and exorbitant prices to the public at large in practically every city and hamlet of the Nation.

Meat rationing and price controls, if forced upon the American people, will not only be responsible for decreasing the meat supply in 1948 and 1949, but will result in the loss of many animal byproducts used by the medical profession for the protection of the Nation's health; and, furthermore, will mean the destruction of a significant percentage of the Nation's meat supply because of improper processing and handling of meat by black-market operators.

We further know that consumers in the lower-income brackets, because of unequal distribution and exorbitant meat prices, would suffer the most severely under such restrictions and regulations as may be imposed.

We respectfully request that you use your influence to avoid the initiation of rationing or price controls now under consideration in Washington.

Cordially yours,

FRED W. HEINE,
President.
WILL J. MILLER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on Monday, January 19, the call of the calendar is in order, beginning with Calendar No. 863, Senate bill 1485. The bill will be stated by title.

SALE OF ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL LANDS

The bill (S. 1485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a

third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to sell or exchange all or any part of those certain areas heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, situated within tracts Nos. 97a, 97b, and 98 as shown on the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District map, comprising approximately thirty and seventy-five one-hundredths acres. In effecting any sale or exchange hereunder the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute such deeds or other instruments as may be necessary to transfer the title to any land so sold or exchanged. Any exchanges of land effected pursuant to this act shall be on an equal-value basis.

SEC. 2. That the proceeds derived from any sale made under authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as school revenues, pursuant to the act of May 27, 1926 (44 Stat. 560), and shall be available in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of other lands and improvements or interests therein for the use of said Albuquerque Indian School.

PAYMENTS TO SEMINOLE INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 1733) to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in making the payment to the enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma or their heirs, authorized in section 1 of the act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.), the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior under date of October 14, 1942, shall be followed in ascertaining the heirs of the enrolled members entitled to share in the funds of said tribe as to those persons who died prior to the act of December 24, 1942 (Public, No. 833, 77th Cong.), and payment shall be made accordingly.

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY TO OSAGE INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3326) to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill should be passed, but the Committee on Public Lands has received a suggestion from the Osage Tribal Council of Oklahoma proposing an amendment, which is recommended by the committee and also by the Department. I propose such an amendment. On page 1, line 3, the amendment would strike out the words "upon request of the Indian."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the name "Interior", it is proposed to strike out "upon request of the Indian."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REPEAL OF INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS IN CERTAIN PARTS OF MINNESOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1049) to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I will give the explanation.

This bill removes the restrictions of the Indian liquor laws as applied to Indians in the State of Minnesota away from the Indian reservation.

Many decades ago, laws were passed commonly known as the Indian liquor laws, designed to prevent Indians from securing liquor. It was felt at that time that use of liquor by the Indians led to debauchery and enabled the white man to exploit the Indian. Now conditions have changed, and many Indians feel keenly their inability to buy any type of liquor even when outside the Indian reservation. In practice, the Indian liquor laws are not enforceable when the Indians are away from the reservation, because in many cases bartenders do not know whether their customers are Indians or not, and are not familiar with the laws. This bill would simply repeal all such restrictions in Minnesota against purchase of liquor by Indians away from the Indian reservation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Legislature of Minnesota, at its last legislative session, amended the laws of the State of Minnesota relating to Indians, so as to permit Indians to buy liquor away from the reservation. This bill would permit Indians to buy liquor off the reservation in the same manner that you or I might buy it. The bill would conform to the laws already enacted in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In view of the explanation, I will leave it to the State of Minnesota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question about the bill. I did not quite hear the explanation which was made, because of the confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the old statute forbade the sale of liquor to Indians, particularly as related to States where there are Indian reservations. The State of Minnesota, at the last session of the legislature, in 1947, amended the statute so as to permit the Indians to buy liquor in public liquor places, just as any other citizen would buy it.

One of the reasons why the State found itself in favor of such an amendment was that returning World War II veterans, as well as World War I veterans, would enter liquor establishments anywhere in the State, and they would be confronted with the fact that they would be denied the right to purchase liquor, even though they had but a fraction of Indian blood in them. That was the law.

So the State amended its law. The purpose of the pending bill is more or less to conform to the type of correction which we have attempted to make in that State.

Mr. HATCH. There are Indians on reservations in Minnesota, are there not?

Mr. THYE. In any liquor establishment in the State, if it were known to the keeper that a man had Indian blood in him, he would be denied the right to sell liquor to him. The correction is to permit him to buy liquor in the same manner that any other citizen would be privileged to buy it.

Mr. HATCH. The law to which the Senator refers is one of general application throughout the United States in States where there are Indian reservations. What the bill proposes is to make a separate provision for Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The title of the bill is "An act to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota."

Mr. HATCH. Then it does not relate to the entire State of Minnesota, but only to certain parts of the State.

Mr. THYE. Of course, it could not and would not relate to the reservations, but it relates to territory off the reservations. If an Indian came to Minneapolis, St. Paul, or any other town off the reservation, the bartender could not legally sell him liquor. This bill would amend the law so as to permit such sales.

Mr. HATCH. I shall not object at this time. However, after I examine the bill and the report further, I may ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed, because I think it establishes a rather dangerous precedent by making a certain act of Congress not effective in one section of the country, but effective in all other parts of the country where similar conditions prevail. I doubt the wisdom of such procedure, making separate provisions for the State of Minnesota. I shall not object at this time. However, I shall look into the question.

Mr. O'DANIEL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to the consideration of House bill 1049, Calendar No. 866.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. The bill was passed during the call of the calendar today, was it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I assume there is no objection to the Senator's request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 1049 was passed?

Mr. THYE. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY THROUGH OSAGE INDIAN LAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3322) to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, empowered to grant rights-of-way for all purposes, subject to such con-

ditions as he may prescribe, over and across any lands now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations, or any lands now or hereafter owned, subject to restrictions against alienation, by individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations, including the lands belonging to the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, and any other lands heretofore or hereafter acquired or set aside for the use and benefit of the Indians.

SEC. 2. No grant of a right-of-way over and across any lands belonging to a tribe organized under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250); or the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), shall be made without the consent of the proper tribal officials. Rights-of-way over and across lands of individual Indians may be granted without the consent of the individual Indian owners if (1) the land is owned by more than one person, and the owners or owner of a majority of the interests therein consent to the grant; (2) the whereabouts of the owner of the land or an interest therein are unknown, and the owners or owner of any interests therein whose whereabouts are known, or a majority thereof, consent to the grant; (3) the heirs or devisees of a deceased owner of the land or an interest therein have not been determined, and the Secretary of the Interior finds that the grant will cause no substantial injury to the land or any owner thereof; or (4) the owners of interests in the land are so numerous that the Secretary finds it would be impracticable to obtain their consent, and also finds that the grant will cause no substantial injury to the land or any owner thereof.

SEC. 3. No grant of a right-of-way shall be made without the payment of such compensation as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be just. The compensation received on behalf of the Indian owners shall be disposed of under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. This act shall not in any manner amend or repeal the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended by the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 838), nor shall any existing statutory authority empowering the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way over Indian lands be repealed hereby.

SEC. 5. Rights-of-way for the use of the United States may be granted under this act upon application by the department or agency having jurisdiction over the activity for which the right-of-way is to be used.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe any necessary regulations for the purpose of administering the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. This act shall not become operative until 30 days after its approval.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations."

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS ADJACENT TO MUNCIE, IND.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2361) to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818, which had been

reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment, on page 3, line 8, after the words "September 1", to strike out "1947" and insert in lieu thereof "1948"; and at the end of line 13, to strike out "1947" and insert in lieu thereof "1948".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISPOSAL OF SUBMARGINAL LANDS IN MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND SOUTH DAKOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3153) to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was, in section 7, on page 2, line 18, after the word "county", to insert "in which the major portion of the Indian reservation lies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 3, line 12, after the word "units", to insert "for experimental purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to strike out:

The title to any lands remaining unsold or otherwise undisposed of after 2 years from the date of approval of this act are hereby declared to be in the United States in trust for the Indians of the reservation for whose use and benefit the lands were assigned by Executive order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, after the word "be", to strike out "divided as follows: (a) One-fourth shall be paid to the county in which the lands are located; (b) one-fourth shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States; (c) one-half shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribe of the reservation for whose use and benefit the tract concerned was assigned by Executive order" and insert "covered into the Treasury of the United States for credit to miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO MRS. MARY E. LEAF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 773) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "upon application in writing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf, of McIntosh, S. Dak., a patent in

fee to the following-described lands allotted to her in Corson County, State of South Dakota: The west half of section 20, township 22 north, range 21 east, of the Black Hills meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FORT PECK RESERVATION

The bill (S. 1591) to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in aid of the administration of the Fort Peck project, there is hereby granted to the United States, for use by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), in the discharge of its duties pursuant to the act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403), the electric-transmission lines, substations, rights-of-way, and other property described in section 7 of that certain permit and memorandum of understanding, dated November 2, 1945, between the Bureau and the Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Indian Office"): *Provided, however*, That the Bureau shall continue to furnish electric service for the uses and purposes of the Indian Office on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, pursuant to the terms and conditions of said permit and memorandum of understanding, except as the same may be modified by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. That the amount of money to be paid for said property shall be \$58,577.52, or so much thereof as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be needed pursuant to the provisions of said permit and memorandum of understanding. Such sum shall be paid, from funds now or hereafter made available to the Department of the Interior for the construction of transmission lines and substations of the Fort Peck project, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who shall deposit such sum in the Treasury of the United States as a credit on expenditures made for irrigation and power construction on the Fort Peck Indian irrigation project.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts as may be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PATENT IN FEE TO MABEL TOWNSEND PRETTY ON TOP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 400) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "upon application in writing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top, of Lodge Grass, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in the State of Montana: The southwest quarter of section 13 and the southeast quarter of section 14, township 7 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PATENT IN FEE TO CLARENCE M. SCOTT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 401) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, upon the filing of a written application by the Indian owner named in this act, to issue to Clarence M. Scott, of Billings, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands, including homestead lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The south half of section 16, and the north half of the northwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 6 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JAMES PERRY DOYLE

The bill (S. 1517) authorizing the issuance to James Perry Doyle of a patent in fee to certain lands in Big Horn County, Mont., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to James Perry Doyle, a Crow Indian allotted No. 1661, of Sheridan, Wyo., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: Southeast quarter of section 17, township 8 south, range 37 east; the northwest quarter and the north half of the north half of the southwest quarter, section 21, township 8 south, range 37 east; the east half of the east half of the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 20, township 7 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 640 acres.

ROBERT E. DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1407) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Robert E. Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "authorized" to strike out the words "and directed" and insert "in his discretion"; on page 1, line 9, after the words "half of the", to strike out "northeast quarter, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter, and the east half of the southeast quarter, section 29; township 8 south, range 36 east", and to insert "northwest quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter, section 28; the north half of the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and the east half of the east half of the west half, section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to issue to Robert E. Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The north half of the northwest

quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter, section 28; the north half of the northwest quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter, section 28; the north half of the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter, and the east half of the east half of the west half, section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 640 acres.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, MINNESOTA

The bill (S. 1611) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn., authorized to be built by the Minnesota Department of Highways and the counties of Benton and Stearns in Minnesota, by an act of Congress approved October 9, 1940, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved June 1, 1944, is hereby extended 3 years from October 9, 1946.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION NEAR YORK-TOWN, VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1545) to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 1, line 5, to insert after the word "him" the words "and to the Secretary of the Navy"; on page 2, beginning in line 2, to insert after the word "bridge" the words "the level and design of which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, such bridge"; to strike out on page 2, line 24, the words "The value of park lands involved shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one to be chosen by the Governor of Virginia, one to be chosen by the Secretary of the Interior, and the third to be chosen by these two", and to insert the following:

The value of the park lands to be conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia as herein provided shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one each to be selected by the Governor of Virginia and the Secretary of the Interior, with the third appraiser to be mutually satisfactory to them. The Secretary may, in his discretion, approve the value agreed upon by a majority of the appraisers or he may require a new appraisal to be made in a similar manner. The decision of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive as to the value of the easement lands conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Nothing in this act or in any grant of right-of-way or other easement issued pursuant to this act shall be construed to affect the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, upon such terms and conditions as to location, type, or design of the structure or otherwise as to him and to the Secretary of the Navy may appear proper to protect the interests of the United States, is authorized to grant to the Commonwealth of Virginia or to its agency the Highway Commission of said Commonwealth right-of-way or other easement as may be proper to enable a highway bridge the level and design of which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, such bridge to be erected, operated, and maintained across the York River in the State of Virginia at or near Yorktown, Va., and for the purpose of permitting such portions of said bridge, the roads and approaches thereto, together with any necessary structures connected therewith as may be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge, and for safe, reasonable, and proper ingress thereto or egress therefrom, to be located and erected across, over, or upon the property of the United States forming a part of the Colonial National Historical Park.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed and authorized to secure and accept payment in cash or by land exchange as compensation to the United States for any lands used for such right-of-way and any moneys received may in turn be used by the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of other privately owned historical lands within the boundaries of Colonial National Historical Park. Any lands so received or so purchased shall become part of Colonial National Historical Park.

The value of the park lands to be conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia as herein provided shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one each to be selected by the Governor of Virginia and the Secretary of the Interior, with the third appraiser to be mutually satisfactory to them. The Secretary may, in his discretion, approve the value agreed upon by a majority of the appraisers or he may require a new appraisal to be made in a similar manner. The decision of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive as to the value of the easement lands conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Nothing in this act or in any grant of right-of-way or other easement issued pursuant to this act shall be construed to affect the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847).

The amendments were agreed to.

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

TRAINING OF OFFICERS FOR THE NAVAL SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1214) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 5, after the parenthesis to insert "as amended"; on line 6, after the word "hereby", to insert the word "further"; on page 2, line 6, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out the word "part" and insert "paragraph"; on page 2, line 13, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" and insert "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6"; on page 3, line 11, after the words "pursuant to", to strike

out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" and insert "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6"; on page 3, line 17, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on page 3, line 23, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on page 4, line 14, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "subsection 1 of section 6 (a)" and insert "paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6"; on line 15, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "section 6 (b)" and insert "subsection (b) of section 6"; on line 20, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on line 9, after the words "with the", to strike out the word "rank" and insert "grade"; on line 10, after the words "junior grade" in parentheses, to strike out "in the grade appropriate to that rank", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) In clause (b) of section 2 after the word "Navy" insert the following: "or his designated representative."

(b) Amend the first sentence of the first proviso of section 4 to read as follows: "Provided, That such benefits and retainer pay shall commence to accrue on the day each midshipman or apprentice seaman commences his first term of college work under the provisions of this act and that such benefits and retainer pay may be received by midshipmen appointed pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 for a period not exceeding four academic years."

(c) Amend section 8 to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Navy shall during the second quarter of each calendar year cause to be examined (a) the records of all ensigns of the line of the Navy and second lieutenants of the Marine Corps commissioned pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 who apply prior to April 1 of that calendar year or prior to the first anniversary of the acceptance of their commissions, whichever is earlier, for retention in the Regular service as permanent officers and who in the then current calendar year will reach the first anniversary of the date of acceptance of their appointment as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, selecting from among such officers the number he may determine necessary for retention, and (b) the records of all other officers appointed pursuant to this act who apply prior to April 1 of the third calendar year following that in which they accepted their commissions or prior to the third anniversary of the acceptance of their commissions, whichever is earlier, for retention in the Regular service as permanent officers and who in the then current calendar year will reach the third anniversary of the date of acceptance of their appointment as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, selecting from among such officers the number that he may determine necessary for retention."

(d) Amend section 9 to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. (a) The commission of each officer commissioned pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 who, prior to April 1 of the calendar year following that in which he accepted his commission or

prior to the first anniversary of the acceptance of his commission, whichever is earlier, shall not have applied for retention in the Regular service, shall be terminated not later than the first anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, and the commission of each such officer who applies for retention as a permanent officer within the time limits prescribed by this subsection, but who is not selected for retention under clause (a) of section 8 shall be terminated not later than June 30 of the appropriate calendar year or the first anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, whichever is the later date. Upon termination of commission, each such officer who thereupon accepts appointment to commissioned rank in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve may apply for and receive retainer pay at the rate of \$100 for each calendar month or part thereof during which, while an officer of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve, he pursues full-times instruction in an accredited college or university but not to exceed a total of \$2,000, such instruction to commence not later than a date to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy; in addition, each such officer shall be entitled to the benefits provided for him by section 10 of this act.

(b) The commission of each officer commissioned pursuant to paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6 and pursuant to subsection (b) of section 6 who, prior to April 1 of the third calendar year following that in which he accepted his commission or prior to the third anniversary of the acceptance of his commission, whichever is earlier, shall not have applied for retention in the Regular service, shall be terminated not later than the third anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, and the commission of each such officer who applies for retention as a permanent officer within the time limits prescribed by this subsection, but who is not selected for retention under clause (b) of section 8 shall be terminated not later than June 30 of the appropriate calendar year or the third anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, whichever is the later date. Upon termination of commission, each such officer may be commissioned in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) or first lieutenant, as the case may be (if in a staff corps, with the grade of lieutenant (junior grade)), and to rank from a date 3 years after the date of rank stated in his original commission in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes', approved August 13, 1946, as amended."

RETENTION IN SERVICE OF CERTAIN DISABLED ARMY PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1783) to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army personnel, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 5, after the word "Army", to insert the words "and the Air Force", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized and directed to retain in service disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight

officers of the Army and the Air Force of the United States until their treatment for physical reconstruction has reached a point where they will not be further benefited by retention in a military hospital or in the military service.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes."

EXEMPTION OF NAVY OR COAST GUARD VESSELS FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS

The bill (S. 1961) to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of December 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 590), is hereby repealed.

JAMES Y. PARKER

The bill (S. 1673) to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712 as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, to the temporary grade of major in the Army of the United States under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), with date of rank as of March 1, 1942. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to carry such officer upon such appointment on the records of the War Department and of the Army as having served in the grade of major from March 1, 1942, to the date of his subsequent appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing additional pay and allowances to the aforesaid James Y. Parker: *Provided*, That all payments of moneys heretofore made to such officer on the assumption of a previous legal appointment to the grade of major are hereby validated.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO UNKNOWN AMERICAN

The bill (S. 1802) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized and directed to award, in the name of the Congress, a Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War, and who will be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., as authorized by the act of June 24, 1946, Public Law 429, Seventy-ninth Congress.

CARE AND TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD, ORGANIZED RESERVES, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1470) to amend the act entitled "An act to make provisions for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, section 2, line 12, to strike out the word "section" and to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The foregoing amendment shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force to the same extent as if enacted prior to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1507), as amended (act July 15, 1939, 53 Stat. 1042; sec. 5, act Oct. 14, 1940, 54 Stat. 1137; 32 U. S. C. 164d; 10 U. S. C. 455e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term 'in time of peace' shall include that period after September 2, 1945 (the date of formal surrender by Japan), which is prior to the first day on which the United States is, by action of the Congress, or the President, or both, no longer engaged in any war in which the United States is engaged on the date of enactment of this section.

"SEC. 3. The foregoing amendment shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force to the same extent as if enacted prior to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes', approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes."

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED SERVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1521) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail scientific and technical employees of the War Department or the Army and the Naval Establishment to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Defense (with respect to personnel of the National Military Establishment, any department or agency thereof, or any field activity of such establishment, department, or agency), or the Secretary of the Army, the

Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force (each with respect to his respective department or any field activity thereof), or the Secretary of the Treasury (with respect to the United States Coast Guard or any field activity thereof), is authorized to detail to duty, by contract or other agreement, in privately owned plants or laboratories, any scientific or technical employee of any establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity administered by such Secretary when, in the opinion of the Secretary concerned, such detail will materially increase the value of such employee to such establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity: *Provided*, That no such employee shall be detailed in any plant or laboratory for a continued period of duty in excess of 6 months: *Provided further*, That no provision of this act shall be construed in such manner as to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds by such Secretary to pay any privately owned plant or laboratory for the privilege of detailing an employee or employees to duty therein.

SEC. 2. Any employee selected for detail to duty in accordance with the provisions of this act shall, before being so detailed, make a definite statement in writing that he will, unless involuntarily separated, remain in the employ of the establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity from which detailed for a period of not less than 18 months after completion of such detail or reimburse the establishment, department, agency, service, or activity concerned for any expenses incurred in effectuating said detail.

SEC. 3. Any detail to duty provided for by this act shall be effected only after the plant or laboratory concerned in the arrangements for such detail signifies in writing to the Secretary of the establishment or department concerned its concurrence with said arrangements.

SEC. 4. Each such Secretary is authorized to establish and administer such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem necessary to effectuate the provisions of this act, or he may, should it be deemed necessary or advisable, delegate the authority to administer said rules, regulations, and procedures, in whole or in part, to such official or officials of his respective establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity as he shall designate.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Treasury to detail certain scientific and technical personnel employed by or within the National Military Establishment or the United States Coast Guard to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does that mean a complete substitution, or only a substitution for one section?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a complete substitution, striking out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we should have a word of explanation from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the substitution is merely to bring the bill into line with the unification bill, and to expand it to include the Air Corps.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

TRANSFER OF LANDS AT CAMP PHILLIPS, KANS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1791) to transfer certain lands at

Camp Phillips, Kans., to the War Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, to strike out the words "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That all land owned by the United States in section 7, township 15 south, range 3 west of the sixth principal base and meridian, containing approximately 640 acres, together with the buildings, improvements, and facilities located thereon, which comprised the hospital area at Camp Phillips, Kans., and now under the control and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, is hereby transferred, without reimbursement of funds, to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army."

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS MADE BY DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1298) to invalidate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to insert at the end of the bill sections 2 and 3, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That payments heretofore made by disbursing officers covering the cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees of the Government of the United States made under orders directing permanent change of station of said employees where such shipments were made from the last permanent-duty station of said employees or from some other place, to some place other than the new permanent-duty station of such employees, are hereby validated, if otherwise proper, and such employees shall be relieved of indebtedness to the United States on account of such shipments to the extent that such payments do not exceed the cost which would have been properly borne by the United States for such shipments under laws and regulations in effect at the time of such shipments, had such shipments been made from the old to the new permanent-duty station of such employees: *Provided*, That in any case where a civilian employee has made refundment to the United States on account of payments herein validated, reimbursement of the amount so refunded is hereby authorized to be made to such employee on the presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That employees who paid the carriers the amount due covering the shipment of their household effects shall be entitled to reimbursement of so much of the amount expended, if otherwise proper, as does not exceed the cost of such shipment from the old to the new permanent-duty station upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office: *And provided further*, That amounts due deceased persons or persons determined to be mentally incompetent shall be paid to the extent herein provided upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office by their heirs or personal representatives.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to

allow credit in the settlement of accounts of disbursing officers of the Government of the United States covering payments for the shipment of household effects of civilian employees which are, and to the extent that such payments are, validated by section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provision of this act are hereby authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

PRESERVATION OF THE FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, after line 7, page 1, to insert:

All costs of repairing, equipping, and restoring such frigate, other than pay and allowances of naval officers and enlisted men engaged in such work, shall be defrayed from a fund consisting of such donations or contributions and the net proceeds of the sales made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to repair, equip, and restore the frigate *Constellation*, as far as may be practicable, to her original condition, but not for active service, and to accept and use any donations or contributions which may be offered for the aforesaid purpose. All costs of repairing, equipping, and restoring such frigate, other than the pay and allowances of naval officers and enlisted men engaged in such work, shall be defrayed from a fund consisting of such donations or contributions and the net proceeds of the sales made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby further authorized to give or to sell, under such regulations as he may prescribe, such parts or pieces, including rigging, of the frigate *Constellation*, as are suitable for use as relics, souvenirs, or mementos, and which cannot profitably or advantageously be used in restoring this vessel to original condition, to clubs, associations, or individuals making donations or contributions for the restoration of the frigate *Constellation*. The cost of converting the aforesaid material into relics, souvenirs, or mementos shall be charged against, and the proceeds of such sales shall be added to, the fund created by authority of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CONSTRUCTION OF REFLECTING POOL AT UNITED STATES NAVAL HOSPITAL, HOUSTON, TEX.

The bill (S. 1794) to authorize the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States Naval Hospital, Houston, Tex., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting

pool on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, at Houston, Tex.

SEC. 2. The site of the reflecting pool and its design and construction shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. The design and construction of the reflecting pool shall be without cost to the United States.

SEC. 3. Upon completion of the construction of the reflecting pool, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept it as an unconditional gift to the United States from the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States.

USE OF CRYPT AND WINDOW SPACES OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY CHAPEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1800) relating to the restrictions on the use of crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy Chapel, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the final paragraph under the subheading "Contingent, Naval Academy" under the heading "Naval Academy" of the act of March 3, 1909 (34 U. S. C. 1111), as it appears on page 773 of volume 35 of the United States Statutes at Large, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy chapel are to be used only for memorials to United States naval officers who have successfully commanded a fleet or force in battle, or who have received or may receive the thanks of the Congress of the United States for conspicuously distinguished services in time of war, and no memorial shall be accepted for or installed in said crypt or window spaces until at least 2 years after the death of the officer in question; the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to appoint a board which shall recommend to the Secretary of the Navy the names of officers whose service is considered to qualify them to be so memorialized: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be considered as invalidating any agreement made by the present or any former Superintendent of the Naval Academy, authorizing a memorial window in the old Naval Academy chapel to be transferred to the new Naval Academy chapel."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of this bill and the one which immediately follows.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the report is very brief. The existing law is sought to be changed only to a slight degree in reference to the windows in the chapel. The present language refers to naval officers who have successfully commanded a fleet or squadron in battle. The term "squadron" is changed to bring it into line with the modern organization of the Navy. The second change reduces the waiting period after the death of the officer concerned from 5 to 2 years. That is the gist of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. I am also interested in having an explanation of the following bill. I thought it would save time to have it now.

Mr. WHERRY. I call for the regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 1528) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devises, and requests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries and other institutions, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. GURNEY. This bill would authorize the Secretary of National Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force to accept gifts for museums, libraries, and so forth.

Mr. GREEN. I wish to know whether that means unconditional gifts, or whether there might be conditions which the Government would be obligated to carry out.

Mr. GURNEY. Does the Senator mean conditions in regard to the upkeep of the gifts, and so forth, after they are accepted?

Mr. GREEN. I mean any conditions which might be imposed.

Mr. GURNEY. They have to be approved by the Secretary before the gifts are accepted.

Mr. GREEN. That would give the Secretary absolute discretion to undertake the carrying out of any conditions which might be attached; is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. The bill provides that he cannot accept a gift unless the conditions are satisfactory to the Government.

Mr. GREEN. No, unless they are satisfactory to him.

Mr. GURNEY. I presume that would follow.

Mr. GREEN. There have been cases in which the conditions which were attached proved to be very onerous. If the officer who has the discretionary power has a friendly disposition, he may accept the gifts under almost any conditions. I think there should be some restrictions in regard to this matter.

Mr. GURNEY. I understand that where such things as ship models are offered to the Academy, frequently a sum is provided for their upkeep, although it is not a large sum.

Mr. GREEN. But sometimes the condition is that the gift must be placed in a certain conspicuous position or in a certain building, or something of that sort; and sometimes such conditions prove to be very onerous.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the bill passed over until the Senator is satisfied about this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED MATERIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 774) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, in line 8, after

the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force"; on page 2, in line 20, after the word "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES WITHIN GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNLAWFUL WEARING OF UNIFORMS IN CANAL ZONE, GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (S. 1799) to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216; 10 U. S. C. 1393), as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting between the first and second paragraphs thereof the following new paragraph:

"The provisions of this section shall apply to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, as well as to all other places within the jurisdiction of the United States."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that this bill has a very far-reaching effect in regard to the Surplus Property Act. I believe that Senators would like to consider the bill further. I have spoken to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who reported the bill, and he understands that I object to its present consideration. Therefore I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have the Senate take up at this time two bills which have been passed over during the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. For the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I should like to state that a week ago it was announced that the calendar would be called today, beginning with Calendar No. 863, the point at which the call of the calendar was concluded on January 12. Let me also state that it is the intention, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, to have the calendar called regularly each Monday. For that reason, I shall be forced to object to any request to have the Senate consider at this time bills prior to No. 863 on the calendar, because there are those who have been informed that that is the procedure which we shall pursue relative to the calling of the calendar.

I should also like to say that if the Senator from Connecticut desires to do so, of course, he can bring up the bills by motion, but in that event I think notice should be given, so that all Members of the Senate can be advised.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bills to which I have reference were called during the previous call of the calendar, but at that time there was some objection to their consideration. However, I understand that objection has been withdrawn. I refer to Senate bill 357, Calendar No. 702, providing for the incorporation of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and Senate bill 1375, Calendar No. 704, providing for the incorporation of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. But if the Senator from Nebraska objects to the consideration of those bills at this time, in view of the order which has been entered, of course I do not press the request. I understand the calendar will be called next Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. I further understand that these bills will be included in that calling of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Under the circumstances, I withdraw my request.

Mr. LODGE. Let me inquire whether the call of the calendar at that time will include the bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the calendar which will be called then will include all bills on the calendar.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I understand the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRAH] requested that at some opportune time he be permitted to bring up the daylight-saving bill. That is a rather indefinite request, and I should like something specific about it. I should like to know when it is coming up.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may respectfully state the situation to the Senator, no

request was made. A simple notice was given that at some appropriate time in the near future the Senator would present the matter to which the Senator from Louisiana refers.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope, and I am sure, the Senator from Rhode Island will give me due notice of his intention.

Mr. McGRAH. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the orderly processes laid out by the leadership, but it is imperative, if we are to get action on the measure at this session, so that it will be in effect by the time the rest of the country goes on daylight-saving time, that we have some time fixed within the next week or two when the matter can be brought up. I have been consulting and conferring with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana about an appropriate time. We were not able to agree on a particular time, so in order to protect whatever rights we may have in the situation, I give notice, and I have given notice, that at an appropriate time I shall move that the bill referred to be taken up. It would be most agreeable to me if the leadership on both sides of the aisle could agree upon a time and a day certain, when consideration could be given to the matter. I realize that it is an inconvenience to the Senator from Louisiana to have to remain here during all the sessions, awaiting the time when I may call up the bill. It is just as inconvenient to me to have to be here to carry out what I regard as my responsibility in the matter. Probably the distinguished leader of the majority could agree with us on a time when we could know definitely that the matter could be taken up for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for an observation, I shall be glad at any time to consider any measure any Senator would like to have taken up. I should like to say, however, that in the orderly process of debate the pending business is the St. Lawrence seaway, and I hope, if other matters are to be taken up, Senators will confer with the leadership, so that we can work out an orderly program, but at the same time preserve the continuity of debate, and bring the pending business to a conclusion. I assure the Senator from Rhode Island we shall be glad to take it up with him and see if something can be worked out that will be satisfactory to those who are interested in the legislation.

Mr. McGRAH. Mr. President, that is more than satisfactory to me, and I assure the Senator from Louisiana that until an agreement is reached with the leader of the majority by the Senator from Louisiana and myself, I shall not press the motion concerning which I have given notice.

Mr. OVERTON. I wished to make an additional observation, that I do not desire to interpose any objection to taking up the bill at any time. The Senator from Rhode Island has been very courteous to me, and I am very glad to reciprocate. I shall be perfectly willing to have the bill taken up at any time. The only suggestion I make is I should like to have some definite time fixed. If

I can have adequate notice, any time will be satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. Ample notice will be given.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES BY THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is our purpose to call the calendar, as I have stated before, beginning where the call was concluded on January 12, and then to carry out the further order of the day. Last Friday, however, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was about to request consideration of two bills, which I asked him to withhold until today. I asked that he give notice of his desire that the bills be taken up today.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of Calendar No. 597, House bill 1366, to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes, be resumed.

The Senate will recall that when the bill came up there were several amendments that were considered and agreed to, and at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon to have them printed for the benefit of Senators, the bill went over. The Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is now present. I think this matter can be disposed of within a few moments. Should it provoke any lengthy discussion, I shall call for the regular order, because I feel that the time has arrived when we should proceed to the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, and the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is prepared to address the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILEY. With the understanding stated, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill is for the purpose of improving the method of purchasing supplies by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. One of the reasons why it is necessary is because of the unification of the services. The matter was very carefully considered by the committee, and the bill has the approval of the Comptroller General, of the Budget Director, and of the interested agencies of the Government. I shall be glad to make any further explanation that may be desired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have just received word that during the consideration of this particular bill, the in-

sition of the words "the Secretary of the Air Force" was inadvertently omitted from one of the amendments. I therefore ask the Senate to agree to a committee amendment on page 31, line 25, of the bill as it was amended January 12, after the word "Army," to insert "and the Secretary of the Air Force."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill H. R. 1366 was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. (a) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to all purchases and contracts for supplies or services made by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (each being hereinafter called the agency), for the use of any such agency or otherwise, and to be paid for from appropriated funds.

(b) It is the declared policy of the Congress that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small business concerns. Whenever it is proposed to make a contract or purchase in excess of \$10,000 by negotiation and without advertising, pursuant to the authority of paragraph (7) or (8) of section 2 (c) of this act, suitable advance publicity, as determined by the agency head with due regard to the type of supplies involved and other relevant considerations, shall be given for a period of at least 15 days, wherever practicable, as determined by the agency head.

(c) All purchases and contracts for supplies and services shall be made by advertising, as provided in section 3, except that such purchases and contracts may be negotiated by the agency head without advertising if—

(1) determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress;

(2) the public exigency will not admit of the delay incident to advertising;

(3) the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$1,000;

(4) for personal or professional services;

(5) for any service to be rendered by any university, college, or other educational institution;

(6) the supplies or services are to be procured and used outside the limits of the United States and its possessions;

(7) for medicines or medical supplies;

(8) for supplies purchased for authorized resale;

(9) for perishable subsistence supplies;

(10) for supplies or services for which it is impracticable to secure competition;

(11) the agency head determines that the purchase or contract is for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test: *Provided*, That beginning 6 months after the effective date of this act and at

the end of each 6-month period thereafter, there shall be furnished to the Congress a report setting forth the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been entered into pursuant to this subsection (11) since the date of the last such report, the amount of the contract, and, with due consideration given to the national security, a description of the work required to be performed thereunder;

(12) for supplies or services as to which the agency head determines that the character, ingredients, or components thereof are such that the purchase or contract should not be publicly disclosed;

(13) for equipment which the agency head determines to be technical equipment, and as to which he determines that the procurement thereof without advertising is necessary in order to assure standardization of equipment and interchangeability of parts and that such standardization and interchangeability is necessary in the public interest;

(14) for supplies of a technical or specialized nature requiring a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, as determined by the agency head, when he determines that advertising and competitive bidding may require duplication of investment or preparation already made, or will unduly delay procurement of such supplies;

(15) for supplies or services as to which the agency head determines that the bid prices after advertising therefor are not reasonable or have not been independently arrived at in open competition: *Provided*, That no negotiated purchase or contract may be entered into under this paragraph after the rejection of all bids received unless (A) notification of the intention to negotiate and reasonable opportunity to negotiate shall have been given by the agency head to each responsible bidder, (B, the negotiated price is lower than the lowest rejected bid price of a responsible bidder, as determined by the agency head, and (C) such negotiated price is the lowest negotiated price offered by any responsible supplier;

(16) the agency head determines that it is in the interest of the national defense that any plant, mine, or facility or any producer, manufacturer, or other supplier be made or kept available for furnishing supplies or services in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense in maintaining active engineering, research, and development, are otherwise subserved: *Provided*, That beginning 6 months after the effective date of this act and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, there shall be furnished to the Congress a report setting forth the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been entered into pursuant to this subsection (16) since the date of the last such report, the amount of the contract, and, with due consideration given to the national security, a description of the work required to be performed thereunder; or

(17) otherwise authorized by law.

(d) If in the opinion of the agency head bids received after advertising evidence any violation of the antitrust laws he shall refer such bids to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

(e) This section shall not be construed to (A) authorize the erection, repair, or furnishing of any public building or public improvement, but such authorization shall be required in the same manner as heretofore, or (B) permit any contract for the construction or repair of buildings, roads, sidewalks, sewers, mains, or similar items to be negotiated without advertising as required by section 3, unless such contract is to be performed outside the continental United States or unless negotiation of such contract is authorized by the provisions of paragraphs

(1), (2), (3), (10), (11), (12), or (15) of subsection (c) of this section.

Sec. 3. Whenever advertising is required—

(a) The advertisement for bids shall be a sufficient time previous to the purchase or contract, and specifications and invitations for bids shall permit such full and free competition as is consistent with the procurement of types of supplies and services necessary to meet the requirements of the agency concerned.

(b) All bids shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: *Provided*, That all bids may be rejected when the agency head determines that it is in the public interest so to do.

Sec. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, contracts negotiated pursuant to section 2 (c) may be of any type which in the opinion of the agency head will promote the best interests of the Government. Every contract negotiated pursuant to section 2 (c) shall contain a suitable warranty, as determined by the agency head, by the contractor that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure such contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business, for the breach or violation of which warranty the Government shall have the right to annul such contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

(b) The cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting shall not be used, and in the case of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract the fee shall not exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the agency head at the time of entering into such contract (except that a fee not in excess of 15 percent of such estimated cost is authorized in any such contract for experimental, developmental, or research work and that a fee inclusive of the contractor's cost and not in excess of 6 percent of the estimated cost, exclusive of fees, as determined by the agency head at the time of entering into the contract, of the project to which such fee is applicable is authorized in contracts for architectural or engineering services relating to any public works or utility project). Neither a cost nor a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract nor an incentive-type contract shall be used unless the agency head determines that such method of contracting is likely to be less costly than other methods or that it is impracticable to secure supplies or services of the kind or quality required without the use of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or an incentive-type contract. All cost and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts shall provide for advance notification by the contractor to the procuring agency of any subcontract thereunder on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis and of any fixed-price subcontract or purchase order which exceeds in dollar amount either \$25,000 or 5 percent of the total estimated cost of the prime contract; and a procuring agency, through any authorized representative thereof, shall have the right to inspect the plants and to audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

Sec. 5. (a) The agency head may make advance payments under negotiated contracts heretofore or hereafter executed in any amount not exceeding the contract price upon such terms as the parties shall agree:

Provided, That advance payments shall be made only upon adequate security and if the agency head determines that provision for such advance payments is in the public interest or in the interest of the national defense and is necessary and appropriate in order to procure required supplies or services under the contract.

(b) The terms governing advance payments may include as security provision for, and upon inclusion of such provision there shall thereby be created, a lien in favor of the Government, paramount to all other liens, upon the supplies contracted for, upon the credit balance in any special account in which such payments may be deposited and upon such of the material and other property acquired for performance of the contract as the parties shall agree.

SEC. 6. Whenever any contract made on behalf of the Government by the agency head or by officers authorized by him so to do includes a provision for liquidated damages for delay, the Comptroller General on the recommendation of the agency head is authorized and empowered to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in his discretion may be just and equitable.

SEC. 7. (a) The determinations and decisions provided in this act to be made by the agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided by this act, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the agency.

(b) The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12), (13), (14), (15), and (16) of section 2 (c) and in section 5 (a) shall not be delegable, and the power to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraph (11) of section 2 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement and only with respect to contracts which will not require the expenditure of more than \$25,000.

(c) Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), or (16) of section 2 (c), by section 4 or by section 5 (a) shall be based upon written findings made by the official making such determination, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the agency for a period of at least 6 years following the date of the determination. A copy of the findings shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office with the contract.

(d) In any case where any purchase or contract is negotiated pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c), except in a case covered by paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) thereof, the data with respect to the negotiation shall be preserved in the files of the agency for a period of 6 years following final payment on such contract.

SEC. 8. No purchase or contract shall be exempt from the act of June 30, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 2036), as amended by the act of June 28, 1940, 54 Stat. 681, and by the act of May 13, 1942, 56 Stat. 277; U. S. C., title 41, secs. 35 to 45) or from the act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494, as amended by the act of August 30, 1935, 49 Stat. 1011, and by the act of June 15, 1940, 54 Stat. 399; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 276a to 276a-6), solely by reason of having been entered into pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof without advertising, and the provisions of said acts and of the act of June 19, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 137, as amended by the act of September 9, 1940, 54 Stat. 884; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 324 and 325a), if otherwise applicable, shall apply to such purchases and contracts.

SEC. 9. As used herein—

(a) The term "agency head" shall mean the Secretary, Under Secretary (if any), or

any Assistant Secretary of the Army, of the Navy, or of the Air Force; the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department; and the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively.

(b) The term "supplies" shall mean all property except land, and shall include, by way of description and without limitation, public works, buildings, facilities, ships, floating equipment, and vessels of every character, type and description, aircraft, parts, accessories, equipment, machine tools and alteration or installation thereof.

SEC. 10. In order to facilitate the procurement of supplies and services by each agency for others and the joint procurement of supplies and services required by such agencies, subject to the limitations contained in section 7 of this act, each agency head may make such assignments and delegations of procurement responsibilities within his agency as he may deem necessary or desirable, and the agency heads or any of them by mutual agreement may make such assignments and delegations of procurement responsibilities from one agency to any other or to officers or civilian employees of any such agency, and may create such joint or combined offices to exercise such procurement responsibilities, as they may deem necessary or desirable. Appropriations available to any such agency shall be available for obligation for procurement as provided for in such appropriations by any other agency through administrative allotments in such amount as may be authorized by the head of the allotting agency without transfer of funds on the books of the Treasury Department. Disbursing officers of the allotting agency may make disbursements chargeable to such allotments upon vouchers certified by officers or civilian employees of the procuring agency.

SEC. 11. (a) The following acts are hereby repealed:

Revised Statutes, section 3716 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1202);

Revised Statutes, section 3717 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 9);

Revised Statutes, section 3718 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 561);

Revised Statutes, section 3719 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 562);

Revised Statutes, section 3720 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 563);

Revised Statutes, section 3721, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 569-570);

Revised Statutes, section 3722 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 572);

Revised Statutes, section 3723 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 573);

Revised Statutes, section 3724 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 574);

Revised Statutes, section 3726 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 577);

Revised Statutes, section 3727 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 578);

Revised Statutes, section 3729 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 579);

Act of June 14, 1878, No. 30 (20 Stat. 253; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 565);

Act of March 3, 1893 (ch. 212, sec. 1, 27 Stat. 732; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 566);

Act of March 2, 1907 (ch. 2512, 34 Stat. 1193; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 571);

Act of March 4, 1913 (ch. 148, 37 Stat. 904; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 575);

Act of June 30, 1914 (ch. 130, 38 Stat. 398; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 567);

Act of May 15, 1936 (ch. 400, 49 Stat. 1277; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1199 (a));

Act of July 13, 1939 (ch. 265, 53 Stat. 1000; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 313);

(b) The following acts shall not apply to the procurement of supplies or services by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department, or the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:

Revised Statutes, section 3709, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5);

Revised Statutes, section 3735 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 13);

Act of October 10, 1940, ch. 851, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 1109, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, secs. 6 and 6a).

(c) The following parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) That portion of the act making appropriations for fortifications, approved February 24, 1891 (26 Stat. 769), relating to "Armanent of fortifications," which reads as follows: "Provided, That no contract for the expenditure of any portion of the money herein provided, or that may be hereafter provided, for the purchase of steel shall be made until the same shall have been submitted to public competition by the Department by advertisement."

(2) Those portions of the Army Appropriation Acts approved March 2, 1901 (ch. 803, 31 Stat. 905; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1201); and June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 514), relating to "Quartermaster's Department, Regular Supplies," which read as follows: "Provided further, That hereafter, except in cases of emergency or where it is impracticable to secure competition, the purchase of all supplies for the use of the various departments and posts of the Army and of the branches of the Army service shall only be made after advertisement, and shall be purchased where the same can be purchased the cheapest, quality and cost of transportation and the interests of the Government considered."

(3) That portion of the Army Appropriation Act approved June 12, 1906 (ch. 3078, 34 Stat. 258; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1205), relating to "Ordnance Department," which reads as follows: "Hereafter the purchase of supplies and the procurement of services for all branches of the Army service may be made in open market, in the manner common among businessmen, when the aggregate of the amount required does not exceed \$500; but every such purchase exceeding \$100 shall be promptly reported to the Secretary of War for approval, under such regulations as he may prescribe."

(4) That portion of the Army Appropriation Act, approved May 11, 1908 (ch. 163, 35 Stat. 125; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1199), relating to "Ordnance Department," which reads as follows: "Whenever proposals are invited for the furnishing of articles of ordnance property, the character of which or the ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the interests of the public service would be injured by publicly divulging them, the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to purchase such articles in such manner as he may deem most economical and efficient."

(5) That portion of the War Department Appropriation Act, approved May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1299), relating to "arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, for field service, National Guard," which reads as follows: "Provided, That specifications for motor vehicles, which shall be so drawn as to admit of competition, shall to the extent otherwise practicable conform with the requirements of the National Guard."

(d) All other laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Navy shall have the same authority with respect to contracts of the Department of the Navy as the Secretary of the Army has with respect to contracts for the Department of the Army under the act of April 10, 1878, as amended (20 Stat. 36, as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, 22 Stat. 487; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 218). The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall have the same authority with respect to emergency purchases of war material abroad as the Secretary of the Navy has with respect to such purchases under the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 399; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 568).

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective 90 days after the date of enactment.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will recall that it has hitherto been ordered that upon conclusion of the call of the calendar on today, January 26, 1948, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 111, a joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, in section 1, on page 2, line 16, after the words "on the", to strike out "Saint Lawrence River" and insert "Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence System"; in section 3, page 3, line 25, after "(4)", to insert "that tolls may also be charged for passengers but that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of \$1.50 per passenger; (5)", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That, as provided by article XIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain, the agreement made by and between the Governments of the United States and Canada, dated March 19, 1941, published in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, is hereby approved, with the exception of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and article IX thereof, and the President is hereby authorized and empowered to fulfill the undertakings made on behalf of the United States in said agreement, with the exception of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and article IX, upon the receipt by him of satisfactory evidence of the approval of said agreement with the exceptions provided above, by reciprocal or concurrent legislation of Canada: *Provided*, That the President, before said agreement enters into force, obtains satisfactory assurances, by exchange of notes or otherwise, that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the new deep-water navigation works on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system herein authorized self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls, this principle to be implemented through the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both Governments pursuant to section 3 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that it would be desirable for the President to negotiate with Canada a treaty or treaties with reference to the matters provided for in articles VII and IX of the agreement of March 19, 1941, including provisions with respect to perpetual navigation rights on the Great Lakes, on the connecting channels and canals and in the wholly Canadian sections of the St. Lawrence River, and the provisions for the amendment of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 with respect to diversion of waters at Niagara River; and to submit such treaty or treaties for the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) During the period of construction the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada, under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, defining the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River, authorized in this joint resolution: *Provided*, That

(1) the total charges shall be fair and equitable and shall give due consideration to encouragement of increased utilization of the navigation facilities, and to the special character of bulk agricultural, mineral, and other raw materials; (2) that tolls shall vary for ships in ballast and according to the character of cargo with the view that each classification of cargo will so far as practicable derive relative benefits from the use of these facilities; (3) that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of \$1.25 per short ton of laden cargo, and may be less, depending on character of cargo; (4) that tolls may also be charged for passengers but that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of \$1.50 per passenger; (5) that tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River, with such exception of local or way or Government traffic as may be agreed upon by the two countries: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall become effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

(b) The President may, at his discretion, appoint a St. Lawrence Advisory Commission, to cooperate with similar representatives of the Government of Canada, for the purpose of studying and, after public hearings, making recommendations to their respective Governments on the administrative, technical, and economic aspects of a toll system on the proposed 27-foot St. Lawrence Canals, as a basis for the agreement on tolls proposed in this section.

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and to enable the United States to carry out the undertakings hereby authorized.

(b) Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, no amendment of the agreement, and no exchange of notes under article I, section 4 thereof, shall impose additional financial or other obligations on the United States.

SEC. 5. The President is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the government of the State of New York for the transfer to the appropriate agency of that State of the power facilities on the United States side of the International Rapids constructed pursuant to this joint resolution, the cost to be determined in accordance with the method of allocation included in the joint recommendation of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Power Authority of the State of New York, dated February 7, 1933, presented at public hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations February 10, 1933, Seventy-second Congress, second session: *Provided*, That such arrangement is consistent with the laws of the United States and protects the interests of the United States and of other States: *And provided further*, That such arrangement will be effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the State of New York.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is a privilege as well as an honor for me to speak in favor of the passage of so vital a piece of legislation as the St. Lawrence seaway, vital not only to 50,000,000 people in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Basin, but vital to 145,000,000 people who are citizens of this country, vital to another twelve to fifteen million people dwelling in Canada, and vital to those who are to come hereafter, affecting in all from two hundred to two hundred and fifty million people.

Mr. President, prior to the time that Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, became a candidate for the Senate of the United

States, he occupied an office in the legislative branch of Illinois, and one of the challenging problems that came before the people of Illinois was whether or not they would permit bonds issued by the State of Illinois to go to default. There was a great deal of discussion. Finally, Mr. Douglas crystallized the matter by means of a simple resolution, reading:

Resolved, That Illinois be honest.

That resolution was adopted, and Illinois made good on the bonds she had issued.

Mr. President, in facing the issue of the St. Lawrence waterway I have no question in my mind respecting the honesty and integrity and the good judgment of every Member of the Senate. I have been associating with the Members of the Senate for 9 years. But I also know that we are all only human, and I know that many times we are creatures of emotion, fear, doubt, and frustration when we ought to be creatures of logic. So, prefacing my remarks, I say, let us use that God-given judgment in this case, bearing in mind the world in which we are living, a world contracted by man's inventions and man's ingenuity. Let us try to see in all its implications the project we are undertaking to discuss and understand.

Mr. President, I need not say that the Congress of the United States has before it, and will begin consideration within the next few weeks, the question of whether or not we shall appropriate four or five or six or seven billion dollars for foreign aid. Let us be honest and realize that a great problem exists nearer home.

I hope to make of these remarks merely a summary of the principal arguments advanced for the seaway. May I ask of my colleagues their kind indulgence so that I may complete my statement without interruption. I shall then be happy to answer any questions which they may care to submit.

Following my presentation, I understand that a number of my colleagues will give to the Senate the benefit of their judgment on behalf of this vital project. The proponents include the Senate President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the worthy minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who introduced the seaway joint resolution in the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress; the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has ably championed the project since his coming to this great body; the worthy Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who headed up the subcommittee which extensively explored the seaway measure in 1946 and favorably reported it, the senior and junior Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG], and other Senators.

LITERATURE ON SEAWAY

I ask that during the next few days my colleagues try to find time to consult some of the literature on this subject. I invite their particular attention to the following:

First. The majority report on the seaway, Senate Report No. 810, part 1, which includes the 1946 majority report.

Second. The booklet of questions and answers on the seaway, prepared by the Commerce Department.

Third. The summary by the Library of Congress, giving the historic background of the seaway.

Fourth. The digest of hearings before my own foreign relations subcommittee on the seaway.

If Senators have sufficient time they might try to glance through the hearings held in 1947 and perhaps the more voluminous hearings held in 1946. I believe that even with the limited time which they can reserve for this matter amidst all their other responsibilities, they will be impressively convinced, as I am, of the need of this Nation—of all its sections—for the seaway now and in the period to come.

PROCEDURE WHICH I SHALL FOLLOW

It will be my aim, in the course of my remarks, to present the arguments as I see them on behalf of this long-deferred project. I do not intend to indulge in personalities, nor do I intend to make a large number of references to some of the organizations which oppose the seaway. I shall, however, cite some of them and endeavor objectively to disprove their arguments. I may say, however, that I recognize and respect the able character and that I treasure the friendship of many of my colleagues in this body who are unfortunately opposed to this valuable project, as well as many private individuals who also are opposed to it. But my personal deep feelings for them do not and will not change my unalterable desire to see the joint resolution passed by the Senate and House during the Eightieth Congress.

PREVIOUS SUPPORTERS OF SEAWAY

We are not alone here today, Mr. President, as we begin the debate on this historic project. The generations of men who have nobly contributed toward the advancing of this great idea and its fulfillment, as well as the 50,000,000 men and women of the Midwest and the Great Lakes area whose welfare depends on this project, are with us in spirit today. They are looking to us for statesmanship, for the national view, the larger perspective. They are hoping that we will serve them and the generations of Americans who are to follow.

The Halls of the United States Senate have been graced by countless statesmen who have worked nobly for the objective of the bill which we are taking up today.

I could not, of course, undertake to cite all the names of my illustrious predecessors who have worked for this objective. No list would, however, be complete without the names of Senator William Edgar Borah, of Idaho, Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, Senators Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Senator Irving Lenroot, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, and countless other Senators—some now with us, some now departed, but all of them great servants of the Republic.

NATIONAL VERSUS SECTIONAL VIEW

These great statesmen recognized that although the Midwest would be the primary area which would feel the favorable impact of this mighty waterway, it would benefit all sections of the land,

and we are concerned here today with the national welfare, with the public interest of 143,000,000 Americans and countless millions yet unborn.

I recall the words spoken in the United States Senate in 1848 by Henry Clay, who stated:

I have heard something said about allegiance to the South. I know no South, no North, no East, no West, to which I owe any allegiance. * * * The gentleman speaks of Virginia being my country. The Union, sir, is my country.

America is our country—not Wisconsin, not Massachusetts, not Pennsylvania, but the 48 States and all the people within it, who will be benefited by the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

SUPPORT BY UNITED STATES PRESIDENTS

No introduction to this resolution could be adequate without reference to the great Chief Executives of America in recent history who have unanimously endorsed this project. Although history may not have yet given a final evaluation to their life endeavors, nevertheless their stature and importance are uncontested. Let the opponents of the seaway bear in mind that when they oppose this project they put their views in contrast alongside the resounding statements of these American Presidents.

FORMER PRESIDENTS HOOVER'S AND ROOSEVELT'S ENDORSEMENTS

One former Chief Executive of our land testified for the seaway. A great engineer, a great organizer of foreign relief, a selfless servant of this Nation, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, stated:

The signing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway treaty marks another step forward in this, the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American Continent. * * * Its completion will have a profoundly favorable effect upon the development of agriculture and industry throughout the Midwest. The large byproduct of power will benefit the Northeast. * * *

Mr. Hoover has consistently supported the seaway for over two decades.

Mr. Hoover's successor in the White House, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, also took his stand forthrightly on behalf of the seaway. He remarked:

I subscribe to the definite belief that the completion of the seaway will greatly serve the economic and transportation needs of a vast area of the United States and should, therefore, be considered solely from the national point of view.

Franklin D. Roosevelt stated also that he was convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway would not "injure the railroads or throw their employees out of work," nor would it "interfere with the proper use of the Mississippi River or the Missouri River for navigation." It is this American President who stated in words that rang throughout a then panic-stricken Nation, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." So today, the only thing we have to fear about this project is fear over the most minute details, and fear that it may, if only temporarily, hurt the interests of this or that small segment of our country.

Fear did not build America. Fear did not see us through every one of our wars. Fear will not answer the needs

of America in this atomic age. Rather it is faith which moves mountains; faith in the words, for example, of these great men. You and I know that lesser men have always followed the great stars on the horizon—the great statesmen like those whom I have mentioned, who serve as guides to a nation in doubt.

HARDING, COOLIDGE AND LA GUARDIA ENDORSED SEAWAY

I could cite the names of other great Americans. Warren G. Harding, for example, stated:

The feasibility of the project is unquestioned; and its cost, compared with some other great engineering works, would be small.

Calvin Coolidge, in commenting about projects such as this, said that their completion:

Is not incompatible with economy—

Get that, Senators—

for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive, as evinced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress.

I could cite the testimony of so forthright a figure as the late Mayor LaGuardia, of the great metropolis of New York City, who, testifying in 1946, remarked:

I am from the greatest port in the whole world. I have confidence in my port. * * * It is not the St. Lawrence seaway that I fear.

I could cite the testimony of great builders of American railroads who have testified for the seaway. Yet, to be sure, there are other and lesser railroad men who have opposed projects such as this, just as the purchase of Alaska was opposed. There were those who ridiculed the Panama Canal, who jeered at the possibilities of Duluth Harbor; fearists who opposed the purchase of Louisiana, doubting Thomases and others who have always opposed the expansion of this Nation. But fortunately their counsel was not heeded; and I trust and believe that the counsel of the seaway's opponents will not be heeded in our day.

This is a revenue-producing, self-sustaining project which will not drain the Treasury, but on the contrary will increase the material wealth of the American people and will retire its own investment.

FOUR-F OPPOSITION

The grounds for opposition to the seaway seem strictly four-F in their basis—fear, fancy, folly, and frustration—fear of progress, fancy in relying on questionable statements rather than facts, folly because of lack of vision, and frustration because this great Nation will frustrate the ambitions of a few selfish interests. I am not referring to any of my colleagues in this statement, but rather to the general grounds on which most of the opposition seems based.

INITIAL SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR SEAWAY

Mr. President, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 111 is to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The reasons for the affirmative recommendation by an overwhelming majority of the Foreign Relations Committee are spread in the volu-

minous records of the committee, which held extensive hearings on this subject in 1933, 1946, and 1947.

Before this debate is concluded, the following facts will be amply proved:

First. The St. Lawrence seaway is a needed navigation facility which will relieve recurrent shortages of transportation and eliminate the economic wastage that results from the inability of the railroads to carry the peak traffic of the summer months.

Second. The St. Lawrence seaway will reduce transportation costs in an area which contains more than 50,000,000 people, an area which has become not only the arsenal of democracy for war but also the hope of the world in the revitalization of human and material welfare in food production and in manufactured and mineral products.

Third. The St. Lawrence power project, which is a byproduct of this undertaking, will supply 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity to Canada and the United States in an area which has been suffering from the beginning of World War II with recurrent power shortages. This power is cheaper than any alternative source now available or hereafter to be available in the northeastern part of the United States.

Fourth. The St. Lawrence project as herein presented will be an addition to our national defense potential by virtue of the additional and much-needed navigation and power facilities which it will make available for necessary industrial mobilization in a time of emergency.

Fifth. The St. Lawrence project will be self-liquidating, returning to the Government and the people, the taxpayers of this Nation, the capital investment and interest upon that investment, as well as all operating costs. It will be self-liquidating in its navigation aspects as well as in the sale of power.

Sixth. It will be amply demonstrated that the opposition to the St. Lawrence project seems mainly centered in certain small economic and financial groups in the East who seem anxious to maintain their hold on transportation from the Middle West to the seacoast and their hold upon the power supply for the northeastern area.

It will be demonstrated that no economic harm is actually threatened to those interests, but that their position seems motivated principally by their desire to maintain their hold upon the future growth of this whole territory.

These facts will be proved by documentation in these proceedings.

I ask my colleagues to suspend judgment until they have heard the full case, not only my statement but also the statements which will be given by other proponents of this resolution, as well as the statements of the opponents.

HISTORY OF THIS LEGISLATION

This and similar resolutions have been considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at various times during the past 3 years. My colleagues will recall that Senate Joint Resolution 104 of the Seventy-ninth Congress was the subject of extensive hearings and a favorable report by the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 14 to 8. Being reported near the end of the con-

gressional session, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was not acted upon by the Senate.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 111 was submitted by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on behalf of himself and 15 other Senators. On May 14, 1947, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee appointed a subcommittee consisting of myself as chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. The Senator from New Mexico had previously served as chairman of a subcommittee in the Seventy-ninth Congress on Senate Joint Resolution 104, thereby establishing a continuity in the deliberations of the present subcommittee.

WHY 1947 HEARINGS WERE LIMITED

In view of the voluminous record accumulated over a period of 3 weeks by the subcommittee on Senate Joint Resolution 104 in 1946, the record of which extends through 1,383 pages, the present subcommittee confined the scope of the hearings to the two main subjects of immediate importance, namely, the extent to which national defense interests were involved in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and means of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. Although major emphasis was placed upon these two subjects, no testimony was excluded on other phases of the project and there was considerable repetition, particularly by opponents of the project, of the arguments previously presented on the economic phases of the subject.

Our subcommittee held hearings during 6 days, and the record of hearings, in spite of the abbreviated scope of the inquiry, consists of 603 pages. All who sought to be heard were heard by our subcommittee.

In deliberating on the subject, the committee had before it the hearings as well as the majority report of its predecessor subcommittee in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The majority report which I presented on January 7 does not repeat the substantive facts and arguments of the report on Senate Joint Resolution 104, but accepts them as an integral part of this report, except for costs and self-liquidation, which are on a new basis and are thoroughly discussed in the present report.

In view of the fact that the subcommittee which considered Senate Joint Resolution 104 of the Seventy-ninth Congress—of which subcommittee the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] was chairman—held most exhaustive hearings, and prepared a report which covers every aspect of this project thoroughly, it has been deemed helpful to the Senate to append this previous report to the present majority report, as well as the minority views of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. Thus the Senate has before it a most comprehensive and fair record.

Our subcommittee of five Senators voted unanimously to report the resolution to the full committee, and the committee on July 18 voted 9 to 4 to report

to the Senate, with the proviso that the minority would be accorded the courtesy of ample time to prepare its report. A minority report has been filed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and is available in printed form.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RESOLUTION

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will present in due course a detailed statement on the evolution of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and the constitutional aspects of the form of this legislation. He has taken the lead, over the past 3 years, in cooperation with the State Department and through them with the Canadian authorities, in redrafting the legislation into its present form in order to meet objections raised by several Senators in 1944.

Without elaborating on the issue of constitutionality of the procedure herein recommended, I will say briefly that the basic authority of Congress to legislate as proposed rests in the constitutional power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States"—Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8.

The Supreme Court has, on numerous occasions, held that this clause vests in the Congress power to authorize the construction of navigation and power works in river basins. In addition to this constitutional authority, article 13 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 with Canada establishes a procedure whereby special agreements may be entered into between the parties for the development of boundary waters, which agreements, or any mutual arrangements, are subject to approval by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of the Congress and the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada. This is exactly the procedure herein adopted as this agreement is subject to a majority vote by both Houses of Congress and after that by the Parliament of Canada. It does not go into effect until such approval is obtained.

The pending proposal thus adequately meets all legitimate questions regarding constitutionality. On this subject, pending a full discussion of the subject by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, I commend the attention of Senators to the memorandum of the Department of State on the constitutionality of the St. Lawrence legislation, which is available as a committee print, and the conclusions of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee embodied in the report on Senate Joint Resolution 104, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and his committee performed a herculean task, and I am sure that anyone who is vitally interested in the constitutional question will find all the answers there.

Mr. President, I wish to give a brief explanation of the provisions of the bill. As I said some time ago, most of us in Congress have to follow leaders. We are very busy in our own committee work, we have our individual problems, so that matters outside of our committee jurisdiction necessarily do not come to us, and we therefore look to men of judgment,

men who have given study and who have had time to contribute deliberation to the subject.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL'S PROVISIONS

Suffice it to say that section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 111 authorizes the President to carry out the provisions of the agreement of March 19, 1941, with Canada, with the proviso that the President shall obtain, prior to such undertaking, assurances that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. This measure, in effect, authorizes the President to contract for our share of the joint undertaking at the international section of the river. The actual appropriations would still await congressional action, of course.

Section 2 authorizes the President to negotiate certain treaties with Canada to expand provisions of existing navigation rights between the two countries and to authorize additional diversion of water at Niagara.

Section 3 authorizes the President to enter into a new agreement with Canada to define the conditions and rates of charges for making the seaway self-liquidating.

Section 4 authorizes the necessary appropriations but limits the powers of the President so that the financial commitments of this Government may not be altered by executive action or exchange of notes between the two governments.

Section 5 authorizes the President to enter into an agreement with the government of the State of New York, to transfer the power facilities authorized by the agreement to the State in consideration of a price equal to the cost of the power project and one-half of the joint costs allocated to the United States.

FUTURE SENATE APPROVAL OF TREATIES

It must be made clear that the treaties to be negotiated pursuant to section 2, the agreement concerning tolls on the seaway, and the agreement for the transfer of the power project to New York State are all subject to approval by the Congress according to appropriate procedure applicable in each case. The Congress, therefore, will have full opportunity to express itself on the conditions of operation of both the seaway and the power project.

The effect of this resolution, therefore, I repeat, is simply to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, subject to similar approval by the Canadian Parliament, insuring at the same time that both the navigation and power aspects of the project will be self-liquidating. In short, the Congress is called upon to make an investment in this project, which will be returned ultimately with interest on the investment.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The St. Lawrence project now before Congress has two purposes: First, it will make it possible for oceangoing, deep-draft vessels to travel directly from the Atlantic Ocean into the Great Lakes. It will make seaports of such great cities as Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth. It will bring the great agricultural and indus-

trial productive capacity of the Middle West into direct communication by cheap water transportation with the rest of the world and with the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts of the United States.

As a navigation project, it is as important to our country as the Suez Canal is to Europe, as the Dardanelles is to Russia, as the Panama Canal is to the east and west coasts of the Western Hemisphere.

In building the necessary dams and canals on the St. Lawrence River, there will be a large byproduct of cheap hydroelectric power in northern New York. The capacity of this single powerhouse will be 2,200,000 horsepower, the largest power capacity of a single project with the exception of Grand Coulee. This will be three times as large as the Dneiper Dam, the pride of Russia. The annual output of electricity will be larger than all the power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1944. It is cheap power, costing one and two-thirds mills per kilowatt-hour of average output at the station, one-quarter as expensive as the cheapest source of steam power in that area.

The power will be divided equally with Canada. The American share will be available for distribution as far south as New York City, and throughout the New England States. Cheap water power in that area of 20,000,000 people means lower monthly electric bills, more industries, more jobs, greater sales of electric appliances, more farms electrified.

PREVIOUS CONSTRUCTION

This is not a new project, but a bid for final completion of a waterway that has been in process of construction for 40 years. The Great Lakes now provide deep-water navigation throughout their length and breadth.

We start at Duluth and swing up to the Soo. I call attention to the fact that through the Soo locks in 1946 there were carried 120,000,000 tons of freight, most of it one way, and through the MacArthur Lock approximately 50,000,000 tons at the Soo alone.

The MacArthur Lock at the Soo, built by the Army engineers in 1943 as a war project, connects Lake Superior and Lake Huron. That part of the seaway, as originally proposed, is now completed.

Eight locks of the Welland Canal, completed by Canada in 1932, scale the difference in the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, 324 feet. Except for a little dredging operation, that part of the seaway is completed too, and deep-draft ships can now proceed from Duluth at the head of Lake Superior for 1,200 miles to Ogdensburg, N. Y., on the upper St. Lawrence River.

The eastern end of the St. Lawrence River is navigable for ocean ships for a thousand miles from the Atlantic Ocean to Montreal, Canada. This city, on the St. Lawrence River, is the second largest seaport in North America, next only to New York City.

We have, therefore, deep-sea navigation for a thousand miles inland from the Atlantic on the lower St. Lawrence River to Montreal. We have deep-sea navigation for 1,200 miles in the Great

Lakes and the upper St. Lawrence to Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The only impediment that prevents through navigation is the presence of some rapids in the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg, on the upper St. Lawrence, and Montreal on the lower St. Lawrence. Over this distance of 119 miles, the water level drops some 223 feet in three series of rapids. The project now before Congress contemplates the construction of the necessary dams, canals and locks by Canada and the United States to complete this work, with a huge byproduct of cheap water power. We can join the Great Lakes and the Atlantic together for ocean navigation by helping to knock away the rocks in the St. Lawrence rapids through congressional approval of Senate Joint Resolution 111.

ARMY ENGINEERS' COST ESTIMATE

What will this work cost? Everyone is rightly interested in this subject and there is unfortunately much misrepresentation of the facts. Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of the United States Army engineers, during his testimony before the subcommittee submitted a table showing the total cost of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the cost to complete the project, based on May 1947 price levels. The subcommittee accepted the Army engineers basic cost figures as they relate to the United States portion of the works. It has, however, found it desirable from the standpoint of appraising the feasibility of self-liquidation to bring the Canadian cost figures up to date. The Army engineers table showed all Canadian costs with the exception of those in the international rapids section at 1941 levels. The subcommittee therefore added 54 percent to put them upon a basis uniform with the American costs. This results in an overstatement, since Canadian construction costs have not advanced as much, but it has the advantage of making our estimates conservative.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT—LOCKS AND POWER FACILITIES—SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY MILLIONS

The cost to complete the project on this basis is in round figures \$720,000,000, of which the Canadian cost is approximately \$230,000,000 and the United States cost \$490,000,000. This \$720,000,000 figure is the one adopted by the subcommittee as the starting point for determining the amount to be liquidated. The resolution provides for the self-liquidation of new works and the subcommittee considers that it properly excludes from self-liquidation the cost of work done in the past. The construction already completed—chiefly the Welland Canal by Canada and the MacArthur lock and past dredging of channels in the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers by the United States—will form an integral part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, but they also have served and will continue to serve Great Lakes shipping which will not be subject to tolls.

FIRST COST OF SEAWAY, THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHT MILLIONS

As already indicated, the subcommittee considers that all expenditures for

new work should be liquidated. Accordingly, the actual payments by the State of New York to the United States Government under the provisions of section 5 of the resolution, and the payments by the Province of Ontario to the Dominion Government for the power facilities, must be taken as the total cost of the power project, and must be deducted from the total cost of \$720,000,000. In this way, we arrive at the out-of-pocket contributions by the Federal Governments of Canada and the United States for navigation to be liquidated by charges on tolls. The cost of the power projects thus to be deducted is estimated at \$322,000,000 leaving as the first cost of the seaway \$398,000,000.

TOTAL SEAWAY NET INVESTMENT, FOUR HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHT MILLIONS

Using the interest rate of 2½ percent, which is closer to the actual rate—2.06 percent—at which the United States Government borrows money today, the total net investment would be about \$428,000,000. This is the total cost of the seaway to the two Governments. I am dealing with total cost figures because, if the seaway is to be self-liquidating, and the users will pay for it, then the economic and financial calculations must be made on a total basis, for the traffic going through the St. Lawrence deep seaway must pay for both Canadian and American costs.

ANNUAL COST OF SEAWAY, SEVENTEEN AND ONE-HALF MILLIONS

We now have the total cost, including interest during construction, namely, \$428,000,000. What is the annual cost that must be met by annual revenues? The annual cost must consider interest, amortization, and operation and maintenance. Taking \$428,000,000 as the investment and applying an interest rate of 2½ percent, which more closely approximates actual borrowing rates, and using a sinking fund of 1 percent at 2½ percent compound interest, which would retire the investment in 53 years, and maintenance and operation at \$2,460,000, the total annual charges would be \$17,450,000.

ALTERNATIVE POLICIES FOR SELF-LIQUIDATION

The committee is cognizant of the fact that there are several alternative financial and accounting policies that may be adopted in bringing about a sound administration of this project on a self-liquidating basis. There are choices to be made in the matter of interest rates, in the matter of amortization policy—whether straight or sinking-fund or a depreciation policy—and in the period over which the retirement of investment should be effectuated. Any one of these alternatives would be sound and acceptable, and they have been used both by private industry and by Government. The exact details may not be established by unilateral action of the United States Government alone, but must be settled through negotiation and agreement with the Canadians. The committee has applied these available alternatives to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and finds that the results show annual cost of figures that vary between fifteen million and twenty-one million dollars. Mr. President, I ask Senators to note that

amount. That is the annual overhead, on this basis, for maintenance, depreciation, and so forth.

Any one of these alternatives would be a sound policy. If the accounting system used on the Panama Canal by the War Department is used on the St. Lawrence seaway, the lower figure of \$15,000,000 a year would be obtained. If the system recommended by the opponents is used, the figure is \$21,000,000.

RAILROADS' PADDED COST ESTIMATES

Before proceeding to consider traffic and revenue potentials, let me briefly dwell upon some of the accounting ledger-deman that the opponents employ in order to pad and exaggerate cost figures.

In the course of the hearings on this joint resolution it became abundantly clear that the principal opponents of this proposition are certain groups who seem afraid of the effect of the competition of this waterway upon their businesses. Of these, the Association of American Railroads is apparently in the forefront.

MAGNIFICENT RECORD OF UNITED STATES RAILROADS

Let me first state that as I take issue with the association's attitude on this proposition, I am not without appreciation of the splendid work the association has done and the railroads have done, both during the war and since, in carrying the Nation's military and civilian traffic. The railroads reached great heights of accomplishment under terrific handicaps; in fact, they have carried the enormous traffic of our wartime and post-war economy with equipment which, both in capacity and age, dates back to the First World War. In spite of the superhuman efforts of the operating officials of our railroads, there have inevitably developed, during each peak season, shortages of transportation which have caused wastage of production in many parts of our land. All of us are aware of that. It has become a common and perennial experience, one that we have come to expect every summer, that staple foods, such as grains, stored in the open fields because of lack of elevator capacity and lack of boxcars, and perishable foods in California, Texas, Florida, and many other States are wasted because the railroads are unable to render the service, upon demand, which their franchise requires them to do.

INADEQUACY OF RAILROAD FACILITIES

I am not criticizing or blaming anyone for this condition. I am merely pointing out a fact, namely, that we are trying to run a \$200,000,000,000 economy with transportation equipment that was designed and constructed and expected to serve a sixty- or seventy-billion-dollar economy 25 or 30 years ago.

Any effort on the part of rail transportation interests to put impediments in the way of expanding transportation services will result in putting the economy of this country into a strait-jacket, and such a procedure is directly contrary to public interest. I make that definite statement. It is possible that if I were not in the Senate of the United States, I might, as an attorney, be on the opposite side of this issue, having served in my time, in a local way, two railroads. But, fortunately, I am in the Senate, and

I must take the national view. My own judgment is, with that background, that not in the long run, but in the short run, if this St. Lawrence waterway is constructed, it will ultimately improve not only the business of the railroads, but the business of everyone in America. Perhaps I shall have something more to say about that later on.

SEAWAY WILL MEET FUTURE UNITED STATES NEEDS

In discussing the St. Lawrence seaway project, we must conceive of it as a facility that is designed to meet transportation requirements not this year, not next year, not in 1950 or 1951, but 10, 20, and 30 years from now. Under peacetime conditions of construction this project will take 6 years to complete. If approved this year, we cannot expect the seaway to be utilized until 1954 or 1955, or perhaps even later.

It must be obvious to everyone that in the light of the experience of the last 7 years, with the growth of population and the working force of this country, with greater efficiency and productivity of workers, with greater utilization of mechanical devices and of electric power, and with increased productivity per man-hour, this country will experience over the next 10 or 20 years a growth in total national production and the standard of living which will necessitate enormous expansion in transportation facilities. So the St. Lawrence seaway must be considered as a part of the additional new facilities the country needs.

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

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

Mr. WILEY. I have asked not to be interrupted during the presentation of this part of my remarks; but if the Senator from Maryland has a specific question, I am willing to be interrupted for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to defer to the Senator's request. I do not wish to take issue with him on any particular matter, but I wish to ask whether he has any data, to be presented during the course of his address, which tend to show the purported volume of business likely to be carried over this canal in 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, if it is constructed.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, we have the judgment of the best men available, and they have considered the future situation. I refer to men of about as high integrity as we can find, men of high position in Government, men like former President Hoover and others who have given their judgment; and all that information is to be found in the hearings. If I do not refer to all of it during my remarks, I shall be happy to refer the distinguished Senator from Maryland to the evidence set forth in the hearings, where he can read what they have said about it.

In response to the Senator's question, I wish to say that the expressed fear that there will not be sufficient tonnage to carry the load of \$15,000,000, or even \$21,000,000, is to my mind the usual fear that has been expressed throughout the history of mankind in regard to such projects. A similar fear was expressed,

for example, in regard to the Panama Canal. The same interests opposed the building of the Panama Canal. The fear was that America would remain static, would not grow. However, in the case of the Panama Canal, subsequent events indicated, as I shall show, a tonnage growth to a point where it is a good business proposition, even from the standpoint of dollars and cents; and the same is true of the other large canals of the earth. I do not wish to be diverted into a discussion of that point at this time, but I shall come to it later.

At this time I simply wish to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Maryland that all of us should refer to the map and see what this seaway project will mean—a route of 1,200 miles from Duluth, on Lake Superior, through the Great Lakes to Ogdensburg, N. Y., where there are rapids for a short distance—approximately 116 miles—which will be avoided by the building of locks, and where at the same time great quantities of electrical energy will be developed. New York is short of such energy, the East generally is short of it, and if we ever encounter another emergency, we shall be able to use that power, transmitting it as far west as Chicago.

The whole picture is one that simply calls upon us to get rid of the fear that the completion of the project is going to hurt this locality or that locality. We see that men like Secretary Harriman, a railroad man, Dewey, of New York, Roosevelt, of New York, LaGuardia, of New York, and numerous others, were returned by their constituents time and time again, by increasingly large majorities. They were men who stood for the project. They were not limited to the local view, but had the over-all view that by improving part of the Nation we improve the whole Nation. We had in the picture the railroads, as I will show, who said they would not oppose the project if it were put on a liquidation basis. It is put on a liquidation basis. They now question repeatedly all the estimated items. Of course, it is necessary to estimate futures, but we Americans have been rather good at that. There was testimony by the engineer, Mr. Wheeler. Figures will be placed in the RECORD showing that the Army engineers through the years have done such a tremendously accurate job of estimating that it is almost miraculous, comparing the estimated costs with the actual costs.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to refer the Senator from Maryland to the Industry Report on Domestic Transportation, which came off the press just a little over a month ago. It is a study made by the United States Department of Commerce on the very subject about which the Senator from Maryland was inquiring. The summary of the report does not appear in either the report of the committee or the minority views on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, because the study was not completed until late last fall, whereas the hearings were concluded last spring. I am sure if the Senator from Maryland will get this industry report, which is available at the Depart-

ment of Commerce, he will find just what the estimated amount of tonnage may be, and what the estimated amount of receipts and tolls may be. Of course, no one can tell to the ton or to the dollar just what either will be.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TYDINGS. I again thank the Senator from Wisconsin and apologize for violating his request, which I had no intention of doing when I arose.

Mr. WILEY. There is no need to apologize. I should like to have any Senator interrupt, but it does not make for continuity, that is all.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I should like to have is evidently the data suggested by the able Senator from Vermont. I should also like to have for my own consideration the data as to what traffic would likely be diverted, and from where, to make up the volume which he has suggested.

Mr. WILEY. I think there will be found testimony on that subject by men like Harriman, who testified there might be a little diversion. One might find testimony by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, who fears there will be a great diversion, but I think by and large the testimony overwhelmingly shows that the traffic is going to be in the nature of the shipment of grains and heavy materials out-bound, with various materials in-bound. I shall go into that later in my remarks. The coast-wise traffic was estimated in one place at from 1 to 3 percent, possibly, to begin with, but I think it will be found in the over-all picture that will all be caught up, with the Midwest economically healthy, which it may not be unless they get the St. Lawrence seaway, which I hope the Senator will note as I develop that subject. With the Midwest healthy, there is no question that, as we grow in population and in economic health, the tonnage in the East ports and in New Orleans will be increased rather than decreased.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WILEY. I will finish first with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the Senator's primary premise is a sound one, that anything that benefits part of the country benefits the whole of the country. I think the converse is also true, that anything that hurts a part of the country hurts the whole country. My point was that if the seaway were not built, the traffic would move by other routes. If the seaway is built, some of the traffic that would not flow on it, of course, if it were not built, will be taken from other transportation routes and diverted to the St. Lawrence seaway. I want to know, and I am hoping someone who has been on the committee will tell me, where the traffic that would normally be carried by the existing routes is to come from if the St. Lawrence waterway is built.

Mr. WILEY. We will see that the Senator receives that break-down. Most of the information will be found right in the RECORD, but in the report referred to by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] there will be found additional testimony. I shall develop that point later on, when I present the picture of what the Middle West is facing in relation to its economic life. There is no buncombe about that conclusion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am going to take my seat, but before I do so I should like to state to the Senator that he can understand the primary motive for my asking the question. The city of Baltimore is the second port in exports and imports in the United States. The port of Baltimore was first in exports for 5 months of 1947. I want to help any other section of the country to improve, but it would be asking a good bit, if the building of the St. Lawrence seaway would cripple the great investments in the facilities that have already been installed in Baltimore to handle the freight received there. I do not want to approach the question on a narrow or provincial basis, but certainly that would be one of the great questions that ought to be considered not only by me but by the entire Senate in arriving at the feasibility of the project.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood the Senator did not want to be interrupted, so I did not interrupt him before, but on this point I should like to ask a question, or make a statement. The Senator from Vermont referred to the industry report of the Department of Commerce, headed by Mr. Harriman. I read that report, and if my memory is accurate—and I should like the Senator from Vermont to check it—the three principal commodities which the report says will be carried, and which will make up the most of the toll, are iron ore from Labrador and from Brazil, which will make up approximately fifteen million of twenty-one million estimated, or possibly twenty-seven million estimated, the balance being grain and coal shipped up the canal. In other words, if my understanding is correct, the report indicates that most of the revenue will come from iron ore shipped up to the Great Lakes ports, rather than from iron ore which is now in the Duluth section of Lake Superior, and which is used for the steel mills of the Middle West, and in the rest of the country.

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

Mr. WILEY. I should like to continue, but if it be a matter of courtesy, I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It would be along the line that is now being discussed. The Senator has been courteous to other Senators. I thought he might yield to me.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator will recall that I had inserted in the RECORD during the closing days of the last session letters addressed to the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, from all the principal

ship lines operating under the American flag. They stated, with one exception, that they did not propose to use the St. Lawrence seaway, and they gave their reasons for not doing so. It is a very voluminous record. Has the Senator any evidence to the contrary, indicating that American shipping would be benefited by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; there is plenty of evidence, I am sure, but I do not care to go into the subject, except to say that that is one of the arguments made. Of course, first, there is a fear that the tonnage will be taken away from them, and then the argument is made that there will not be any tonnage taken away, that there will not be any ships to carry it. That is just one of the arguments that is used continually.

Mr. VANDENBERG rose.

Mr. WILEY. I want to place in the Record at this time the Harriman report. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Maryland has gone. The report, on page 73, indicates roughly the possible range of toll charges and toll revenues. The estimate is from thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of ore, which would yield from \$15,000,000 to \$18,750,000 of revenue; grain, six and one-half to eleven and one-half million tons, that would yield \$1,625,000 to \$4,025,000; coal, 4,000,000 tons, which would yield from \$1,000,000 to \$1,400,000; and ballast, nineteen and one-half to twenty-two million tons, which would yield from \$3,300,000 to \$2,925,000, depending upon the toll. The toll ranges from 50 cents down to 15 cents. That is the Harriman report on the potential tonnage, totaling, as may be seen, in the neighborhood of fifty-odd million tons.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not care to interrupt the Senator, as I know he will reach all the related matters in good time. But I do not like to have the Senator from Maryland left even in temporary suspense regarding an overriding fundamental fact in connection with this contemplated traffic. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has referred to it. I think he was very gracious in providing us with an exhibit, which thus substantially destroys his own position in connection with the issue.

The fact is that by far the major portion of the traffic contemplated is a brand-new traffic in iron ore moving in to the steel production of the Middle West, something which has not occurred in hardly any degree heretofore. The truth of the matter is that we have exhausted our inland iron ore reserves, under war pressure, to such an extent that there certainly is no fooling about the proposition that we confront a crisis in respect to raw ore materials if the steel production of the Middle West is to continue.

All that traffic, as the able Senator from Massachusetts has so graciously indicated, is brand new traffic which is not being taken away from the port of Baltimore or the port of Boston or any other port, because it has not existed

heretofore, and it would have to exist on a water-borne basis. It could not possibly be shipped cheaply enough in any other manner because of the tremendous bulk and weight of the product.

We could not have developed the steel industry in the Middle West, even during the past years—and without it I do not know how we could have won the war—with rail transportation, because the ore does not lend itself to rail transportation. It has to be water-borne, and, if possible, without breaking cargo.

That is the chief source of contemplated revenue. And I respectfully submit to the Senator that he need have no fears that that sort of traffic is going to reduce any existing traffic, either in his great port of Baltimore or anywhere else on the Atlantic seaboard, because it is new traffic.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask one question. I see on the sheet the Senator from Wisconsin has handed me the item "Grain, 11,500,000 tons." Is that new traffic?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, probably not. I am not undertaking to give the Senator, I ask the Senator please to understand, a complete answer, because I do not want to intrude on the able Senator from Wisconsin, and I know he is going to reach this point in the course of his address. I simply wanted to underscore immediately the fact that there is a tremendous traffic involved here, which is entirely new traffic.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hand back to the Senator from Wisconsin the sheet which he permitted me to examine. I am very glad the Senator from Michigan has been fair enough to say that two of the items on the list, which are to be new traffic, and which he did not enumerate in his remarks, are not new traffic at all, they are old traffic, traffic that will be diverted from existing lines to this new line. Perhaps some of the old lines—it is not certain—possibly might go into bankruptcy. What I do not want to do is to hurt one part of the country while I am very anxious to help another part.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the gracious remarks of the Senator from Michigan, because they give me the opportunity to make myself, to use his term, crystal clear. As I understand, this iron ore which provides \$15,000,000 of the \$21,000,000 of prospective toll is to come from Labrador. The extent of the reserves of the prospective mines there have not even been tabulated. A 325-mile railroad has to be built before the ore can be brought to a port where it can be placed on boats. The question of the building of the railroad, the grades, and so on, the cost of building the road and the cost of operating it, are matters which are yet utterly unknown. I said what I did say to the Senator from Michigan, and I reply to him equally as graciously as he did to me, in an effort to point out that these tolls are illusory and in the future rather than of today or tomorrow.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway has been centered in a few ports, and among those ports have been the ports of Baltimore and Boston. Let me say that the development of the seaway will not take business from those ports. It will probably add greatly to the business of those ports. But there are in both Boston and Baltimore a few persons who have dreams of the days when the high-grade iron ore of the Midwest will be exhausted, and the steel industry will have to be forced to move to the Atlantic coast in order to get the low-cost foreign ore.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is stealing part of my argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, am I? Perhaps Members of the Senate do not know that the Sparrows Point steel plant of Baltimore used Chilean ore all through the war. They would stand for an expansion of that business in Baltimore if they could blot out the steel industry of the Midwest States. That would mean also that the Pennsylvania Railroad and possibly other lines would reap a harvest in hauling the finished products from Baltimore and possibly other eastern ports to the midwest. But the farmers, and others living in the midwest, would pay that cost. It would not be good for our country to destroy one of the greatest industries we ever had, which is the midwest steel industry.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

RAILROADS ACCEPT SELF-LIQUIDATION IN THEORY

It must be said to the credit of the Association of Railroads that they do not oppose—at least in their public statements—waterway facilities which are self-liquidating. Although the spokesman of the association was unable to recall any waterway which they had supported, still as a matter of principle it is clear that they do not oppose waterways, including the St. Lawrence seaway, if they are self-liquidating. This is what Dr. Julius H. Parmelee, vice president of the Association of Railroads said before the committee under cross-examination by me:

Senator WILEY. We understand now that this association that you represent has reached the conclusion that if it could be demonstrated with reasonable certainty that this could be a 100 percent liquidating project, a self-liquidating project, you would not be against it.

Dr. PARMELEE. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. We take that position, and it is a position we have held for many years. There has been no change in that position.

We have taken them at their word and are sincerely trying to make this project self-liquidating. We have no crystal ball. We cannot look into the future, but we will not sell America short, as some of the opponents of the seaway have. We have watched the progress of this Nation for 60 years, and we have seen that during every decade the level of the economic life of the Nation has risen, the standard of living of the Nation has increased, until today

we have a national income of \$220,000,000. We have balanced our budget, and we are paying off on our debt. We are contemplating building works in Europe like the one now under consideration, and yet we hesitate to build such works at home.

Since Dr. Parmelee made the statement I just read, however, the association of railroads has shown increasing activity in opposing the legislation in spite of its provisions for self-liquidation. Now they try to point out that the project cannot be made self-liquidating. A careful reading of their thesis, published in a pamphlet entitled "The Great Delusion," shows, however, that having conceded the primary principle that they favor the development of waterways on a self-liquidating basis, they are now driven to quibbling on facts and figures—a transparent strategem.

OPPONENTS AND PROPOONENTS AGREE ON FIRST COSTS

A careful study of their figures indicates there is not much difference between the proponents and opponents of the waterway on the initial costs. The association accepts the cost estimates of the Corps of Engineers which, for the total project, including both the seaway and power, amounts to \$720,000,000. Eliminating the cost of the power project which Ontario and New York will pay, some \$322,000,000, this leaves \$398,000 for the first cost of the seaway, including both Canadian and American expenditures. From here on, there are divergences between the opponents and the proponents.

WHY ADD INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL OF POWER COST TO SEAWAY COST?

The Association of American Railroads prefers to charge 3 percent interest during construction instead of 2½ percent, and to pad the account further, adds the interest on construction of the power project to the cost of the seaway—an amount of nearly \$29,000,000. By this device the association of railroads reaches a figure of \$464,000,000 for the cost of the seaway, with interest during construction at 3 percent, including interest on the power project. Why the seaway should pay the cost of interest on the power project is not explained. This is one example of the manner in which the association pads the figures. However, if we take the \$398,000,000 and add interest at 3 percent we would get \$435,000,000 for the cost of the seaway. At 2½ percent interest, a more reasonable and realistic figure, the cost of the seaway would be \$428,000,000. That is, take the cost of \$398,000,000, add the interest at the rate of 2½ percent during the period of construction, and we will have what the seaway will cost.

SPURIOUS RETIREMENT POLICY PROPOSED BY RAILROADS

The Association of Railroads again pads the account when considering the annual costs of the project. The annual costs consist of interest, amortization, and operating expenses. The Association of Railroads prefers to retire the entire investment of the seaway in 40 years, which requires an annual charge of 1.33 percent on the cost of the project on a sinking-fund basis.

I know of no project of the nature and magnitude of the St. Lawrence, either in private or public hands, in which the total investment is retired in 40 years. Power companies apply at least a 50-year period of retirement for the dams and structures in water-power plants; railroads practically never retire their fixed investments, and one often wonders if they have any provision for retirement of their rolling stock, in view of the antiquated equipment used for passengers and freight.

The Congress only now has begun to develop a policy for the retirement of public works and reclamation projects which require at least a 50-year period of amortization.

In the case of the Panama Canal, which, by the word of every witness who appeared before our committee is a successful business enterprise, because it has paid all of its expenses—2½ percent interest and a small profit above that from the beginning up to 1940—there is no provision for retirement of the investment. However, improvements and upkeep are met out of current revenues, and a depreciation reserve is set aside for contingencies. Here is a successful enterprise run by the War Department which does not have a retirement system, but a system of depreciation applied only to depreciable property.

The Association of Railroads insists upon applying onerous conditions to the retirement of the proposed investment in the St. Lawrence in order to show that it is uneconomical. When asked whether they would be satisfied if we applied the same depreciation policy as the railroads applied to their own business, Dr. Parmelee said, Oh, no, he did not think that those principles would be applicable.

I can well understand his reaction, because if we applied railroad policies toward amortization of this project, the cost of the seaway would be even lower than the committee estimates.

RETIREMENT POLICY RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE

The committee, in its majority report, recommends a 53-year amortization period, which will require a 1 percent sinking fund annual charge. This will retire the total investment in the seaway, including interest during construction, in 53 years. This includes not only the locks and lock gates, dams, and spillways, which are the only depreciable items, but also the canals and the excavation work, which are of more permanent nature.

I personally would prefer the application of the Panama Canal principle to the St. Lawrence, whereby a depreciation reserve is set up to take care of depreciable property, but in deference to my colleagues on the committee, particularly the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who feels that the total investment should be retired within a reasonable time, I am willing to endorse the principle of total retirement in a period of 53 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am seeking light. The Senator cites the example of the investment in the Panama Canal. Is the

amortization of the St. Lawrence seaway figured on the basis of the tonnage which will go through during the period when it will be navigable? If so, is that a direct analogy for a comparison? The Panama Canal operates 12 months in the year. As I understand, the seaway will operate during only a part of the year.

Mr. WILEY. Seven months.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the operation of the Panama Canal on a 12-month basis affords a proper example for comparison of earnings and investment with the St. Lawrence seaway, in view of the fact that it will operate only 7 months in the year?

Mr. AIKEN. Eight months.

Mr. WHERRY. Whatever the number of months may be. I am only seeking light.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy that the Senator has asked the question. We have shown, and will show further in the debate, that the estimated income will run between \$15,000,000 and \$21,000,000 on a 7-month basis. It will probably be more than that. That is more than ample to take care of depreciation.

In connection with the estimate of tonnage which will pass through that canal, when we take into consideration the fact that through one lock, the MacArthur Lock, in 1946 more than 50,000,000 tons passed, in the down-passage alone, we can see the possibilities of earnings of this canal. I believe that within the lifetime of some of the younger Members of the Senate the population of that area will be possibly 100,000,000. There is the upper basin of Canada, with all its fertility. There are the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska, and other States in the Senator's section. The Senator has some idea what the population will be, and what the load on transportation will be. I am sure that if the Senator will look at the tables in the books which are available, he will understand very clearly that the estimates are made on a business basis.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the amortization is based upon the actual tonnage which has gone through, and estimates of what the tonnage might be in the event certain locks were built.

Mr. WILEY. It is based upon the best opinion of men like former President Hoover, Secretary Harriman, and others who testified, including witnesses from New York and New England.

Mr. WHERRY. Where do they get their figures? I am trying to learn the facts as to the present tonnage, and what the estimate is.

Mr. WILEY. That information is all contained in the Department of Commerce report.

Mr. WHERRY. Upon whom does the Department of Commerce rely? Upon what basis is the survey made?

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator speaking now about the estimate of tonnage?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. I would prefer to have the Senator consult the record and see what it is. It is set forth in detail, showing who testified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point raised by the Senator from Nebraska?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

MR. WILEY. I yield. I prefer to carry on with my argument, because there is no continuity when there are interruptions such as this. Many of the questions which are asked will be answered later by the argument. However, I am glad to yield.

MR. SALTONSTALL. I think it is fair to say to the Senator from Nebraska that there is now a 14-foot canal which goes down the St. Lawrence. It is my understanding that the traffic which goes through the Welland Canal and down the 14-foot canal is not to pay any of the proposed tolls. The tolls are to be charged only on ships going up or down the new seaway. So when we estimate tonnage, and particularly when we use the figure of 50,000,000 tons going through the MacArthur locks in the past, we must remember that much of that tonnage would not pay tolls when it gets down into the seaway.

MR. WILEY. Mr. President, the opposition reflected in such arguments has its mind pinned on Boston, New York, and a few other cities. It fails to take into consideration the dramatic statement of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENEERG], which is the testimony of every great American.

We of Wisconsin have given of our timber. Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota have given of their iron ore. We have given 2,000,000,000 tons of it to build cities, railroads, and skyscrapers. Now the iron ore is being exhausted. There are 500,000,000 tons left. It is being taken out at the rate of 100,000,000 tons a year. The businessmen of the East are planning and scheming deliberately to transport the iron industry of the Middle West into the East. They want to cut the throat of the Middle West. If they do, what do Senators suppose the ports of the East will get? There are fifty million or sixty million of us living out there, building an economy upon iron. We have given of the life-blood of our economy. In this war we gave 100,000,000 tons a year. Now all we ask is that there be opened up a stretch of 113 miles in the St. Lawrence River. The businessmen of the East say, "No; you are going to hurt us." If the heart of any man is hurt, I would not give much for his limbs. If we hurt the heart of an industry like the United States of America, we know what will happen to what is outside.

We lived through the prewar period, when the farms of America were being foreclosed. Before the war, insurance companies and banks were taking over farms, and industry was being centralized on the east coast. Some of us had to open the eyes of the people. We finally got them to the point where they saw the need of keeping the great Mississippi Valley industrially and economically sound.

We have given of our iron. We have given of our timber. All we ask is that we be given an opportunity, that the rapids of 113 miles may generate the electric power needed for the lifeblood of industry in the East, and that we may

have an opportunity to transport our surplus wheat rather than let it rot on the farms of the Dakotas and Montana.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. WILEY. I yield.

MR. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has said that I am opposing him on sectional grounds. I simply point out that I oppose the joint resolution in its present form, and at the present time. I have never said, and I do not now say, that I will oppose the joint resolution ultimately, if I believe it is practicable.

The Senator was discussing with the Senator from Nebraska the question of making the seaway self-liquidating through tolls. I simply pointed out to him—and I reiterate and point out to him again—that much of the traffic which goes through the Great Lakes, the Welland Canal, and the MacArthur locks, will not pay any tolls on this seaway.

There will be some traffic, of course, which will pay tolls, and I think it is fair to point it out. It is not, in my humble judgment, a sectional argument; it goes to the question of whether this seaway will be practically a self-liquidating project.

MR. WILEY. Mr. President, everyone knows that under this resolution and under the treaties we have with Canada the Lakes are open. When we put in 113 miles of channel, cutting out the rock in the rapids, we are asking that the ships which pass up and down those lakes pay toll. Travel from Superior and Duluth down to Ogdensburg is free to the boats of Canada and of the United States. We are not interfering with that traffic. We are saying what former President Hoover said, that if we had had this canal built during World War II it would have been a great help. Military men have said the same thing. Former President Hoover said, further, that if we had a canal we could attend to the job of feeding Europe and getting wheat over there. We are now limited to a capacity of approximately a million bushels a month for export.

The whole fear is built upon a straw man—that this great America of ours has not the iron in her system to come through. The argument which is advanced at this time was advanced when it was stated that we should have built the canal years ago. There was procrastination, there were Fabian tactics and delay. If we fail to pass this resolution we will be called upon—mark my words—to spend billions in making taconite practical as an iron base.

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

MR. WILEY. I yield.

MR. AIKEN. I should like to say, first, that the traffic to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] refers as going through a 14-foot canal at the present time, and which would not pay toll, is largely traffic in grain from the Great Lakes ports to the port of Montreal, which would not be expected to pay tolls under the proposed St. Lawrence development.

I think now is the time to say this. I am a loyal New Englander, but my country comes first, last, and all the time,

and I am mortified and ashamed at the smallness of a little group of selfish businessmen in Boston.

Not long ago I heard Mr. Laurence F. Whittemore, secretary of the New England Council, and the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, who was an official of the Boston & Maine Railroad, speaking to a group of New England businessmen and telling them to consider the effect of the impact of the St. Lawrence seaway upon them, and hinting to them that with the development of ore in Labrador the steel industry would expand tremendously and New England could become a great steel center. He was misleading the people of New England, just as much as he was misleading the people to whom he was speaking, because he did not tell them that ore was already available to them, that they had to have hundreds of thousands of tons of coal to operate the steel industry, and that there is no coal within hundreds of miles of New England. I think he was imposing upon the businessmen of New England and upon the people of New England who now pay outrageous prices for their electricity. When anyone talks of taking the steel industry away from the Midwest, centering it on the Atlantic coast, and giving our railroads an opportunity to make outrageous profits in transporting iron and steel, farm machinery, and other things that are made from iron or steel, it should be remembered that the additional cost comes right out of the pockets of the farmers and the businessmen of the Midwest who would then have to depend upon their high-cost steel from the central part of the continent, or else take the low-cost steel on either coast and pay transportation charges to get it inland.

That is my sentiment as a New Englander.

MR. WILEY. I will say, Mr. President, that the sentiment which the Senator has just expressed was also expressed by a great man from Massachusetts, who was regarded as America's greatest forensic speaker, Daniel Webster. He said:

Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country.

On another occasion he said:

There are those in each party who are more concerned for their State than for national politics. Their objects are small and their views are narrow.

Daniel Webster, "Black Dan," gave leadership to the Nation.

I said a few moments ago that prior to our getting into the war, when we were in the prewar days, I spoke on the floor of the Senate and stated that if my little city of Chippewa Falls, a town of 10,000 people, could have a pay roll equal to that of the people who were taken out of that little town and lived in Washington it would be economically healthy. Those were the days when grass was growing in the streets. That was simply because there was a taking of pay rolls from those communities that needed them, taking men and hiring them and paying them here. Then started that centralization. Thank God, they woke up. We did build in the

Middle West war plants. But how would it be now if into this eastern area the conspiracy of some of these folks is effectuated so that the plants that have built up Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, and other places, because they could not meet competition in the East, should migrate. How much traffic will the railroads lose?

All we are asking is a loan of \$700,000,000 for the building of great productive institutions, a seaway, an electric energy producing plant. We are not asking that Congress do for us what it did for TVA. TVA seems to be panning out. We are asking that the money be loaned to ourselves. There has been no hesitation in sending into Europe between \$5,000,000,000 and \$7,000,000,000, but there is an unwillingness to take a little risk of our own.

I shall go on now with debunking the proposed padded interest rate.

The opponents insist on padding annual expenses in addition by insisting on a 3 percent interest rate as an annual charge. As stated before, the cost of money to the Federal Government is around 2 percent. Any revenue that yields beyond that amount brings a profit to the Federal Government. It seemed to the committee that a 2½ percent interest rate is reasonable and adequate. It is a fact also that in the case of power projects built and operated by the Reclamation Bureau, the Government has accepted a 2½ percent interest rate as adequate.

The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, in proposing a draft agreement with the State of New York for the transfer of power facilities on the St. Lawrence River, recommended a 2½ percent interest rate. There would seem to be no logical reason whereby the Corps of Engineers should recommend a 2½ percent interest on the St. Lawrence power facilities and a different rate on the seaway. A 2½ percent interest will meet all the costs of money to the Federal Government and show a profit besides.

SEVENTEEN MILLION FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ANNUAL SEAWAY COST

The committee therefore calculates that on the basis of 2½ percent interest, and 1 percent sinking fund amortization which will retire the total investment in 53 years, and, in addition, a \$2,400,000 annual operating expense, the St. Lawrence seaway will cost annually \$17,400,000. This is the total cost, to both Canada and the United States.

The Association of Railroads, by using 3 percent interest and 40 years amortization, arrive at an annual figure of \$21,600,000. The difference between the padded figures of the opponents and the reasonable calculations of the committee is a matter of \$4,000,000 a year.

Under these conditions, after having conceded the desirability and acceptability of the St. Lawrence seaway on a self-liquidating basis, I find, with all due respect to our learned adversaries, no logic or legitimate reason to justify the continued opposition of the Association of American Railroads. I requested counsel for the association to submit his recommendations in a constructive

spirit on this legislation for the purposes of improving it and making it acceptable, but to this day I have, unfortunately, heard no word.

Instead, we have, regrettably, only had evidences of oblique opposition, such as I have described. Such an attitude on the part of so distinguished an organization is really disturbing to me.

TRAFFIC POTENTIALS

It is my belief that the traffic that will utilize the St. Lawrence seaway during the succeeding decades will be able to meet not only the reasonable cost estimated by the committee, but even the inflated cost figures of the opponents.

The essential character of the St. Lawrence seaway is that it connects by cheap water transportation the greatest concentration of agricultural and industrial products in the Middle West with all the ports of the world. The traffic and the need for transportation are there. Given the facilities, the traffic will grow decade by decade, until the works now authorized will appear inadequate.

PANAMA CANAL QUICKLY EXCEEDED TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

In the case of the Panama Canal, the initial estimates of traffic, conducted under the auspices of the Isthmian Canal Commission, were not realized during the first year of operation; but within 10 years, by 1924, the Canal carried 27,000,000 tons of traffic—10,000,000 tons above the earlier estimates; and since then it has brought in revenues of as high as \$27,000,000 a year. A similar experience can be confidently expected for the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I have dwelt extensively on the position of the opponents on cost because they have conceded their agreement to the construction of the St. Lawrence project on a self-liquidating basis and because they now base their opposition upon what I regard as indefensible annual cost accounting principles which have no basis in fact or theory.

RAILROADS FEAR CHEAP SEAWAY TRANSPORTATION COST

Mr. President, the continued opposition of the Association of American Railroads, and also of the port interests in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans, seems predicated on the belief that even with all reasonable charges added to the cost of constructing and operating the St. Lawrence seaway, it still will provide cheap transportation. These interests are concerned with possible diversion of traffic from the established rail lines and ports to the more economical route. This concern cannot be general with all the railroads, but is specifically applicable to the eastern trunk lines connecting Chicago with the eastern seaboard. Their influence goes into New England.

I, of course, have no objection to having the New York Central, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad come forward in their own name and in their own right to express their opposition to this project because they feel it will impinge on the future traffic potentials of their lines. They have a right to do that. They have a right to take the position, as the case seems to them, that even with all charges

paid through tolls, the St. Lawrence seaway would still be competing with the future business of the territory they serve. The Senate, of course, will have to decide whether the economic interests of the 50,000,000 people that live in the whole area of the Great Lakes and the national defense interests of the country as a whole are primary or secondary to the desire of those lines to have a hold on all future growth of traffic in that territory. The testimony of former President Herbert Hoover and Secretary of Commerce Harriman indicated that there might be some temporary inconvenience to the eastern trunk lines, but that future growth in traffic would smooth things out.

My own personal feeling is that the St. Lawrence seaway will be utilized primarily for the transportation of bulk commerce in grain, coal, iron ore, petroleum, bauxite, and many other products as to which water carriage is the most convenient and economical means of transportation, and that without the St. Lawrence seaway such traffic would be strangled, for the railroads could not economically carry the quantities of this traffic that the country will need.

Mr. President, I do not have to tell the Senate right now, with the oil situation in the Middle West what it is at the present time, and with people there freezing—and I just came from there this morning—that the trouble is transportation; and I do not have to assert that the St. Lawrence seaway will be utilized to provide fuel for the Middle West and fuel storage along the Great Lakes, so that people in that great industrial area will not freeze.

Mr. President, on the basis of the testimony presented to the committee by former President Hoover, Secretary Harriman, the Department of the Interior, the American Farm Bureau, and the National Grange, as well as by other business and technical witnesses, the committee estimated an annual traffic of from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 tons, bringing revenues of from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000. The opponents questioned these figures, principally on the premise that no recent studies were made, and that Secretary Harriman's figures were preliminary. I was very much surprised to see that statement in the minority views.

REPORT OF COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. President, those figures are no longer preliminary. The minority views must have been written before November, while most of us were in Europe, for early in November the Secretary of Commerce made public an exhaustive report entitled "An Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project." There is no reference in the minority views to this work, although there is repeated reference to the preliminary nature of the Secretary's testimony. This report is thorough and definitive; and I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska, particularly in view of his questions, that he read the report. It reveals that three commodities alone—grain, iron ore, and coal—would supply 40,000,000 or more tons of traffic, with revenues of between twenty million and twenty-seven million dollars. The report also states that if the United States oil reserves are dimin-

ished off-shore imports of oil would amount to between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 tons of cargo.

These figures do not include such other important traffic items as newsprint and wood pulp, iron and steel, machinery and vehicles, sugar and coffee, bauxite and chrome ore, and many other products.

NARROW VERSUS NATIONAL VIEW

No, Mr. President, the opponents may not be concerned about the taxpayers' interest. They know full well that there is enough traffic to and from the great industrial empire of the Middle West to utilize the capacity of the seaway and to pay for it. The few interests who benefit from the toll gates of commerce in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans are apparently afraid they will lose their financial grip. But that is a narrow and limited view, limited even in perspective as to their own interests.

This country will continue to grow, and by the time the seaway is fully utilized there will be such large transportation requirements and improvement in industry and employment in the country that their children and grandchildren will look upon the present opposition to the seaway with the same amusement with which we view the efforts of the stagecoach interests 100 years ago to stop railroads from having terminals inside city limits. The stagecoach interests did just that, Mr. President.

RAILROAD OPPOSITION TO PREVIOUS COMMERCE PROJECTS

The real possibilities of the seaway probably will not be realized until 10 years after its completion, which will take us into 1965. This means that we are not now considering primarily the present fate of the longshoreman in New York or Boston or the ticket collector on the Long Island railroad who is about to reach his retirement age. We are considering the needs and welfare of their children and of the Nation in an expanding world of economic opportunities 15, 20, or 30 years from now.

I might reiterate, in passing, that I have the deepest respect, generally speaking, for the Association of American Railroads, which in countless instances has rendered magnificent service to American industry and the American Nation, particularly in our war effort. I have high esteem and personal friendship for the association's distinguished president, Mr. William T. Faricy, and for his fellow officers. I have always had, too, real admiration for the railroad brotherhoods and for their membership. That does not, however, alter my appraisal of the objective facts in this situation.

Mr. President, I contend that the common railroad man is in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, and I say that the letters from the railroad brotherhoods and from others who pretend to speak for the railroad employees, and who say that the railroad employees generally are opposed to construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, are mere buncombe. I have talked to the railroad employees. I talked to some of them only yesterday, as I was on my way to Washington on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. I have talked to them in my own section of the country. These people, the common

people, of whom Abraham Lincoln said, "God Almighty must have loved them, for He made so many of them"—have a vision of what the St. Lawrence seaway means in the building of America.

What is the situation as to the leadership of the railroad employees, Mr. President?

When this subject first arose, the presidents of many of those railroads—as we shall show from the record—endorsed this project. The president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the president of the New York Central Railroad, and the presidents of the western railroads were independent souls then; but somehow or other they got into the Association of American Railroads, for which only one man speaks. But he does not speak for the common laboring men. As one man in my own State said to me, "Why, we are for anything that will build America. We know that the railroads have to get busy. They are not serving the interests of the people as they should. It took a lot of the truckers to wake them up and to give the country part of the equipment that was needed. The railroads have to wake up some more, for we are growing faster than our transportation system is growing."

Mr. President, that man spoke with wisdom and with vision.

It is well known that the railroads opposed the construction of the Panama Canal on the theory that it would take traffic away from the transcontinental railroads. Let us read the debates of those days. Today those same railroads are enjoying the fruits of the expanding empire of the West, largely stimulated by the Panama Canal; and not one railroad man will deny now that the Panama Canal has been a boon to this Nation. I asked that question of Mr. Parmelee when he appeared before us. He said, "Yes, now we agree. Now we agree the Panama Canal was a good thing."

WHY THE COAL INTERESTS OPPOSE SEAWAY

The National Coal Association and John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, are opposed to the St. Lawrence project, both as a power-generating facility and as a means of transportation. Why? Just stop and think of it. Why? He averred that if the canal were built, foreign countries would be shipping in coal and taking away our market in this country. Ever since his appearance before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in 1941, John L. Lewis and his representatives have taken the position that the St. Lawrence seaway will open up the whole Great Lakes area for the invasion of imports of cheap coal from abroad, principally from England and Russia, and that both the domestic as well as the Canadian market will thereby be threatened. John L. Lewis went as far as to state that the 96,000,000-ton market for coal in the Great Lakes region may be taken away from the American producers if the seaway is opened.

Since then we have had the unusual experience of exporting 40,000,000 tons of coal last year, and the only limit upon further exportation is lack of transportation and dollars with which other countries can buy from us. John L. Lewis, himself, in many statements and articles has said that no foreign country can

compete with us in the production of coal. Extensive studies by British working parties on coal indicate that one miner in the United States produces 4 or 5 tons of coal a day, as compared with 1 ton a day in England, and 1½ tons a day on the Continent of Europe.

Of course, our wage rates are high in view of the high productivity of our miners. In spite of low wages in Europe they cannot compete with us either in the American or the Canadian market on a price basis. The proof of that is in the fact that even before the war our greatest markets for coal have been open to imports without hindrance. Yes, these various cities, New York, Boston, Baltimore, and New Orleans, have been open to the import of coal. Did they import it? They did, in an infinitesimal amount. Nothing but small dribbles of imports are to be found in all the statistics of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Commerce. Yet the bugaboo has been used repeatedly on Members of this body to show that John L. Lewis and his miners are against the project, they being afraid that European coal could come in and steal their market.

Since the facts John L. Lewis presented in 1941—and I may say that the coal operators repeat his contentions—are unsound, what is the reason for their continued opposition? Why do they mislead the thousands of upright American working men in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Kentucky with these untrue statistics? The answer is clear. They seem to be responding with enthusiasm and loyalty to the interests of their first customers, namely, the railroads. Yet the strange situation is that those very interests for whom coal miners and operators raise the hue and cry against the St. Lawrence seaway are the ones who are now running out on them, for it is obvious that the railroad industry is converting rapidly from the use of coal to the use of oil.

CONVERSION OF RAILROADS TO DIESEL ENGINES

If the coal interests have any delusions that they have a primary interest in keeping all traffic on rails, the recent statistics showing orders for locomotives must disabuse them. Time magazine of December 2 reported that of the 1,176 locomotives on order on December 1, only 33 were for steam. The rest were Diesels.

The New York Central, which is spearheading the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, recently placed a \$21,000,000 order for 111 locomotives and all of them are for Diesels. The coal interests are misdirecting their efforts in fighting the seaway. They ought to keep their eye on the revolution taking place in railroads' motive power. Paradoxically, John L. Lewis, with his capricious strikes, is himself mainly responsible for the loss of the principal coal market, and not the St. Lawrence project.

The opposition of the coal interests to the St. Lawrence seaway has no justified basis in fact. Insofar as it is a "secondary boycott" on behalf of the railroads, it is just as intelligent as locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

I come now to a second major element of my case: The value of the seaway for national security.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In their heedless and headstrong desire to defend their interests, opponents have presumed to take on the responsibility of deprecating the recommendations of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the heads of the armed services, and the present Secretary of State who was, during the war, chief of staff. We have sent our boys to die upon the battlefields of the world at the command of anyone of these people who have the responsibility of the defense of the Nation, but when it comes to putting mortar, steel, and stone together for the harnessing of natural resources, the opponents—the railroads, the eastern ports would have us believe that these officials' words are not to be trusted.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF ENDORSE PROJECT

The Joint Chiefs of Staff's report on the St. Lawrence project carried the signature of Admiral Leahy, Chief of Staff of the President, Admiral Nimitz, General Eisenhower, and General Eaker. It was transmitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 16, 1946, with the expressed concurrence in the conclusions of the Secretary of the Navy, now Secretary of National Defense, James Forrestal. It must be remembered that this report was prepared and transmitted to the Senate many months after the general public knowledge of the destructive potentials of the atomic bomb and certainly after many more months of private and secret knowledge of not only this, the most fearful instrument of war, but also of many other secret devices yet unknown even to the opponents of this project. In spite of that knowledge of the latest devices of destruction, the Joint Chiefs of Staff in February 1946 recommended strongly construction of this project. The grounds upon which they based their recommendations are as follows:

First. The St. Lawrence seaway will provide an alternate- and protected-transportation route in case of a national emergency.

Second. The St. Lawrence project will provide a large block of power in an area which was a power-deficit area in World War II.

Third. The St. Lawrence seaway project will make it possible to construct larger ships within the protection of the Great Lakes area where resources of steel and manpower are abundantly available.

The fundamental thesis of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is that total war requires the complete mobilization of the resources of the country, and the St. Lawrence project will materially help in such mobilization in another emergency. Basically, it comes down to the fact that the St. Lawrence is going to save manpower, materials, and transportation facilities which in effect will increase the industrial capacity of the country in times of peace and in war.

In his appearance before our committee, former President Hoover stated definitely that the St. Lawrence project would have been of immeasurable value in World War II and that if it had been available in this last war, it would have paid for itself several times over. Secretary Marshall, in addition to reiterating

recommendations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of his knowledge as Secretary of State as well as former Chief of Staff, stated that he considered it important to the defense of the North American Continent. To this effect, he presented to the committee the conclusions of the Canadian-American Joint Defense Board which is charged with planning and coordinating the common defense interests of the two countries which recommended strongly this project as necessary to the joint defense of Canada and the United States.

OPPOSITION OF MINORITY REPORT TO DEFENSE STATEMENT

Such is the evidence upon which the majority base their recommendations for the completion of this project as a contribution to national defense. Yet the junior Senator from Massachusetts, in the minority report which he has prepared, undertakes diligently to obliterate the recommendations of those to whom this Nation has entrusted our security and defense. What is the basis of his skepticism?

It is the opinion of two retired officers, one of the Army and one of the Navy, who were hurriedly brought before our committee, having studied the subject of the St. Lawrence project only in a matter of days and not having read any of the extensive documentary evidence which was easily available to them. These two retired officers may have been, I assume, retained by those who are motivated less by national consideration than by their own peculiar situation.

THE SO-CALLED INDEFENSIBILITY ARGUMENT

One of these retired officers, Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley—I emphasize, this is Follett, not Omar, Bradley—stated that that part of the St. Lawrence now in operation—the Soo locks—and the Welland Canal are not defensible against air attack. Here was a man who was entrusted with the air defenses of our east-coast shipping, who says that the two most vital waterways in our continent are not defensible. Just think what would have happened in World War II if the Soo locks were really attacked, and according to this man, were put out of commission. Members of the Senate must realize that, actually, our whole industrial and agricultural economy depend upon the Soo locks. Eighty percent of all the steel in the United States is made of the iron ore that passes through the Soo locks. Gen. Follett Bradley says that those locks are not defensible. I say to General Bradley, if they are not defensible, then I say the steel industry is not defensible; Chicago and Detroit, Cleveland and Pittsburgh, are not defensible; power plants at Niagara, Montreal Harbor—yes, Washington and Boston—are not defensible.

MINORITY DOES NOT QUESTION DEFENSIBILITY OF POWER PROJECT

The opponents would have us believe that the major part of our industrial civilization of North America is not defensible and that therefore we should not add any new works in that part of our country. Yet the minority, which makes much ado about the vulnerability of the seaway, is careful to distinguish between the seaway, which they oppose, and the

power project which they say they do not oppose. The seaway must be considered vulnerable but not the power project, apparently. The seaway project and the power project are all one. They are all built together in this 113-mile stretch. In other words, we should stop growing; we should not build any weapons of defense or provide for the future development of this country, because we are liable to be destroyed by an atomic bomb. Of course, after our experience in Japan we know well that nothing is safe from the atomic bomb, but that is no reason why we are going to stop building and growing and hoping that we shall find a defense against an atomic attack. That is the business of our great generals and admirals, the commanders of our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The main dams and power plants are the major part of the works involved in this undertaking and if anything is not defensible in that area, dams and the powerhouse will be the most vulnerable, more so certainly than the locks and canals. Obviously the opponents cannot argue against any power plant because they know that if this project is not constructed, some equally vulnerable steam power project must be constructed in the same general area. Yes, Senators representing the East know that steam plants must be constructed in the East, plants which are just as vulnerable, if not more so, than the ones in question.

One is entitled to question the consistency of their argument that the seaway is vulnerable when they exclude the power plants from their arguments.

In New England, it seems unpopular these days to talk against cheap additional power, because they have an acute shortage, and industry is moving away. The logic of the opponents must lead them to the conclusion that the country must stop adding new works to increase industrial potential because whatever is built above ground is vulnerable to bombing.

I have yet to hear of a constructive suggestion from the opponents as to what to do to protect Grand Coulee, the Soo locks, the cities of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland and Pittsburgh, Boston and New York. If any enemy ever reaches these shores with atomic bombs, I can assure Senators that the first target would be New York and Washington, and not some canal on the St. Lawrence. Mr. President, this vulnerability thesis is the most transparent smoke screen. Those who raise that issue seriously do not do credit to the intelligence of this body.

SHALL WE DEVELOP POWER ABROAD BUT NOT AT HOME?

I note that the junior Senator from Massachusetts, after his brief trip to Europe, has recommended to the people of the country enactment of some form of the Marshall plan with all its costs and with all its works in western Europe. If my distinguished colleague from the Bay State has read and studied the reports of the European Coordinating Committee on the Marshall plan, he must know that a good deal of the resources required will go into the very type of works which he opposes in our own country. The program developed for western Europe for the next 4 years calls for in-

creased capacity of electric power plants of 25,000,000 kilowatts, a 60 percent increase over what they had before the war. It calls for rehabilitation of railroads and canals, and increase in their capacity. It seems unlikely that we will get back any of that investment.

The Senate will be interested to know that one of those projects is international in nature, a hydroelectric project of the TVA type, straddling Italy, France, and Germany, a truly international project even more complex than the St. Lawrence waterway between Canada and the United States. We are going to be called upon to finance such projects as these in western Europe, and I assume my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, is all in favor of it.

VULNERABILITY OF EUROPEAN PROJECTS

I do not wish to raise the issue of consistency of such a position in view of his opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. I merely wish to analyze the military security of works in western Europe as against our own project here. The idea is that the project now proposed to be built on this continent can be destroyed. How about the projects proposed to be built in Europe in the construction of which we shall participate? How much more vulnerable will these works in western Europe be to any potential enemy of democracy that may decide to launch an atomic attack by air without warning. We will be called upon to increase production potentials of democracy in an area in Europe which is much more vulnerable to attack by a continental power, while complacently and blindly the opponents of this program oppose a development of our own resources certainly at a much safer distance from a potential enemy.

We who are called upon to give moral encouragement and material assistance to the other democracies of the world would be making a poor showing of strategic thinking by such an inconsistent position. What a fine example we will set for the world. What fine geographical strategy to prevent developments in this country while we pour our substance into the more vulnerable areas of western Europe.

LACK OF BACKGROUND OF ANTISEAWAY "EXPERTS"

What, I repeat, is the "informed opinion" upon which the opponents of the St. Lawrence project base their case? Vice Adm. Russell Willson, retired, appeared on behalf of the opponents by arrangement of the National St. Lawrence Projects Conference, which has its offices in the Transportation Building in Washington. This is, unfortunately, the extent of the admiral's knowledge of the St. Lawrence project:

Senator WILEY. Have you studied the voluminous documentary background on this project?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The International Joint Commission's hearings of 1920?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The report of the Joint Board of Engineers in 1926?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The Hoover report of 1927?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The interdepartmental report of 1934?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The congressional hearings of '32-'33, '41, and '46?

Admiral WILLSON. I have seen some of the documents, sir. I have the great advantage of approaching the subject with an open mind, sir.

Senator WILEY. I have no question about that.

Here is the other witness whom the opponents bring against Admiral Leahy, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and other heads of our armed forces. He is Maj. Gen. Follett—not Omar—Bradley, retired.

Senator WILEY. Have you read the various reports. Have you studied the reports that have been given on this project heretofore?

General BRADLEY. No. The only report that I studied, and I have not studied that, I read it through hurriedly, was dated 1941, I think, prepared by the then Secretary of Commerce, and I do not remember the title of it. It is a gray volume, and one of several volumes.

Senator WILEY. When did you first get interested in studying this report?

General BRADLEY. About 10 days ago.

It is a despairing case, indeed, when at the last moment the counsel for the defense, knowing that he has lost the case on its merits, rushes to bring in witnesses with little knowledge of the subject matter to bolster an indefensible position.

SUMMARY OF CONFLICTING ARGUMENTS OF SEAWAY FOES

Let me summarize briefly the conflicting and confused arguments made by the minority to disqualify the St. Lawrence project.

They said, without due proof, that all works from Grand Coulee Dam to Sault Ste. Marie and all the works, establishments and cities around the Great Lakes are indefensible to air attack; therefore the St. Lawrence would be equally vulnerable and should not be constructed.

However, they do not express any opinion on the St. Lawrence power project which is located in the same spot. Apparently they object only to the seaway which, for that matter, is much more defensible than the main dam and the power plants.

They claim that the locks on the St. Lawrence would be just as vulnerable as the Panama Canal; in fact, Admiral Willson stated that he almost damaged one of the gates of the Panama Locks when he was guiding a destroyer through the canal. Hence one must conclude, according to the opponents, that the St. Lawrence would also be subject to damage. On the same theory, we should not have built the Panama Canal because some future Admiral Willson might by mistake damage the gates.

They say the St. Lawrence would not give relief to transportation in time of war because its carrying capacity would be small. To the contrary, however, they claim that the waterway would seriously damage the rails and the eastern ports.

They claim that the season of navigation is only 7 months of the year and will necessarily limit the usefulness of the St. Lawrence as a national defense asset. This argument, of course, does not apply to the power project, which will operate 12 months of the year. As far as the seaway is concerned, exactly the same argument can be made against the Great Lakes, upon which our whole western in-

dustry is based, including our steel industry, the key to national defense. It would be just as logical to argue that the Mesabi iron range, the Harbor of Duluth, the Soo locks, the Great Lakes, are all of limited use to national defense because they, too, have a 7-month navigation period.

NEED FOR NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Mr. President, we must come back to first principles in determining the value of an undertaking such as the St. Lawrence for national defense. As before, I grant the right of any economic group, of any transportation agency and of any port authority to come forward and express their views and particularly what they mistakenly regard as their own interests in relation to any given piece of legislation. I grant sincerely and sympathetically the right of any Senator to represent, as best he can, what he construes to be the interests of his constituents. But to go beyond that in defense of these interests and to try to cast out the judgment of the leaders of our national defense establishments, from the Commander in Chief through the military heads of our Armed Forces, is a serious responsibility and should not be undertaken lightly upon such flimsy conclusions and with such witnesses as the opponents have brought forward.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. President, there is one further phase of the St. Lawrence seaway project of paramount national interest and which deserves thorough discussion in these proceedings. I refer to the need of natural resources, particularly iron ore, copper, and petroleum and the role that the St. Lawrence seaway project will play in the future stability of industry in these United States. It requires no proof that the welfare of this country in peace and war and its ability to withstand contingencies and dangers in succeeding generations will depend upon the availability of energy resources, food, and industrial raw materials such as iron, steel, and copper. It is because the St. Lawrence seaway makes a direct contribution to these factors of national strength that the majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee urges the adoption of the present agreement with Canada.

STRATEGY OF FOOD AID FOR OVERSEAS

We have come to realize now more than ever before that food is one of the vital weapons of warfare and one of the essential weapons of democratic strategy. Yet, the food-producing districts of the United States and Canada are the only areas in the world removed from cheap water transportation on the high seas by a thousand miles or more. It is only because we have had the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence canals and the Mississippi River system that that area has been able to develop as a major source of foodstuffs for the world.

But now we realize that those facilities are inadequate for the production and transportation of enough supplies to meet world demand, and they will continue to remain inadequate until, learning by the lessons of experience, we undertake through this project to bring deep-draft vessels into the Great Lakes,

or to allow the Lake carriers to proceed down the St. Lawrence to Montreal without expensive transfer of cargo. In that way, the immense productive capacity of our farms and fields can be easily and quickly made available to our friends in this and any future times of crisis. There can be no economic nor strategic excuses and defense for a program as presented by the opponents which would make it difficult and expensive to bring this food to the needy millions of the world.

The St. Lawrence project, under present conditions of high transportation costs, would save as much as 10 cents a bushel. Even if only half of our 500,000,000-bushel exports came down the lakes, this would mean a direct saving of \$25,000,000 to the taxpayers, where the exports are subsidized, or that much more income to the farmer if sold on a commercial basis.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We now ship grain from Omaha via New Orleans to London, do we not?

Mr. WILEY. I so understand.

Mr. WHERRY. What will be the difference in freight rate, if any, in shipping from Omaha to London via New Orleans, as compared with shipping from Omaha to Chicago, and via the St. Lawrence to London?

Mr. WILEY. I would have to consult the freight schedules. Of course, that rate has not been determined, so far as shipment north is concerned. In that case, of course, there would not be continuous passage.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the distance? I can see that possibly the freight rate cannot be established until after the seaway is built. However, the point upon which I should like information is this: A wheat producer in Colorado, Wyoming, or Nebraska may ship his grain either to Omaha or Chicago, and have it transported via the Mississippi and New Orleans to London. Some products, of course, might require deeper draft vessels; but such shipments of grain are certainly being made now.

Mr. WILEY. Before we are through I shall try to get the figures. If some of that grain moves to Chicago, it must be transported to Ogdensburg; and under present conditions it must be re-loaded into smaller vessels, and transported in smaller vessels until it reaches Montreal. Then it must be reloaded again into ocean-going vessels. However, we can easily ascertain what the present cost is. It has been estimated that there would be a saving of 10 cents a bushel.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been so informed. The estimate has ranged all the way from 3 to 10 cents a bushel, representing the saving to be made by the wheat producer. I have not yet placed my hands upon any study which has been made which shows what the wheat farmer will save, if anything, by transporting wheat from Omaha by way the proposed

St. Lawrence seaway to London, as compared with shipping it by barge to New Orleans and then to London by ocean freight.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that if the grain were shipped to Chicago from Omaha it would be necessary to pay a rail rate?

Mr. WHERRY. If it were shipped from Omaha to Chicago; but we have water transportation from Omaha down the Missouri and Mississippi to New Orleans.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. Also there is a water-way from Chicago to New Orleans and by way of the ocean. I think we should have the facts, because it is of vital interest to the wheat producers to know what saving will be possible in connection with wheat originating at Omaha. We know what the freight rate is now if the wheat is loaded on a barge and transported down the Missouri and Mississippi to New Orleans, and then shipped by ocean from New Orleans to London. What we do not know is what the freight rate would be if the wheat were shipped from Omaha by rail to the nearest port on the St. Lawrence seaway, and then shipped by water down the St. Lawrence seaway and across the ocean to London.

Mr. CONNALLY. The point I wish to make is that in that sort of a transaction there would be two changes. The grain would have to be shipped to Chicago by rail. When it reached Ogdensburg it would have to be placed in light vessels. Then there would be another operation in getting it off the light vessels and into larger vessels. So there would really be three operations.

Mr. WILEY. Under present conditions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand. Also, the grain would be placed on a line which would involve payment of a toll, which would not be operative in the case of shipment by New Orleans. From Omaha to New Orleans there would be only one operation. The grain would be taken to New Orleans and placed on ocean-going vessels. The seas are pretty free.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am raising.

Mr. WILEY. Is Omaha south of St. Louis?

Mr. WHERRY. No; it is north.

Mr. WILEY. The answer would be this: Suppose the grain is transported by water. There is probably not more than a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River.

Mr. WHERRY. A 9-foot channel is what we have.

Mr. WILEY. It is transported in small boats, which do not carry large loads. One would have to figure what the costs would be under those circumstances in the case of shipment to New Orleans. The grain would be reloaded at New Orleans, and it would be necessary to add the tariff from New Orleans to London.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any testimony anywhere in the hearings on that subject?

Mr. WILEY. No. It would be necessary to have a tariff board figure the costs.

Mr. WHERRY. Such information would certainly be informative. Those of us in the Great Plains area ought to have the information. If a purported saving of from 3 to 10 cents a bushel on grain is to be effectuated, we should know how it is to be done, as compared with our present-day costs. I should like to have the information.

Mr. WILEY. I shall try to obtain the information for the Senator. This question takes us back to the field of the individual interest of the individual Senator in an individual State. We are asking Senators to raise their visors and see the larger perspective.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would not judge how far I am looking. I am very open-minded on this question.

Mr. WILEY. I assume the Senator is, or he would not have asked the question.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I am suggesting the question to the distinguished Senator is that we are appropriating large sums of money to develop navigation on the Missouri River with the idea of bringing the ocean close to Omaha, Nebr. However, other States and cities are interested. There are 9 or 10 States in all which have an interest in this question. A number of cities receive wheat from the producing areas. Wheat is one of our large transportation items in that section of the country.

Let us be brutally frank. If there is a saving, I want to be convinced of it. My reason for asking for the production of the records is that I have not seen them. I should like to know where I can place my hands on any testimony bearing upon the purported saving of from 3 to 10 cents a bushel on grain.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The great Wheat Belt of this country is divided into two sections. Wheat from one section naturally gravitates toward the port of New Orleans or the port of Galveston for shipment. Wheat from the northern States naturally gravitates toward Duluth or Chicago for shipment by way of the Great Lakes or by rail. I do not believe that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would change the amount going either way to any great extent. Shipments destined for Mexico and South America, which are large export markets, would probably continue to come from the Midwest. Nebraska and Kansas are approximately in the center of that belt. Wheat from that section could be shipped either way almost equally well.

Shipments destined to South America would go out by way of New Orleans, thus saving a couple of thousand miles distance. Shipments destined for northern Europe, France, and England would go out by way of the Great Lakes, saving a couple of thousand miles as compared with shipment from New Orleans. In other words, there would be two alternate routes.

Of course, a great deal of that grain must be placed on railroad cars to get to

Omaha, Kansas City, or wherever it is shipped from. It must go by rail either to one of those river ports or to Duluth or Chicago. If it went to Duluth or Chicago, then, with the seaway completed, it would be loaded on ships destined for Rome, Oslo, Liverpool, Berlin, or some other European port, and would go through directly.

Heretofore it has been estimated that there would be a saving of 5 or 6 cents a bushel in the shipment of wheat to northern European ports if the St. Lawrence seaway were completed. There would be a saving in the cost of unloading the grain at Buffalo and transshipping it to New York or Baltimore—mostly to New York—and reloading it on the vessels. However, the cost of labor has gone up, and rail transportation costs have risen, so that now Mr. Julius Barnes, who is one of the great wheat shippers of the country, estimates that the saving, even with the payment of the tolls, would amount to approximately 10 cents a bushel.

If we can save 10 cents a bushel in the export of wheat to the world market, or to the Atlantic coast cities such as Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, it will mean either that the consumers in the world market will save money or that the western wheat grower will have an additional few cents a bushel to put in his pocket.

However, I do not believe that we can force the farmers of the North Central States to ship down a 9-foot channel to New Orleans if they want to ship to northern Europe, and I do not believe that we should try to force the farmers of Nebraska and the surrounding area to the south, who are supplying the Mexican and South American markets, to ship their grain by way of the Great Lakes. I think it would be bad for the economy. I hope to see alternate routes provided so that they can ship their wheat and get the most they possibly can get for it.

Something was said about shipping from Chicago south to New Orleans by way of the canal. I believe it is a 9-foot canal at present. It may be a 12-foot canal some of the distance. I visited that canal approximately 2 years ago and found 75 to 80 percent of the Illinois Canal traffic was moving north-bound, not south-bound.

Mr. WILEY. I want to say, Mr. President, that it seems to me that the junior Senator from Nebraska might well consider—

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In answer to what the Senator from Vermont said regarding the traffic on the Illinois Canal going north, I think that is primarily due to arrangements which the railroad companies have with the present utilities commission in Chicago, whereby they ship coal from the little town of Taylorville, Ill., to my home city of Havana, Ill. When the coal reaches that city it is placed on barges and shipped on to Chicago. That is a tremendous operation. Of course all of that goes north. That is not the only traffic we have that goes north, but there are thousands of tons of coal coming out of the coal fields

at Taylorville, Ill., to Havana which then is transferred some 175 miles.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course it is only natural for a producer of grain in the West to want to get his product to the ultimate market at the lowest possible over-all transportation cost. But I should like to direct the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway, so-called, would perhaps be an outlet for Canadian wheat rather than for grain produced in the United States. The Grain Belt of the United States now has a water outlet down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers up to the Minneapolis market. That is almost to our northern border. It has been moving down for many years at a low water rate to New Orleans, and sent by ocean transport to foreign markets—South American markets as well as European markets. So I should like to have the distinguished Senator bear in mind perhaps the inequitable division of the costs on the proposed seaway as between Canada and the United States. I should also like to have the point developed as to whether the project will bring grain to the markets of the United States for a less cost, in greater or less quantity, than it will take the Canadian grain to market.

Mr. WILEY. I assume from the statement of the distinguished Senator that he is interested in developing the Missouri River waterway system. If this country is to be regarded as a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, or a Missouri River system, a western system, or eastern system, instead of being one Nation, we shall find ourselves blocked.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield for my own personal observation as to the St. Lawrence seaway and its benefits to this great Nation.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I have read the testimony of various persons who appeared before the committee to testify in behalf of the St. Lawrence seaway, the most significant of the benefits is in the low-cost hydroelectric development that is possible if the project is permitted. That would be one of the greatest benefits. If this Nation is ever again confronted by such a world situation as World War II we shall need all the generating capacity of which the St. Lawrence seaway project can be capable in order to furnish us the power for the various installations necessary to conduct the warfare with which we would be confronted.

As I read the testimony I found that the anticipated rate for generating electricity under the St. Lawrence seaway project would be one of the lowest in the world, and that we would have in the flow of water the greatest potential generating capacity that can be found anywhere in the world. It would be the most uniform and steady flow of water for generating purposes of any project in the world.

If we want to look back into the past 5 years and consider the demand for hydroelectric power and the installations

necessary for the production of electric current, and realize what the demand would be if we are ever confronted again with any such armament program as that to which we were subjected, we would need the electric current itself a great deal more than we would need any other phase of the entire project.

As to whether the rate down the St. Lawrence seaway would be a benefit to Omaha, Nebr., or Southwest producers, I think there is no question that it would be a benefit. Every year we in the Northwest are confronted with the fact that we cannot move our wheat. It lies in piles all over that part of the country because we have not the facilities to move it East. That has been a constant problem every year, and it will continue to be a problem. So the St. Lawrence seaway has so many benefits that we have merely scratched the surface in enumerating what it can do for us.

Insofar as the taconite deposits in Minnesota are concerned, they are lying there waiting for the St. Lawrence seaway development. The time will come when the high-grade ores will be depleted. When that time comes, we should be able to utilize that which this project has in store for us.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the best answer as to whether the St. Lawrence seaway would benefit the farmers of Nebraska and other Western States lies in the fact that every major farm organization having members in those States is already on record as favoring the project. That would include the Grange, the Farmers' Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Association of Milk Producers' Cooperatives. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has not endorsed the development of the St. Lawrence River specifically, but it has endorsed the development of all our major river systems collectively.

It may be said that every major farm organization and also the National Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives has unanimously at annual conventions endorsed the development of this great river.

Mr. WILEY. I thank both of the Senators for their contributions.

I want now to get back to the question of the Missouri River.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the freight rates from Omaha.

Mr. WILEY. When I yielded to the Senator from Illinois I had started to say that it seemed to me that, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the development of the St. Lawrence waterway could not help being of material assistance to the farmers of the northern two tiers of States.

We have before us a map showing Minnesota, Iowa, the Dakotas, and Nebraska. The statement was made that if we wanted to develop the Missouri Valley, we could put the wheat in small barges on a 9-foot channel and it could be carried down to New Orleans. There is no

objection to that. But I think the testimony shows, as was stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that there is a territory in this country, particularly Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, that feeds as a matter of course into the Mississippi River. But they are not great wheat-producing States.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. To correct the RECORD, let me point out that Texas is a great wheat-producing State, and we have seven ports of our own on the Gulf coast. So our wheat does not necessarily flow into the New Orleans or the Mississippi outlet.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to have that correction, because I do not have in mind at the present time the statistics State by State.

But in the north central section of the United States, including my own State of Wisconsin, where a great deal of grain is grown, and Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and Minnesota, great quantities of wheat are produced. The point is that certainly no harm can come to the farmers of Nebraska or the other States I have mentioned by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. If the seaway does not result in giving them a cheaper transportation rate, then they can use other transportation facilities; but at least a choice will be available to them.

At the present time a great many of the products of the farm move from the central area of our country by train, but the trains are inadequate to carry the total load. As Mr. Hoover has said, they have not been able to carry it.

Mr. President, I wish to return to a discussion of the situation in the Midwest, a situation which I think is tremendously significant. I now hold before me a map which shows the development of hydroelectric power. I wish the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] particularly to note this point. The map shows the major State, Federal, and municipal hydroelectric power developments, either authorized or under construction. Just consider that situation. There are no such developments in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, or Ohio. But see how many such developments there are in the other States. The Government has subsidized them and in many instances has, in conjunction with the States, paid the bill.

In the case of the St. Lawrence seaway we are not asking that that be done, but we are asking that the Government put up the money and see to it that this great project is developed between two great Nations.

DEPLETION OF MESABI ORE

Mr. President, I was discussing the subject of food. Even more important than the strategy of food is that of materials. It is generally known and accepted today that the iron ore deposits of the Mesabi range have a life expectancy of from possibly 5 to 10 years. A few years ago the estimate was 12 to 20

years; but in view of the rapidity with which we are depleting those deposits of high-grade ore, it is now estimated that they will be exhausted in between 5 and 10 years. That testimony comes from such reliable sources as President C. M. White, of the Republic Steel Corp., and President R. C. Allen, of the Reserve Mining Co. The latter authority appeared before the predecessor committee in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project, but he admitted that the iron ore resources in the Great Lakes region were diminishing rapidly. Mr. Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce in a recent report on the St. Lawrence seaway project affirm the same condition.

SEARCH FOR FOREIGN ORES

In fact, the steel companies are so concerned about this situation that they are now engaged in exploring new sources of iron ore. The Oliver Mining Co., a subsidiary of United States Steel, the Reserve Mining Co., which represents the consolidated interest of Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., American Rolling Mills, and others, are engaged in experimentation for the development of concentrated low-grade taconite iron ore which must be put through expensive processes in order to obtain merchantable iron ores. Hanna & Co., in conjunction with some Canadian interests, are heavily engaged in iron-ore exploration in Labrador. The Republic Steel Co. is developing magnetite ores in the Adirondack area of New York, as well as exploring new deposits in Mexico. The United States Steel Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp., are exploring the Orinoco Basin of Venezuela for the same vital product.

DEPENDENCE OF NATION ON MESABI ORE

These activities and these expenses are not taken in vain. They are undertaken because of the certainty that the life of the Mesabi range is limited. Over 80 percent of the iron and steel produced in the United States has depended on iron ore shipped from Mesabi through the Soo, and down the Great Lakes to the mills of the lower lake States. Our whole industrial structure is based on the happy conjunction of cheap surface ores, such as those the Mesabi Range furnishes, cheaper water transportation down the lakes, and easily accessible coal resources in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Illinois. If the ores in the Mesabi Range are exhausted, a terrible blow will be dealt to the stability and security of this whole Nation.

FUTURE USE OF LOW-GRADE ORES

To meet this situation we must plan on a national basis to make certain that adequate ore resources will be available to sustain and expand our productive capacity in the Middle West, and to do this the St. Lawrence seaway is a necessity. True, some portion of the future requirements will come from low-grade ores, but for them \$15 per ton of annual output is required in plant investment. To obtain an adequate capacity of, let us say, 80,000,000 tons a year, this Nation would have to spend \$1,200,000,000 in beneficiating plants. There is

even some doubt that technically this can be accomplished, let alone the enormous expense of capital investment, plus the expensive operation of such an undertaking.

It is estimated that even if technically possible, iron ores obtained from such sources would cost about \$3 more per ton and the price of steel would increase \$6 per ton for this one reason alone. Fifty or sixty million tons of steel from this new source would cost the consumers of this Nation \$300,000,000 or \$360,000,000 more a year.

To the extent that there will be foreign sources of ore on the east coast and the Gulf coast of the United States, it is to be doubted that the steel industry in the Middle West could sustain the competitive pull and dislocation of the cheaper sources of ore that could be brought into the eastern harbors by deep-water transportation. Regardless of whether it will be technically feasible to develop taconite ores, the higher cost will in itself bring pressure upon many units of the steel industry to move to tidewater areas.

POSSIBLE RELOCATION OF MIDWEST INDUSTRY

Mr. President, I now wish to call particular attention to what is involved in the St. Lawrence seaway development. There is evidence that the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway realize the implications of the iron-ore situation. Disregarding the tremendous cost to the Nation and the dislocation of industry and communities and peoples that this situation will create in the established industrial areas of the Middle West, they may still feel that such a dislocation may redound to their advantage. This is a serious thought, and I would not state it but for the fact that it is a matter of record.

I have in my possession an article written by Mr. Bowditch, president of the New England Council, which appeared in the New England Newsletter of September 1947. Mr. Bowditch and the New England Council are opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project, but they combine their opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project with a plea that the council make every effort to invite units of the steel industry to establish themselves in New England.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that Mr. Dudley Harmon, executive vice president of the New England Council, advised me on Friday afternoon that the New England Council is now taking no position in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, but is leaving it to each member of that council to determine his position for himself.

Furthermore, I wish to say that the New England Council never took a vote of its membership in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, but proceeded on the basis of a vote of the board of directors, and it depended on the advice of Mr. Bowditch; Mr. Ned French, president of the Association of New England Railroads; and Mr. C. L. Campbell, president of the Association of Electric Power Companies of New England.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to have that information.

As I have said, when Mr. Bowditch wrote the letter to which I have referred, he suggested that they make every effort to invite units of the steel industry to establish themselves in New England.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. Let me ask when the letter was written.

Mr. WILEY. It was written in September 1947. I have the exact date on file in my office. It was a news letter issued at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the view there expressed is not shared by a large part of the membership of the New England Council.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to hear that, and I am glad to say in that connection that it is not shared by the common people of even the great State of New York and the great city of New York. Senators are familiar with the polls which have been taken.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. They clearly indicate that in Boston and other cities that are so ably represented in this body by Senators of distinction, the people voted in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway—over 57 percent in one city, for instance, voted in favor of the seaway—recognizing the over-all national demand and necessity for it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the RECORD should show that Mr. Bowditch is a director of the Boston and Maine Railroad, of which the largest stockholders are the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Mr. WILEY. I may say that Mr. Bowditch, in cooperation with the railroads of New England, is trying to channel public opinion in Massachusetts, for instance, against the St. Lawrence seaway project. There is no doubt at all about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; there is no doubt at all.

Mr. WILEY. Yet at the same time they are making plans to receive the benefits of all the sorry dislocations which will result from the migration of the steel industry when the Mesabi range is exhausted. Certainly that migration and those tremendous dislocations will occur if we cannot open up the St. Lawrence, and thus make it possible for high-grade ores to reach the great steel region of the Midwest.

Mr. President, in this situation the responsibility rests on the Members of the Senate. I have been a Member of this body for 9 years, and during that time I have never, I think, in any endeavor, except when seeking to get reasonable prices for milk products, been provincial in my thinking. I respond to the present challenge by stating, echoing the sentiments of Daniel Webster, that I am an American. In the case of this great project, I do not think one can decide the issue on the basis of whether the development will or will not help his particular State. The question is, Will it help America?

In this article, to which reference has been made, Mr. Bowditch proposes that in the light of the exhaustion of middle-western ore resources and the proximity to Boston of Labrador ore, they make

every effort to invite the steel industry to settle in New England. I have not heard from my friend the junior Senator from Massachusetts whether in the interest of national defense he considers a steel plant in Massachusetts a more secure target than one in Pittsburgh or Cleveland or Chicago, or whether there would be particular gain to national security and stability by such a shift—a movement to the east coast, which at present is already overcentralized, I believe, to a suicidal degree in the event of a national emergency.

The Canadian mining authorities, as well as the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior of the United States, agree that the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway project is a guaranty of stability of the Middle West steel industry, and that it will in time become a necessity if we are to prevent the industrial dislocation of this Nation in the next 5 or 10 years.

MOVEMENT OF OIL TO MIDWEST

The same situation exists concerning copper, oil, and many other mineral projects. It is expected that in the foreseeable future, this country will become a direct importer of these products, particularly of petroleum which is so essentially a source of energy. When the great Southwestern oil fields give out, the Middle West again will be at the mercy of shortages and higher costs, and the St. Lawrence seaway project would be needed to bring some South American or near eastern oil, which the industrial empire of the Middle West will need in large quantities.

Perhaps some of my friends in Texas or Oklahoma are afraid that the St. Lawrence Seaway if authorized now would threaten the market for their present oil wells. They need not have this fear, for as long as reserves are available in the southwestern fields, the pipe lines will continue to carry those supplies to the Middle West. It is against the contingency of their exhaustion that we must protect ourselves. So again I invite my friends from the Southwest of our country to think of this project in the terms of the next 10 to 20 years rather than as a threat to their present production.

UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS AND EXPANSION VITAL TO WORLD

No one can foretell, Mr. President, what the future holds for us or for the world. All we can do today is to prepare within the limits of our own judgment and knowledge for all possible contingencies which we can foresee. Basic to the survival of nations is their ability to be strong in the spirit and physical condition of its human resources, and in the material wealth that they create. We are a country of only 145,000,000 people. We are called upon to pour out our labor and resources to those who are friendly to us.

In the ultimate analysis, however, the survival of our own life and institutions will depend on our capacity to keep ahead of the world in development of resources and technology. A project like the St. Lawrence seaway, when presented on a businesslike basis, as a self-liquidating project, must be considered by us

sympathetically, because such projects are designed to increase the productive capacity of our manpower, to replace mineral resources, such as copper, iron ore, oil, and bauxite, and to help carry products over distances with economy in regard to labor, money, and materials. It is by these devices that we can increase our national productivity. It is by these means we must continue to grow in strength and vitality.

These are some of the considerations, Mr. President, which lead me and the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations to advocate and urge speedy passage of Senate Joint Resolution 111.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks some pertinent questions and answers on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project prepared by the Transportation Division, Office of Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, dated January 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

1. WHAT IS THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT?

The purpose of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is (a) to remove the remaining obstructions to deep-water navigation between the Great Lakes and the lower St. Lawrence River, permitting the passage of deep-draft ocean vessels from the Atlantic Ocean to Great Lakes ports and the passage of large lake freighters from Lake ports to ports on the lower St. Lawrence River; and (b) to provide power facilities with a total installation of 2,200,000 horsepower, divided equally between the United States and Canada.

Navigation between the Great Lakes and the lower St. Lawrence River is now restricted to small vessels because of the 14-foot maximum draft of the canal system maintained by Canada around the rapids on the St. Lawrence River. This canal system will continue in operation even after completion of the seaway. The completed waterway will establish a minimum depth of 27 feet over the entire 2,347-mile route from Duluth on Lake Superior to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Of the 18 large locks required to overcome the 600-foot difference in waterlevel between Lake Superior and the ocean, nine (the MacArthur lock at the Sault Ste. Marie, connecting Lakes Superior and Huron and eight locks at the Welland Canal connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario) are completed.

2. WHAT IS THE LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT?

Several attempts have been made to obtain legislative approval of the project, first in the form of treaty ratification and then in the form of approval of an executive agreement between Canada and the United States. In February 1933, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably upon ratification of a treaty authorizing the project. The resolution on ratification received a majority in the Senate in 1934, but, requiring a two-thirds vote, failed of Senate approval. In 1941, an executive agreement was signed with Canada to promote the project. A resolution approving the agreement was favorably reported by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in November 1941 but was deferred as a result of the attack on

Pearl Harbor in December. Efforts were renewed in 1943, 1944, and 1946 to obtain legislative approval, but for various reasons final approval was not obtained.

3. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE PENDING LEGISLATION?

The current legislation authorizing the project was introduced in the Senate in 1947 by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG with the cosponsorship of a bipartisan group of 15 Senators (S. J. Res. 111) and in the House by Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO (H. J. Res. 192). The two resolutions, which are companion measures, are generally similar to previous resolutions authorizing the executive agreement, with one significant point of departure. The new resolutions, as distinct from earlier proposals, contemplate converting the navigation venture from a public-works project into a project which would be self-supporting and self-liquidating by means of toll charges on traffic and passengers utilizing the deep-water facilities on the St. Lawrence River. Self-liquidation of the cost of the power works to the National Government is provided for by authorizing the sale of the power facilities on the United States side of the river to the State of New York.

4. WHAT HAPPENS AFTER SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 111 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 192 ARE APPROVED?

The Canadian Parliament is awaiting adoption of the pending legislation in the United States Congress before actively undertaking consideration of the project. Following approval by both legislatures, the two governments will establish a joint Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission which will supervise actual construction of works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Engineering plans for the section are complete and actual construction may be undertaken whenever the Commission so decides.

With respect to navigation tolls, the President of the United States is authorized and directed under the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192 to negotiate a further agreement with Canada during the period of construction defining the rates of toll charges to be levied for use of the new deep-water navigation facilities in accordance with certain specific standards set in the resolutions under consideration. The tolls agreement will not become effective until approved by the legislatures of the two countries.

With respect to power, the President is authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the State of New York for transfer of the power facilities on the United States side of the river, the cost to be determined in accordance with the method of allocation jointly recommended in 1933 by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Power Authority of the State of New York, provided that such arrangement is consistent with the laws of the United States and protects the interests of the United States and of other States. This arrangement will also not become effective until approval by the Congress of the United States and the legislature of the State of New York.

5. HOW MUCH WILL THE PROJECT COST?

The most recent authoritative estimate of cost is printed in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee favorably reporting Senator VANDENBERG's resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 111. This estimate is based on data supplied by Lieutenant General Wheeler, Chief of the Army Engineers, with certain adjustments to bring Canadian costs up to date. The Senate committee's estimate of total cost of the project, including expenditures to date and based on May 1947 construction cost levels, amounts to \$884,000,000, of which the United States share would be \$523,000,000 and the Canadian share \$361,000,000. Inasmuch as Canada has al-

ready spent \$133,000,000 and the United States \$32,000,000 on existing works comprising integral parts of the project, the cost to complete the project is estimated at \$720,000,000, of which the United States share would be \$492,000,000 and the Canadian share \$228,000,000.

In the event that construction costs drop below May 1947 levels before actual construction of the project is initiated, then, of course, cost of the project will be less than the estimates indicated.

6. HOW IS COST OF THE PROJECT TO BE DIVIDED BETWEEN POWER AND NAVIGATION FOR PURPOSE OF SELF-LIQUIDATION?

The pending United States legislation excludes from self-liquidation the cost of work done in the past on the grounds that these expenditures have served and will continue to serve Great Lakes shipping, even though the works will form an integral part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. The cost to be liquidated, therefore, is the cost of the new work only.

On this basis, the actual payments for the power facilities by the State of New York to the United States Government and by the Province of Ontario to the Dominion Government would represent the proportion of total cost liquidated by power and the remainder would constitute the proportion to be liquidated by charges against navigation. The payments for power are estimated by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at roughly \$161,000,000 each for New York State and the Province of Ontario. Accordingly, the costs chargeable to navigation for the purpose of self-liquidation would be the total cost of new work (\$720,000,000) minus the payments for power (\$322,000,000), or \$398,000,000, of which the United States share would be \$330,000,000 and the Canadian share \$68,000,000.

7. WHAT AMOUNT OF TOLL REVENUE WOULD BE REQUIRED ANNUALLY TO COVER THE NAVIGATION COSTS?

The Army engineers calculate annual navigation charges for the project by adding interest during construction at 3 percent for 3 years to the first cost of the navigation works. By following this procedure, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee calculated the net investment in navigation at \$434,000,000. Applying to the net investment the Army engineers' formula of interest and amortization at 4.33 percent and annual maintenance and operating costs of \$2,460,000 yields total annual charges against navigation of \$21,260,000, of which the United States share would be \$16,840,000 and Canada's \$4,420,000. This is the amount of annual toll revenue required to make the navigation works self-sustaining and self-liquidating.

In addition to the above estimate, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee established a low range of annual charges by using an interest rate of 2 1/2 percent, which is closer to the actual rate at which the United States Government borrows money today, and a sinking fund of 1 percent and 2 1/2 percent compound interest. This results in reducing annual charges to \$17,448,000, of which the United States' share would be \$13,677,000 and Canada's \$3,771,000.

8. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT?

The benefits divide into three main categories: National security, navigation, power. The benefits will be discussed in the following questions.

9. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF NATIONAL SECURITY?

Supporters of the project as a factor in national defense include President Truman, former President Hoover, the late President Roosevelt, General Marshall, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Permanent Joint Board on Defense for the United States and Canada, and Kenneth C. Royall. These authorities ad-

vance four principal advantages of the project to national security:

First, the establishment of a new and vital line of water communication directly into the heart of the continent;

Second, provision for the construction and repair of ocean-going vessels in the relatively secure area of the Great Lakes;

Third, the development of a tremendous source of electric power in an area containing no developments comparable to the TVA or Columbia and Colorado River projects;

Fourth, the over-all economic and industrial advantage accruing from the development of one of the world's greatest waterways.

10. WHAT ARE THE NAVIGATION BENEFITS?

The seaway will result in substantial reductions in the cost of transportation between the Middle West and foreign ports. Likewise it will permit large vessels to operate between Great Lakes points and United States seaports. Transportation savings will result from the fact that the seaway will eliminate the cost of the rail haul or, in some cases, the water haul in small high-cost carriers, between Midwest points tributary to the Great Lakes and Atlantic coast ports, as well as the transshipment charges involved.

At the hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in June 1947, Secretary of Commerce Harriman estimated potential seaway traffic at thirty-eight to fifty-two million tons annually, based upon a preliminary analysis of the advantages of the waterway in the light of current conditions and the proposal for navigation toll charges. Of the total estimate, iron ore made up twenty to thirty million tons, general merchandise six to ten million tons, grain 5,000,000 tons, coal 4,000,000 tons, wood pulp, pulp wood, and newsprint 1,000,000 tons, manganese, chrome, and bauxite ores 1,000,000 tons, and immediate traffic in petroleum and gasoline 1,000,000 tons. In summarizing the benefits, the Secretary stated:

"By making less costly the importation of foreign ores and raw materials the seaway will ease the drain on our dwindling natural resources. By furnishing alternate sources of supply to the great steel industry located in the Lakes area, the seaway will bring an added degree of economic stability to the Lake industries. Finally, the seaway will enable the great midwestern area to receive more fully the benefits of international trade and to make a greater contribution to international trade, so essential to world economic and political stability."

A detailed and carefully prepared study, published by the Transportation Division of the Department of Commerce in November 1947 (Industry Report, Domestic Transportation, August–November 1947, Transportation Division, An Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project), defines the Department's estimates of potential traffic for certain bulk commodities, which, it is anticipated, will furnish the major share of the traffic. In this study, potential traffic in iron ore, grain, and coal is estimated at forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons, shortly after completion of the seaway. Long-range potential traffic in petroleum is estimated at fifteen to twenty million tons.

11. WHAT ARE THE POWER BENEFITS?

The power facilities will have a total capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, with an annual average output of over 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, or almost as much as was produced in all of the United States in 1914. The development will be the second largest single-dam project in the world, being exceeded only by Grand Coulee. Total production will be shared equally by Canada and the United States. The power market area within feasible transmission distance includes the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Is-

land, Connecticut, northeastern Pennsylvania, and northern New Jersey. The emergency range could be extended as far as Chicago and Washington, D. C. The St. Lawrence market is a power-deficit area. As a matter of fact, the War Production Board had what amounted to an informal embargo on the expansion of war production in that area due to the unavailability of adequate power. Power requirements in the area in 1946 were greater than at any time during the war and were cutting deeply into reserve capacity needed to assure dependable service. The Federal Power Commission estimates, on the basis of loads that may be reasonably expected, that the full United States share of St. Lawrence output could be utilized within a relatively short period of time—as short, under certain conditions, as 1 year after the power becomes available.

According to the Federal Power Commission, delivered cost of St. Lawrence power at current high construction costs would be 3.1 mills per kilowatt-hour, or less than the bare operating cost, exclusive of fixed charges, of generating steam electric power in the most efficient steam stations in the area. The latter costs range from just over 3 mills to 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The delivered cost of 3.1 mills of St. Lawrence power represents only 50 percent of average cost in the St. Lawrence market area of producing equivalent output at alternative new private steam plants, including fixed charges and operating expenses, where cost is as follows: New England, 7.2 mills for kilowatt-hour; New York City and Long Island, 7.1 mills per kilowatt-hour; rest of New York, 6.8 mills per kilowatt-hour.

12. WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO THE PROJECT?

The principal objections fall in the categories of denying the benefits of the project to national security and to transportation and power. The project is assailed (by some groups) as a waste of money. Others claim that the project would result in great damage to the railroads, eastern ports, railroad labor, power companies, and other interests. Most of the specific objections are included in the following questions.

13. IN VIEW OF THE VULNERABILITY OF THE GREAT LAKES AREA TO AIR ATTACK VIA THE NORTHERN POLAR REGION, COULDN'T A FEW WELL-PLACED BOMBS COMPLETELY CRIPPLE THE POWER WORKS AND THE SEAWAY?

The Lakes area is already a major center of United States and Canadian production, and would, in any event, require protection from every attack. The locks and powerhouse of the St. Lawrence project are no more vulnerable than any other defense asset in the area. They are no more vulnerable than the Soo Locks, the cities of Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Gary, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Rochester, the Niagara power plants, as well as Canadian cities and production facilities. All of these centers are vitally strategic and require an adequate system of defense. The problem of defending the St. Lawrence powerhouses and locks against air attack is not strategically different nor does it appear to create substantially larger commitments on the part of the armed forces of the two countries than those now confronting them in the defense of the centers above named.

14. HOW CAN THE SEAWAY HELP NATIONAL SECURITY BY PERMITTING THE IMPORTATION OF IRON ORE WHEN ONE OF THE GREATEST DANGERS TO NATIONAL SECURITY IS INCREASED RELIANCE ON FOREIGN SOURCES FOR THIS IMPORTANT RAW MATERIAL?

Secretary Harriman indicated the national security benefits of seaway-routed ore imports, as follows:

"All of the estimates with respect to the Superior ore deposits indicate that in the foreseeable future the maintenance of an

adequate supply of ore will become a serious problem to the operation of the great steel industry centered around the Lake region. Construction of the seaway serves as a sort of national insurance by making it possible to bring into the Lake region great amounts of foreign ore. The high-grade ores of Labrador are particularly significant from the standpoint of national security. If, because of a shortage of upper Lake ore, we are obliged to go on an increased import basis, ore from Labrador in time of national emergency could move to the Lake area from the Gulf of St. Lawrence via a relatively sheltered route as compared with the hazardous open-ocean route of ore from present sources such as Chile or Cuba."

Assistant Secretary Warne, of the Department of the Interior, testified:

"Now we are confronted by the cold, stark fact that our beds of richer ores at the head of the Great Lakes are approaching exhaustion. Although we still have large deposits of inferior- and low-grade ores, we are confronted by a serious economic problem of utilizing them, in view of the costs of concentrating and refining them into suitable ore for industrial use. We are having to import more and more high-grade ore from abroad, and we can expect that trend to continue at an accelerated rate in proportion to the decline of our domestic supplies. Without doubt, this will affect the stability of the iron and steel industry very materially and speed up the trend of steel production migration which is already in process.

"The St. Lawrence seaway, by providing an avenue for ocean traffic into the heart of the existing Great Lakes steel industry, no doubt would be of benefit to those companies which no longer will have access to adequate quantities of high-grade ores from domestic sources."

15. HOW CAN A WATERWAY WHICH WILL BE OPEN ONLY 240 DAYS OF THE YEAR JUSTIFY SUCH VAST EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC FUNDS?

The seasonality of navigation is no handicap to extensive commercial utilization of the seaway. The St. Mary's Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., connecting Lakes Superior, Huron, and Michigan, is also icebound for 4 months every winter. Yet, it can hardly be said that this canal is uneconomic when the tonnage moving through it during an 8-month season exceeds the combined tonnage of the Panama and Suez Canals during a 12-month season. The Great Lakes, which are also closed for the same period, carry two-thirds as much traffic in 8 months as all United States Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast ports combined.

The navigation season on the St. Lawrence River is roughly the same as on the Lakes. Despite the limited season, the port of Montreal, which lies on the St. Lawrence River 1,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean, is the second largest exporting port on the North American continent, being exceeded only by New York.

16. HOW CAN OCEAN VESSELS OPERATE ECONOMICALLY OVER THE FOGGY, CIRCUITOUS, AND HAZARDOUS SEAWAY, WHICH PERMITS VESSELS TO TRAVEL AT ONLY VERY SLOW SPEEDS?

Records of the Canadian Department of Railways and Canals show that fog conditions on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River during the navigation season are much more favorable than those at New York. Montreal, for example, had 4 days of fog per year as compared with 44 days for New York Harbor.

The best indication of the hazardousness of navigation is the accident record on the St. Lawrence, which compares favorably with that of the Panama Canal. During the 5-year period, 1935-39, a total of 116 accidents was reported, of which 65 resulted in damages, amounting to \$419,000, 34 involved no damages at all, and in 17 cases the amount of damage was unknown. This record should be viewed in relation to the number of ves-

sel passages over the St. Lawrence River during the same period, which was roughly 50,000 and involved the movement of 40,000,000 short tons of cargo. Accordingly, the accident rate was less than $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent, which would not indicate a very great hazard to navigation. New radar devices, which have already been successfully employed on a number of Great Lakes vessels, should reduce the accident rate even further.

With respect to the speed of navigation over the seaway, the actual over-all reduction as compared with ocean travel for an average vessel with normal operating speed of 12 miles an hour would be only 14 percent. Reduced speed on the 2,347 mile route would be required only in the 75 miles of canals and restricted channels and the 18 seaway locks. This would lengthen travel time for a round trip between Duluth and Montreal by $1\frac{1}{2}$ days. In view of the heavy volume of traffic moving over the existing shallow canals and through 31 locks, it seems reasonable that oceangoing vessels will not find this small increase in travel time an obstacle militating against their economical use of the seaway.

17. WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES BEAR A DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE OF THE TOTAL COST OF THE NEW NAVIGATION WORKS (\$330,000,000 OUT OF \$398,000,000)?

When the 1932 treaty was negotiated, the division of total cost, including past expenditures, was practically equal for the United States and Canada. The reason for the changed cost relationship today is that past expenditures were primarily Canadian and were made at a time when construction costs were comparatively low. Canada has already expended 133 million dollars on navigation works which are integral parts of the seaway as compared with 32 million for the United States. Future expenditures, on the other hand, for the most part cover works assigned to the United States and have been estimated on the basis of the higher construction costs now obtaining. In any event, the pending legislation provides for self-liquidation of the new navigation works, so that the proportion of cost borne by each country is not a primary factor in evaluating the project. The users will pay for the new navigation works.

18. WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES COMMIT ITSELF TO EXPENDITURE OF VAST SUMS OF MONEY WHEN OUR PERPETUAL NAVIGATION RIGHTS ON THE GREAT LAKES, THE CONNECTING CHANNELS AND CANALS AND IN THE WHOLLY CANADIAN SECTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE HAVE NOT YET BEEN ESTABLISHED?

Treaties between the United States and Great Britain have vested in the United States reciprocal rights to navigation in boundary waters and in those waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system which are wholly located in Canadian territory. These rights have been secured by the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation of 1794, the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the Treaty of Washington of 1871, and the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. The protection afforded the United States under these treaties is indicated by the fact that no insoluble disputes have arisen over United States navigation rights on the Great Lakes or the St. Lawrence River during their lifetime, nor has either party to the treaties in all the years that the treaties have been in force indicated any desire to renounce them.

On the other hand, since the treaties are terminable by either party after due notice, it would certainly be desirable to establish the perpetual navigation rights of the United States. The original 1932 treaty on the St. Lawrence project sought to accomplish this objective by including a provision on perpetual navigation rights. When the treaty failed of ratification because of lack of a two-thirds majority, the same provision was incorporated in article VII of the Executive Agreement of 1941. Opponents of the

project opposed the provision on the grounds that it had no place in the Executive agreement but required a treaty with Canada. The pending legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192, as well as resolutions authorizing the project, have accordingly excepted from approval article VII of the Executive agreement and have expressed the sense of Congress that it would be desirable for the President to negotiate a treaty with Canada on perpetual navigation rights and certain other matters.

19. WHY SHOULD THE PROJECT BE APPROVED BEFORE THE MATTERS RELATING TO TOLLS, WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS WITH CANADA, ARE SETTLED?

Both the United States and Canadian Governments have agreed in principle that the seaway be made self-liquidating through a system of toll charges.

Section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192 authorizes and directs the President to negotiate, during the period of construction of the project, a further agreement with Canada defining the rates of tolls to be levied on the seaway, subject to approval by the legislative bodies of both countries. Reversal of the procedure in order to reach agreement on the tolls system before approval of the project might be justified if the fear were well founded that the two Governments may not be able to reach agreement. It appears inconceivable, however, that the two Governments would agree to enter into a venture of such magnitude, commit themselves to the expenditure of such large sums of money, accept the principle of self-liquidation of the project and then fail to agree on implementation of the principle. The two countries have an equally strong interest in self-liquidation. Both have large national debts and high rates of taxation. Neither would wish to add to these debts or taxation levels. There is no sound reason to doubt that details of a satisfactory system of tolls can be worked out during the period of construction. It is instructive that this procedure was followed in connection with the Panama Canal and was worked out satisfactorily.

20. HOW CAN TOLL REVENUE ADEQUATE TO MAKE THE SEAWAY SELF-LIQUIDATING BE REALIZED WHEN THE TOTAL CAPACITY OF THE SEAWAY IS ESTIMATED BY THE UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AT 25,000,000 TONS ANNUALLY?

The 25,000,000-ton estimate, prepared in 1934 by the Army engineers, was an estimate of practical as distinguished from theoretical capacity and apparently was based on the assumption that the traffic pattern on the seaway would resemble that prevailing on the Great Lakes. This assumption involved an exceptionally unbalanced cargo movement with 80 percent of the traffic moving down-bound and only 20 percent up-bound. On this basis, the Army engineers arrived at an average tonnage per vessel passage through the locks of only 3,800 tons. This relatively small tonnage per vessel multiplied by 7,230 vessel passages produced a maximum tonnage of 27,473,000 tons, which was then reduced to 25,000,000 tons.

Theoretical capacity of the St. Lawrence project represents the total traffic which could be moved through the seaway during a normal 240-day navigation season if the locks were constantly operated at top speed and if every vessel passing through the locks in each direction were fully loaded. The Canadian Government has estimated that the limiting lock of the seaway, lock No. 2 on the Welland Canal, has an effective capacity of 28 single lockages per day with the largest bulk freighters on the Lakes. Assuming that each vessel passing through the locks carried 10,000 tons of freight, the Canadian authorities arrived at a capacity figure of 67,200,000 tons for 6,720 vessel passages.

The Department of Commerce points out that if vessels such as the new lake ore freighters, which can carry more than 15,000 tons each, comprised the entire seaway traffic and were fully loaded in both directions, the theoretical capacity of the project would be in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 tons annually. The Department also points out that the MacArthur lock, which is of the same general dimensions as the limiting lock on the Welland Canal, actually handled 42,000,000 tons of traffic in 1945, despite the fact that most of the tonnage moved in one direction.

In its recent industry report on the seaway project, the Department of Commerce estimates potential seaway traffic in three major bulk commodities at forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons annually, composed of thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of up-bound iron ore, six and one-half to eleven and one-half million tons of down-bound grain and 4,000,000 tons of down-bound bituminous coal. Because they will be able to quote lower rates than other vessels, the Department anticipates that the ships which carry ore up-bound will carry most, if not all, of the down-bound grain and coal traffic. Accordingly, the number of lockages required to handle the maximum traffic of 53,000,000 tons for the three commodities will be the same as that required for handling the ore boats, or an estimated 5,000 lockages per season of navigation. Theoretical capacity of the locks for large vessels is estimated by the Canadian Government at about 6,720 per season of navigation.

21. IT MAY WELL BE TRUE THAT THEORETICAL CAPACITY OF THE LIMITING LOCK OF THE SEAWAY (LOCK NO. 2 OF THE WELLAND CANAL) RANGES UPWARD FROM 68,000,000 TONS ANNUALLY, BUT HOW CAN A CAPACITY OF OVER 20,000,000 TONS BE REALIZED WHEN ABOUT 70 PERCENT OF LOCKAGE CAPACITY OF THE WELLAND CANAL IS NOW ABSORBED BY VESSELS ENGAGED IN PURELY INTERLAKE TRAFFIC BETWEEN LAKE ONTARIO AND THE UPPER LAKES?

The Industry Report of the Department of Commerce carefully considers this question and arrives at the conclusion that interlake traffic through the Welland Canal should not seriously restrict the canal's capacity for seaway traffic. Over 90 percent of total traffic through the Welland Canal in 1945, it is observed, was down-bound. The down-bound traffic was made up almost exclusively of bulk items, such as grain, iron ore, coal, petroleum, and gasoline. Before they can seriously affect the capacity of the Welland Canal, the down-bound ore and petroleum and gasoline movements will probably be reduced to insignificant volume or eliminated entirely as a result of growing shortages in the United States, which furnishes this traffic. The down-bound traffic in grain and coal will be handled at very low rates by the vessels carrying ore up-bound since they would otherwise make the down-bound trip in ballast. It is not anticipated that the small vessels now carrying most of the Welland Canal traffic can compete successfully against large lake or ocean bulk carriers for this traffic and accordingly virtually the entire capacity of the Welland Canal will be available for the large vessels.

22. WHAT PROOF IS THERE THAT, WITH THE IMPOSITION OF TOLLS, IT WILL BE MORE ECONOMICAL FOR TRAFFIC TO USE DEEP-DRAFT VESSELS OVER THE SEAWAY RATHER THAN SMALLER VESSELS OVER THE TOLL-FREE ST. LAWRENCE CANALS OR VIA WHATEVER OTHER MODE OF TRANSPORTATION IS CURRENTLY USED

The transportation savings in using deep-draft vessels over the seaway rather than smaller vessels via the toll-free St. Lawrence canals are unquestionable. The principal cargo carried by the small canallers is grain. The president of Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd., which operates the largest fleet of small

canallers, is quoted in the Commerce Department's recent industry report as stating:

"When the seaway is in operation, it will mean that the large lake freighters and ocean vessels will navigate between the head of the Lakes and Montreal, and so far as upper Lake freighters are concerned, their cost of carrying grain will be applicable to the entire route, instead of only a portion of it. The cost of carrying grain on upper lakers is less than one-third of the cost of carrying grain in small canallers, and, therefore, under the proposed conditions the canaller cannot compete."

The Commerce Department estimates that the seaway rate on export grain in large Lake freighters from Duluth to Montreal, at current high operating costs, would be from 4.90 to 7.40 cents per bushel less than the actual 1946 rate to Montreal via Port Colborne in small canallers. This compares with a suggested toll charge of slightly more than 1 cent a bushel on seaway grain.

Since the small canaller rate on export grain is cheaper than rates via existing competing routes, it is clear that use of the seaway by deep-draft vessels, especially the large Lake freighters, will be considerably more economical, despite toll charges, than any existing mode of transportation. A similar conclusion is drawn by the Department in its study of comparative transportation costs for seaway traffic in coal, iron ore, and petroleum.

23. WHAT PROOF IS THERE THAT TRAFFIC WILL MOVE VIA THE SEAWAY IN SUCH VOLUME AS TO YIELD TOLL REVENUE SUFFICIENT TO MAKE THE PROJECT SELF-LIQUIDATING?

In its recent Industry Report, the Department of Commerce estimates annual toll revenue from 3 bulk commodities which it anticipates will furnish the major volume of seaway traffic at from 21 to 27 million dollars per year.

Possible range of toll charges and toll revenue

Commodity	Potential traffic (million tons)	Per ton toll charge (cents)	Total revenue
Ore.....	30 -37½	50	\$15,000,000-\$18,750,000
Grain.....	6½-11½	25-35	1,625,000- 4,025,000
Coal.....	4	25-35	1,000,000- 1,400,000
Ballast.....	19½-22	15	3,300,000- 2,925,000
Total.....	20,925,000- 27,100,000

¹ Dead-weight tonnage.

This compares with total annual charges against navigation, estimated by the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of from \$17,500,000 to \$21,250,000.

Inasmuch as the estimate of annual charges is based on current high construction costs, while the traffic estimates are not only conservative in volume, but do not include all potential traffic and are based on modest toll charges, it would appear that traffic will move in sufficient volume to make the seaway self-liquidating.

24. WILL NOT SUCH TRAFFIC AS DOES MOVE VIA THE SEAWAY MERELY REPRESENT A DIVERSION FROM THE RAILROADS AND ATLANTIC AND GULF PORTS?

Carrier opponents of the project argue contradictorily that the seaway is a waste of taxpayers' money because it will not be used and that it will be used to such an extent as to damage seriously their interests by diversion of traffic. Both extremes appear to lack foundation.

Some diversion of traffic to the seaway will occur, particularly in grain, as the recent Industry Report of the Department of Commerce points out. But the principal item via the seaway will be new traffic in iron ore (30,000,000 to 37,500,000 tons) which will not represent diversion from any existing mode of transport. Indeed, in-bound ore traffic, by

permitting continued location of the major section of the steel industry in the Midwest, will retain as traffic for the rail lines serving the industry a large volume of ore, coal, and iron and steel products which otherwise might be lost by removal of sections of the industry to the Atlantic coast.

It is axiomatic that benefits to any region of the United States almost always redound to the benefit of the entire country. The transportation savings of the seaway will be of great benefit to Midwest industry and agriculture. The entire Nation will eventually share in these benefits.

25. WILL THE SEAWAY ACT AS A STRONG DETERRENT TO THE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC TAUCONITE?

The charge that the seaway will act as a deterrent on commercial production of taconite implies the admission by the domestic ore industry that taconite, at the present stage of technological development, cannot compete with low-cost foreign ore. From this standpoint, it is true that the seaway will inhibit production of high-cost ore from taconite. On the other hand, the real deterrent is not the seaway but the high cost of taconite-ore production. Whether the seaway is built or not, taconite ore will still face competition from foreign ore, because of the former's high cost of production.

Without the seaway, many experts predict a substantial migration of sections of the Midwest steel industry to the coast in order to take advantage of low-cost foreign ore. If taconite ore cannot compete with foreign ore via the seaway in the Midwest, it most certainly could not compete with foreign ore at the coast where it would suffer the further disadvantage of a costly rail haul from the Lakes area.

Finally, it might be pointed out, the seaway capacity limits the amount of foreign ore to less than half of the peak requirements of the Midwest steel industry. Remaining requirements can be met by ore from taconite, if low-cost methods of production are developed.

26. WILL NOT THE SEAWAY ADVERSELY AFFECT THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE BY DIVERTING TRAFFIC TO FOREIGN VESSELS?

The competitive advantage of foreign vessels in terms of lower shipbuilding and ship-operating costs has long been recognized by the United States Government. It would be no different on the seaway than elsewhere. In meeting competition of foreign carriers, our Government has authorized subsidies to United States vessels on essential lines, routes, or services in the foreign commerce of the United States. American-flag vessels utilizing the seaway would be eligible for such subsidies.

Furthermore, the recent Industry Report of the Department of Commerce indicates that the principal vessel movement over the seaway between the head of the Lakes and Montreal will be large lake freighter rather than ocean carrier, with transfer to and from ocean vessels at Montreal. Such a movement is predicated on the economies afforded by the large bulk lake freighters which can carry 15,000 to 20,000 tons of cargo over the seaway as compared with 8,000 to 10,000 tons for the ocean vessels capable of navigating the seaway. As is well known, the lake fleet, particularly in the large bulk carriers, is predominantly composed of American-flag vessels.

27. IS THE 27-FOOT WATERWAY DEEP ENOUGH TO ACCOMMODATE MOST OCEANOING VESSELS?

The engineering plans of the seaway call for a minimum depth of 27 feet and ultimate depth of 30 feet through additional dredging when necessary. The 27-foot channel would have a normal depth of 27 feet but would be deeper in the rockier or more dangerous spots and will permit vessels of maximum loaded draft of 25 feet to pass through the seaway fully loaded. The 30-foot chan-

nel will permit vessels of 27½ maximum loaded draft to navigate fully loaded.

The most recent authoritative statement on the share of the world and United States fleets that could traverse the seaway at the initial depth of 27 feet was made by Edward Macauley, Acting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission in 1946:

"What share of the United States Fleet and of the world fleets could traverse the proposed 27-foot channel? Whereas vessels having a maximum loaded draft of 25 feet would be able to carry full dead-weight capacity through the waterway, vessels having a maximum loaded draft of more than 25 feet would have to proceed on less than full draft. For the latter vessels an allowance has been made. It has been estimated that the preponderance of vessels transiting the Panama Canal normally have been composed of vessels loaded only to two-thirds of capacity. With an allowance of an additional 8 or 9 percent of the total dead-weight capacity for fuel, water, and supplies, a load of 75 percent of dead-weight capacity would appear to be typical of vessels which would transit such waterways as the St. Lawrence seaway. Of the ships of greater than 27-foot draft, the Victory and Liberty are of special interest. Victoys could go through the canal loaded to 79 percent, and the Liberty to 85 percent of total dead-weight carrying capacity.

"With these considerations in mind, it becomes apparent that there are many vessels in the United States Fleet and in the world fleets that are capable of navigating the proposed waterway.

"An analysis of the fleets of 30 of the principal countries of the world (and the British colonies), as of September 30, 1945, shows that, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over, there were 3,354 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 5,191 vessels within the 27-foot draft range. The aggregate gross tonnages of these vessels were 12,283,972 and 24,592,103 tons, respectively. Freighters predominated, but there were also substantial representations of tankers and combination passenger and cargo vessels. If there are added Libertys and Victoys, which have drafts of 27 feet 9½ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 8,015 and the gross tonnage 45,031,682.

"A somewhat corresponding situation is revealed by an analysis of the United States fleet of similar vessels. This shows that as of the same date there were 763 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 1,173 vessels within the 27-foot range, have aggregate gross tonnages of 3,490,770 and 6,232,356, respectively. As in the case of the world fleet, the United States vessels consisted largely of freighters but with some tankers and combination passenger and cargo ships. If there are added Libertys and Victoys which have drafts of 27 feet 9½ inches, and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 3,997 and the tonnage 26,671,935."

28. WILL NOT THE SEAWAY PERMIT CHEAP FOREIGN COAL TO GLUT THE UNITED STATES MARKET AND REPLACE UNITED STATES COAL?

If foreign coal could compete with United States coal in the Midwest, it would first have to be able to compete on the Atlantic coast. Yet foreign coal has never succeeded in undercutting United States coal in coastal markets. In spite of availability of foreign shipping and the absence of an import duty, average annual United States imports of coal during the 10 years 1929-38 were at the relatively insignificant rate of 669,000 tons or a tiny fraction of 1 percent of United States production during the same period.

The fear of foreign competition in coal has little merit today when the United States is exporting over 60,000,000 tons of coal annually to a coal-hungry world.

Far from facing any danger from foreign competition, the recent industry report of the Commerce Department estimates that

the seaway will facilitate an annual export movement of 4,000,000 tons of United States bituminous coal to the Canadian Province of Quebec and an undetermined quantity abroad.

29. DOES NOT THE POWER PROJECT DUPLICATE PRESENT FACILITIES WHICH ARE ADEQUATE FOR DEMAND?

Far from duplicating existing facilities, the Federal Power Commission estimates that, on the basis of present loads, the entire United States share of the power project (5,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year of firm energy) would be absorbed by about 1950.

Availability of low-cost power creates its own market. In our modern age, industries, particularly electro-chemical industries, are looking for cheap power. Wherever cheap power may be found within the limits of transportation of materials, it is fairly a certainty that it will be used. The Niagara-St. Lawrence frontier has abundantly indicated the willingness of industry to go to that area and take advantage of any cheap power which is available. The same phenomena may be observed in the Northwest and TVA areas, as well as in Canada.

30. HOW WILL NEW ENGLAND BENEFIT FROM THE POWER PROJECT WHEN THE LAW OF NEW YORK STATE PROHIBITS SALE OF ELECTRIC ENERGY PRODUCED IN THE STATE TO ANY CONSUMER OUTSIDE THE STATE BOUNDARIES?

Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192 stipulate in section 5 that arrangement for transfer of the power facilities must be consistent with the laws of the United States and must protect the "interests of the United States and of other States" and that such arrangement will be effective only after approval by the Congress and the legislature of the State of New York.

It is assumed that Congress will take care of the interests of the New England States in the preparation of the above-mentioned legislation.

In the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 111, representatives of the New York Power Authority stated that they were already on record as ready to recommend to the State legislature that the State law be amended to permit sale of power outside the State, if such an amendment were necessary to clarify the State law.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question, which I think is a fair one. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has figured, or whether the committee has figured, as a part of the costs of the seaway, the costs of deepening the harbors and the approaches to the harbors in the various ports of the Great Lakes. I ask that because I understand that Canada is deepening the canal from Quebec to Montreal, I think, from 30 feet to either 32 or 35 feet, the latter, I believe. I also understand that this seaway is to be 27 feet, which the proponents say will take a vessel of 25½-foot draft. I am informed that there is no harbor in the Great Lakes that will take a ship of 25½-foot draft, with the exception of Detroit. That includes Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, Duluth, and several other harbors. Has the committee figured in the costs of deepening the channels up to those harbors, and the cost of building the new docks that will make it possible for an oceangoing vessel to turn around quickly and return to sea?

Mr. WILEY. I am frank to say the committee has not. There was some

testimony on that subject, some by the mayor of Milwaukee. There was testimony in the record. I must say that in hurrying to the Senate Chamber I forgot certain cards which I had prepared for use in giving answers to the numerous questions which I expected would be forthcoming.

Let me read a card I have before me:

NUMBER OF SHIPS WHICH CAN USE CHANNEL

Analysis of fleets of 30 principal countries as of September 30, 1945, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over. There were 3,354 within 25-foot-draft range and 5,191 within 27-foot-draft range. Aggregate tonnage 12,283,972 and 24,592,103 tons, respectively. If we add Liberty's and Victory's which have drafts of 27 feet 9 1/4 inches and 28 feet 6 3/4 inches, respectively, the number reaches 8,015 and the gross tonnage 45,031,682.

I realize that does not answer the question. I have a statement to the effect that most of the cities themselves would do the work the Senator suggests as necessary, and the estimated cost I think was \$8,000,000. I have that information. I intended to carry over my address until Wednesday, at which time I had expected to subject myself to questions. I shall have that information available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish the Senator would furnish that, because my information is to the effect that instead of \$8,000,000 it is something around \$250,000,000. At the docks, as well as in the channels and the harbor facilities themselves, there will have to be very substantial dredging, and in one or two of the harbors, particularly at Cleveland, a great deal of the bottom is ledge, so that it will not only have to be dredged, it will have to be dynamited in order to increase the depth of the water sufficiently to make it deep enough for a seagoing vessel.

The Senator read various amounts of tonnage. Is it not true that the report of the Committee on Merchant Marine stated that the one dry-cargo ship that is practical should be 32 feet in draft and a tanker 35 feet in draft? Is it not also true that at the present time only 9.4 percent of the United States dry-cargo tonnage, and I think a little less than that of the tanker tonnage, could get within a 25 1/2-foot draft?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has asked several questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two questions.

Mr. WILEY. First, I want to put in the RECORD the answer to the claim that the harbors will have to be dredged. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, at this time, as a preliminary to answering the question, that some of the greatest harbors in the world do not qualify to accommodate ships with ocean-going draft. Of the ports with less than 27-foot draft, I may cite the following:

	Feet
Stettin, Germany	26
Seville, Spain	18-21
Vera Cruz, Mexico	27
Bangkok, Siam	14
Nassau, Bermuda	24
Canton, China	16
Guayaquil, Ecuador	26
Hypong, Indochina	21
Rosario, Argentina	22
Basra, Iraq	27

I shall try to provide answers to the questions, though I realize that one is supposed to know a great deal about this subject that I do not know. If one looks at the map of the Great Lakes hanging on the wall here, he realizes that through this one little port at the Soo pass 120,000,000 tons down-traffic practically in one season of 7 months, and he gets an idea of the commerce on the Lakes. I, who have been living close to the Lakes, though I live in the western part of Wisconsin, have seen man's ingenuity in developing boats to such an extent that, whereas formerly the boats had a capacity of 1,000 to 2,000 bushels of wheat, the shippers will now transport in the boats 10,000 tons. The development in the building of boats is such that all the bugaboo as to what can be done will, I think, disappear in the mist, when it is realized that here is an area served by the St. Lawrence Canal, with 50,000,000 souls, who are doing more business in tonnage than is handled in three-fourths of all the ports of the Pacific and Atlantic together.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If all this business is done in the area referred to, and I assume it is, as the Senator from Wisconsin says it is—

Mr. WILEY. I will secure the exact figures and place them in the RECORD on Wednesday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I am getting at is that we want to build a seaway which is practical for oceangoing steamers, and if the President's own committee states that only 9.4 of our dry-cargo ships, and fewer of our tankers—I think it is 5-point something—can go up a 27-foot channel, then if we are going to build it we ought to build it deeper, ought we not?

Mr. WILEY. I am willing to take the judgment of those who have studied the matter. I am not one of those who are building blocks in the road for others to stumble over. First it is contended there will be no traffic for the canal. Then it is contended that the canal will not provide proper facilities to handle the traffic. Then it is contended that the canal should be deeper, which would entail more and more expense. Now I say, let us build it. Let us make an outlet to the sea so that we can take care of the vast dynamo which is operating in the central portion of our country, which is generating power, and wealth, and doing the job which is building up the Nation. Do not keep us hemmed in any longer.

On that very point, Mr. President, I will secure the exact figures involved, and will present them for the RECORD Wednesday. I previously stated I returned from Wisconsin just this morning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask another question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The United States' share of the costs of the power is estimated at \$160,795,000, and the same for the Canadian share. There is also a figure estimated by General Wheeler—and I am reading from page 14 of the committee report marked "Calendar No.

862"—of \$91,000,000 as one-half of the item common to power and navigation.

As I understand, that \$91,000,000 is going to be chargeable to navigation. Now if it is a power cost common to both power and navigation, why should tolls be required to pay and liquidate that \$91,000,000, half of which is chargeable to power? I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am in favor of the power project. I believe it should be built in due course. But I believe it should be built entirely apart from the navigational features of the seaway, and I think it could be done and a very substantial amount of money saved. Why should this \$91,000,000 be chargeable to tolls if half of it is common to power and to navigation?

Mr. WILEY. I think the answer is very simple. I assure the Senator he does not have to assure me that he is in favor of power and against the navigation project. I have known that for some time. I appreciate his strenuous efforts to block navigation. But I cannot see the consistency in saying "Give us all this power. We of the East need that. And we want to keep you of the Middle West locked in."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish one question at a time. The question of \$91,000,000 is simply a matter for the Army engineers in determining what is the appropriate cost. First, it will be understood that under the Constitution the Federal Government regulates navigation, and so forth, on our streams. If Senators will look at the chart which hangs on the wall they will see why it is not reasonable to say that it is only an electric project or only a navigation project. We will have a large map placed on the wall to show the situation in detail. The electric development is made at the point I indicate. At this other point on the chart is where the ships come through. It is a combination of power and navigation. The engineers who apportion the cost to flood control, to navigation, and the cost of erecting these structures took the figure the Senator has referred to and they felt it was a reasonable figure. I must say that I understand this is the first time that question has been raised.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILEY. I think some are trying to confuse the larger issue before us.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has stated that I was attempting in every way to block the navigational features. I respectfully say to the Senator that I want to see the navigational features made practical, to see them made useful, so that they will surely be self-liquidating. I am not blocking them. I am opposing the joint resolution at this time because I do not believe that the joint resolution in its present form provides for a practical seaway for modern ocean-going vessels developed by the war since 1945 and onward.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate fully the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I probably was a little harsh with him, but I nevertheless have to restate the position that every argument the Senator from Massachusetts has made was made time and time again in relation to the Panama Canal, and every argument he has made has been made against every progressive advance the Nation has made. It is always a question of something not being quite practical. It is said that there has not been demonstrated to the *n*th degree the certainty that the proposal will be self-liquidating. It is contended that it has not been demonstrated that the people in my section as against the people in other sections are going to get their full 100 percent of value out of it. Such arguments have been constantly used, and if it were not for the common sense of the jury which has to decide the question—and in this case we are the jury—this matter would be blocked interminably. But I cannot conceive for one moment that such things as insinuating that ocean-going ships will not use the canal are going to decide the matter.

There are five countries using the waterway now and sending small ships which are traveling to the Lake ports. Two of the countries are Sweden and Holland. I will place the names of the other three in the RECORD on Wednesday. They are sending through the waterway such ships as Liberty ships and Victory ships loaded approximately 80 percent. All such ships, and there are thousands of them plying the seas, can go through the canal.

Mr. President, we know what is meant by the draft line on a ship. When the ship gets down to the draft line it is full. We know that, if that ship is full of feathers, as distinguished from iron ore, the draft line will be about at the point which I indicate on this sheet of paper which I am using as an illustration, 10 or 15 feet above the line at which the ship would be in the water if it were loaded with iron ore. Suppose automobiles are shipped from Detroit, as distinguished from wheat, which is shipped in bulk. A ship such as a Victory ship or a Liberty ship can be loaded up to its full capacity with automobiles, but the ship will not go down in the water to the draft line. Why? Because automobiles do not have the solid weight that wheat or iron ore shipped in bulk have. That is the answer.

Mr. President, when the Senate reconvenes on Wednesday next I shall place in the RECORD a statement of the number of vessels using the seaway. I will demonstrate to the Senate that the seaway canal, as outlined by the best military and business brains, and by every President since President Harding, is practicable and will do the job. But up comes this objection and that objection. Some will say, "The construction of the canal is going to hurt my baby." But those who say so cannot demonstrate that it will hurt their baby. When such talk is begun it is well to ask a few questions as to how their baby is going to be deprived of any milk. We have many babies in the Midwest. I say to the Senate again that it will be a sorry

day if the Congress loses its vision and turns down the project.

Mr. President, I have an understanding with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that he is to speak on Wednesday, with the understanding that my statement begun today will be continued over to Wednesday, and that I will occupy some of the time on Wednesday for questions and answers. Then the Senator from Massachusetts is to speak.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my understanding was that I was to begin when the Senate convened on Wednesday. That was the understanding I had with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry, but I understood that if I had not completed my statement I would continue, of course, on Wednesday.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator continue now?

Mr. WILEY. No; I would prefer not to. I do not want to take much time on Wednesday. The Senator from Massachusetts can have most of the time then. I want to answer some of the questions that have been put to me today and place certain things in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. My understanding with the Senator was that he was to begin today, but I was to begin on Wednesday.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator will begin on Wednesday, but after I am through.

Mr. LODGE. That will be 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. LODGE. That is not satisfactory to me, and that is not my understanding of the agreement we had.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator from Massachusetts and I disagree in that respect. I certainly do not want any misunderstanding. Will the Senator from Massachusetts agree that I shall have an hour on Wednesday?

Mr. LODGE. So far as I am concerned, the Senator can take all day Wednesday, and then I will try to take the floor on Friday.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. An understanding can be worked out between the two Senators, and between the opponents and proponents of the measure. An understanding obviously cannot be reached on the Senate floor. I suggest that Senators get together during the recess and endeavor to reach an understanding.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska. I do not wish to have any misunderstanding with the Senator from Massachusetts. I stated my understanding. He has another understanding. I shall waive my understanding in his interest if he does not think I am entitled, under these circumstances, to at least an hour to reply to the questions which have been asked and to present the material which I know I have, but which I have not had time to assemble because of absence from the city. If he is insistent that his understanding is correct, and that he is to proceed at 12 o'clock on Wednesday, I waive any rights which I may have. Of

course, we shall expect to take the floor after he has concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield the floor.

Mr. WILEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Fraser Challenges Wiley's Statement on Seaway Plan," from the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette for January 23, 1948.

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

FRASER CHALLENGES WILEY'S STATEMENT ON SEAWAY PLAN

Harry W. Fraser, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association and president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, locked words Friday afternoon with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on rail labor's stand on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

From Washington Senator WILEY was quoted earlier in the day as telling the Associated Press that he "is convinced that the overwhelming rank and file of American railway labor knows that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will inevitably involve a vast expansion of railroads."

The Wisconsin Senator was also quoted as describing resistance to the seaway as "the most reactionary effort conceivable."

Fraser's answer is as follows:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, boasting for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, presumes to speak for railroad labor and to tell both railroad management and the workers what is good for them and what their attitude should be on this highly visionary project. Senator WILEY asserts that the rank and file of railroad labor knows that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will inevitably involve a vast expansion of railroads. He declares that our transportation system is good for a \$70,000,000,000 economy, but is hopelessly inadequate for a \$210,000,000,000 economy of the future."

"Has he forgotten the job done by the rail carriers and their employees under all of the shortages and stresses and strains of war? It would be interesting to know how Senator WILEY expects the diversion of millions of tons of shipping from the railroads to the seaway to bring about an expansion of rail facilities. The seaway, if developed, would be navigable for 7 months out of the year and frozen over during the other 5 months, during which the traffic would necessarily be moved by the rail transportation systems. Is this expansion?"

"What about the power and equipment, and the personnel which the railroads would be obliged to maintain on a stand-by basis during the 7 months the seaway was navigable? And in addition to these disastrous elements, the development of the seaway project would impose upon the people of the United States indebtedness of multiplied millions of dollars over and above the load they now carry and must carry until the job of world reconstruction is accomplished."

"Senator WILEY finally asserts that rail way labor is serving as a dupe for a few selfish interests which have always fought the workers. I suggest that the Senator could profitably study the relationships of management and labor in the railroad industry and reexamine the source of his information on this subject. Let me say finally that our job is to face the realities and to strengthen and support our basic industries. This is no time to waste either money or effort in the furtherance of experimental dreams."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 26, 1948.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBURG,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I should like to express again the hope that Congress will soon enact legislation approving the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

This great engineering enterprise will develop one of the richest natural resources of the continent for the benefit of the whole United States. It will make deep draft ocean transportation available to the most highly industrialized area of North America. It will develop the largest potential hydroelectric power site of the Nation. It will strengthen and expand our industry, our agriculture, our domestic commerce, and our foreign trade. That is why every President during the past 25 years has given it his strong support. That is why it has been a measure strongly supported by both parties.

This momentous project will confer correspondingly great benefits on our friend and neighbor, Canada. That is why every Canadian administration during the past 25 years has also strongly supported it.

Plans for this great international undertaking are now based upon the principle of making the new deep draft navigation features self-liquidating by a levy of reasonable tolls on shipping. The Government will also be reimbursed for the new power facilities. The application of the principle of self-liquidation to the navigational features as well as to the power phases of the seaway should remove objections concerning the economic soundness of the enterprise.

The St. Lawrence project is an important measure of national defense in both its navigation and power phases. Our security rests in large measure on the development of our natural resources and our industrial potential. The transportation system and the power facilities which the St. Lawrence offers—if only we are willing to develop them—will generally strengthen our national economy and provide in particular cheap water power and water transportation facilities needed in peace as well as in a time of emergency. Our security depends also upon a vigorous and prosperous Canada, our ally in both World Wars. The St. Lawrence project will strengthen the economy and the defenses of Canada as it will our own.

I am convinced that the great majority of Americans realize that the St. Lawrence seaway must be developed if we as a Nation are to continue to receive the fullest benefits from our natural resources. I am personally convinced of the need for this project, both from the standpoint of our common economic welfare and of our national security. I therefore strongly recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing this great undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next meeting of the Senate, which I understand is to be on Wednesday, I be recognized at the outset of the session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say for the information of the Senate that I intend

to state the reasons which actuate me in opposing this project. They are not the reasons which the able Senator from Wisconsin has attributed to me.

THE FUEL OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, several weeks ago, the oil situation being very acute, and suffering and privation impending in the Eastern Atlantic States, particularly, and to some extent all over the Nation, in connection with fuel supplies and oil for this winter's use, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate appointed a subcommittee of five, of which I was appointed chairman, to consider the problem.

The steps taken were to call together a group of approximately 200 in the Banking and Currency Committee room. The group consisted of oil producers, representatives of shipping interests, tank experts, and railroad officials. There was an all-day discussion of the question. At the conclusion I appointed a committee of seven oil men in the Eastern Atlantic States to consider the problem and to report adequate remedies—not suggestions—for the trouble impending. That committee has held several meetings, and will make a report to us tomorrow. I shall place in the RECORD the substance of its report.

Meanwhile, in response to many inquiries, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the coordinators appointed by the governors of the various States at my request—27 already having been appointed. They are now at work with organizations in each State. I also wish to place in the RECORD letters to and replies received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Interior Department, the Maritime Commission, the Department of the Air Force, the State Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Association of American Railroads, in an effort to cooperate with the committee in the solution of the problem of oil shortage.

I ask unanimous consent to have these documents printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATE, GOVERNOR, AND FUEL COORDINATOR APPOINTED

Connecticut: James L. McConaughy; Charles N. Mitchell, Hartford, Conn.

Delaware: Walter W. Bacon; Leon Walker, 827 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.

District of Columbia: Board of Commissioners; Thomas J. Kennedy, East Administration Building, Washington, D. C.

Georgia: Melvin E. Thompson; Frank Arnold, Atlanta, Ga.

Illinois: Dwight H. Green; Carl Johnswold, Forest Park, Ill.

Indiana: Ralph F. Gates; A. W. Groves, attorney, State Conservation Department, State Library Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

Iowa: Robert D. Blue; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Kentucky: Earle C. Clements; Joseph Hutchinson, 1202 South Third Street, Frankfort, Ky.

Maine: Horace Hildreth; Harold W. Nicholson, 561 Preble Street, South Portland, Me.

Minnesota: Luther W. Youngdahl; J. W. Clark, Business Research and Development, St. Paul, Minn.

Maryland: William P. Lane, Jr.; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Massachusetts: Robert F. Bradford; George H. Rockwell, 989 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.

Michigan: Kim Digler; Donald Leonard, East Lansing, Mich.

Missouri: Phil M. Donnelly; Bert Cooper, director, Department of Business and Administration, Jefferson City, Mo.

Nebraska: Val. Peterson; Rufus M. Howard, Department of Agriculture, Lincoln, Nebr.

New Jersey: Alfred E. Driscoll; Joseph L. McLaughlin, 107 West State Street, Trenton, N. J.

New York: Thomas E. Dewey; Charles Sell, Albany, N. Y.

North Carolina: R. Gregg Cherry; W. Z. Betts, department of purchase and control, Raleigh, N. C.

North Dakota: Fred G. Aandahl; no fuel coordinator appointed.

New Hampshire: Charles M. Dale; John E. Holden, Newington, N. H.

Ohio: Thomas J. Herbert; Eric V. Weber, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Oklahoma: Roy J. Turner; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Pennsylvania: James H. Duff; Brenton G. Wallace, 764 Mount Pleasant Road, Byrn Mawr, Pa.

Rhode Island: John O. Pastore; Fletcher Burton, Providence, R. I.

South Carolina: J. Strom Thurmond; E. H. Talbert, Columbia, S. C.

South Dakota: George T. Mickelson; C. F. Overton, natural resources commission, Pierre, S. Dak.

Tennessee: Jim N. McCord; Hilton Butler, Adjutant General, Nashville, Tenn.

Vermont: Ernest W. Gibson; M. A. Campbell, adjutant general of Vermont.

Virginia: William M. Tuck; C. F. Joyner, Jr., Twelfth and Main Streets, Richmond, Va.

West Virginia: Clarence W. Meadows; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Wisconsin: Oscar Rennebohm; Anthony E. Modler, department of agriculture, Madison, Wis.

Maryland: William P. Lane, Jr.; Judge Emory H. Niles, Court House, Baltimore, Md.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
OFFICE OF RUBBER RESERVE,
January 8, 1948.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Reference is made to your telephone call requesting information with respect to pressure tank cars owned by RFC Office of Rubber Reserve, and the present use position of these cars in the rubber program.

The Office of Rubber Reserve owns 450 type 104-A pressure cars which were constructed for its use during the war period for the transport of materials which are utilized in the production of synthetic rubber. The actual requirements for tank cars in the program are not fixed, but increase and decrease as the conditions surrounding individual plant operations necessitate in relation to the quantity of synthetic rubber produced. Present requirements are approximately 350 cars, which is the reason some of the cars that we have released for other uses are being recalled for our service.

Inventories of GR-S in the hands of Government and the rubber fabricating industry are too low to meet manufacturing requirements. There are some 800 rubber-fabricating companies in the United States which are presently using synthetic rubber, employing from as many as 60,000 people to as few as 10. These companies are now receiving from 10 to 30 percent less GR-S than they request for their operations, and many of them have

indicated to this office that further cuts would necessitate closing their plants.

The pressure cars which are owned by Rubber Reserve are managed under a contract with the Union Tank Car Co., and when cars are not needed in the Rubber Reserve operations, the Office of Defense Transportation is notified, which in turn advises the Union Tank Car Co. to whom the cars are to be leased. In the event Rubber Reserve finds it necessary to recall any cars from lessees, the Office of Defense Transportation is again notified and informed of the number of cars required, and in turn advises the Union Tank Car Co. from whom the cars are to be recalled. It will be noted, therefore, that the Office of Defense Transportation has complete control over the allocation of pressure tank cars for essential uses.

I hope the foregoing will give you adequate information with respect to the subject of your inquiry, but if it does not, I shall be most pleased to furnish such further information as you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

G. B. HADLOCK,
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OIL AND GAS DIVISION,
January 17, 1948.

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your suggestion of a meeting of State fuel oil coordinators proved its value beyond question at the meeting held day before yesterday.

The meeting was attended by representatives of 23 States and the District of Columbia, by representatives of the National Petroleum Council's Committee on voluntary programs under the Anti-Inflation Act, and by representatives of other Government agencies. The registered attendance was as follows:

State representatives and their advisers. 65

Congressional:

Senators	1
Representatives	2
Representatives of Senators and	
Representatives	7
Total.	10
Representatives of 24 executive agencies.	54
Representatives of National Petroleum Council and its committee.	16
Association of American Railroads.	1
Council of State Governments.	1
Representatives of the press.	20
Total registered attendance.	167

A list of those who attended and were registered in is attached. A few who attended may have been missed in the registration.

I suspect that one or two State coordinators, who apparently came expecting that the meeting might in some fashion point the way to additional supplies for their States, were disappointed to learn that the problem is basically one of supply and that no one could out-of-hand allocate them additional supplies. The great majority, however, had correctly anticipated the purpose and scope of the meeting, as set out in the carefully worded invitation, and were anything but disappointed.

All of the State representatives, to judge from their expressions from the floor and from private conversations, felt that they had benefited from the comprehensive review of the petroleum situation that was given them and from the discussions by the various State coordinators, particularly those who have been functioning longest, of the problems encountered in their respective States

and the methods devised to meet them. The benefit was greatest, no doubt, to those most recently appointed, but coordinators who have been in office for weeks or months were equally emphatic in their commendation of the meeting.

A number of the industry representatives present have said that they derived much benefit from the discussion of the problems and methods of the State coordinators, and I know that my associates and I did.

As you doubtless know, Secretary Krug lent force to the oil-conservation aspect of the meeting by issuing, coincident with it, an appeal to the public to conserve fuel oil, gas, and gasoline. I enclose a copy. As you suggested, copies of his letter of January 10 to you were given to the State representatives and their advisers.

I feel that the meeting was successful and will have fruitful and long-lasting consequences, and I am deeply grateful to you for suggesting that it be held.

Sincerely,

MAX W. BALL.
Director.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, January 12, 1948.
The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Reference is had to your letter of December 20, 1947, transmitting copy of the report made by an industry committee which you appointed after a hearing of your subcommittee on December 9 concerning fuel shortages in various areas, particularly the North Atlantic States. You refer specifically to those sections of the industry-committee report dealing with the shortage of tanker transportation facilities and request our comments thereon.

This Commission has spent a large part of its time of late on matters pertaining to the oil- and tanker-shortage problems and has endeavored in every way possible to expedite the getting into operation of laid-up tankers and to assure the most efficient use of the vessels which it still directly operates, in meeting domestic needs, particularly those of the Atlantic Seaboard States.

Between November 1 and January 1, 74 T-2 and Liberty-type tankers were moved from Reserve fleet sites for repair and reconditioning for operation, which number includes the 50 T-2 vessels to be operated directly by the Navy. In the week from January 1 to 8, 10 more vessels of these types were withdrawn from lay-up. As of January 9 there remained 45 such tankers still tied up, but these are being moved out day by day, and every effort is being made to expedite the process. As you are aware, all of these vessels have been allocated for sale, and purchasers who have shown indications of being dilatory in completing the sales arrangements, with a consequent delay in breaking the vessels out of lay-up for repair, have been warned that they must promptly comply with our requirements in this respect.

Highest priority has been given to concluding purchase arrangements and physical delivery of all tankers in the laid-up fleet. In this connection the Commission has appointed the Chief of its Bureau of Operations as Coordinator for the purpose of speeding up administrative work incident to such deliveries from lay-up. Second highest priority has been given in the case of citizen buyers of operating tankers who give assurances that the vessels will be used exclusively in domestic service during the balance of the winter and the early spring months.

Every practicable measure is being taken to shorten the sales and delivery processes, to the end that no vessel will be unnecessarily delayed in entering upon or continuing operation.

The Commission and its staff has been in daily contact with purchasers of tankers, with oil companies seeking the use of the tankers which we still operate, and with Members of the Congress and State and city officials seeking to meet the tanker transportation needs of various areas along the eastern seaboard. On January 7 we held a meeting with 15 of the larger oil companies serving United States Gulf- and east-coast States, for the purpose of determining the extent to which those companies have been and are using the American registered tankers which they themselves own in meeting our domestic needs. We are pleased to advise that the information adduced at that hearing indicates that virtually all of the 236 tankers owned by these particular companies are now being used in the United States coastwise and import trades. The Commission has requested these companies immediately to endeavor to divert to our import trade additional tankers under foreign registry which they own or control directly or through subsidiary or affiliated companies.

Vessels recently withdrawn from the Reserve fleets for repairs and refitting are now beginning to enter operation, and we estimate that by the end of this month between 40 or 50 such vessels will be in active operating status. This, coupled with the many additional vessels which will enter operation in the early days of February, should greatly relieve the present difficult situation by the end of that month.

You may be assured that the Commission is keenly aware of this acute situation and will continue to exert its best efforts to assist.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. SMITH,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 14, 1948.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Mr. Symington has referred to me, for study and action, your letter of December 20, 1947, bearing on the impending fuel-oil shortage. The report of the problem transmitted by your letter is excellent and the recommendations contained therein appear to be a sound approach to the ultimate resolution of current fuel-oil difficulties.

The only petroleum products being purchased by the Air Force consist of aviation gasoline, aviation lubricants, and jet fuel. Heating fuels for our installations are purchased by the Quartermaster Corps and the Treasury Department.

Our purchases of petroleum products are handled throughout the United States on a current requirement basis so that there is no program for maintaining reserve stocks of these products. In recent months requirements have not been fully met at certain installations for short periods of time, but aviation fuels available for the remainder of the fiscal year are estimated to be sufficient for our minimum requirements.

Further, in conjunction with the Federal Works Agency, a survey is being made of Air Force installations east of the Rocky Mountains for the purpose of determining the practicability of conversion from oil to coal heating.

Please be assured that the United States Air Force will cooperate fully in holding requirements to the minimum during this critical period.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. BARROWS,
Under Secretary of the Air Forces.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 9, 1948.
My DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have your letter of December 20, 1947, with regard to

the threatened shortage of fuel oil in the New England and Atlantic seaboard areas this winter, and to the recommendations made by the industry committee appointed by you to study this problem. I also have the report of the industry committee and its letter of December 17, 1947 transmitting this report to you, both of which were included as enclosures to your letter.

In your letter you asked that the Secretary inform you of his reaction to the report and its recommendations. As the report is primarily concerned with aspects of the problem regarding which other agencies of the Government can better advise your committee, it is hoped that it will be satisfactory if my comments are confined to the recommendations relating to the responsibilities of the Department of State. I believe two such recommendations are touched upon in the industry committee report and in your letter. One of these is the recommendation that negotiations be inaugurated at once with foreign governments who are parties to the international load line agreement for the purpose of securing their agreement to the increasing of the load limit on tankers during the present shortage period. The other recommendation relating to the responsibilities of the Department of State is that exports of petroleum products be restricted during the next 2 or 3 months to the minimum quantities necessary to maintain the economies of certain foreign nations.

In order to assist in relief of the fuel-oil shortage this winter, the practicability of securing a temporary suspension of the International Load Line Convention, 1930, has been given consideration by the Department of State. This question also has been taken up with the British Government. The preliminary discussions with the British indicate certain complexities which would be involved in securing a suspension of the convention. The British wartime defense regulations to permit deeper loading of tankers have been revoked, and the Department has been advised informally that these regulations cannot be reissued without new legislation. It is doubtful that parliamentary approval could be secured within a sufficiently short period for such action to be helpful in the current emergency. The possible saving of United Kingdom tankers, it is estimated, would be equivalent to not more than six such vessels in continuous employment. If deeper loading were permitted in the older tankers, there appears to be doubt that there would be any saving because of increased repair time due to greater strain and damage to the vessels caused by high seas.

Even if the necessary British legislation were secured, deeper loading would necessitate obtaining prior acquiescence of all convention countries before the contemplated relaxation could be made effective. There are, as you may know, 45 countries which have either ratified or adhered to this treaty. In addition, classification societies and sea labor also should be consulted. With so many countries and interests involved, it is doubted that their concurrence to a suspension of the convention could be secured in the time available if the desired result is to be achieved. It is believed that the necessary agreements could not be obtained in less than 2 months.

The industry committee recognized in its report that some exports of oil products are necessary to maintain the economies of foreign nations. The committee, therefore, recommended that only minimum export requirements from the United States be met during the present shortage in this country. You may be sure that the Department of State will cooperate in the carrying out of this recommendation to the fullest extent consistent with our national interest in supplying petroleum products essential to the economies of foreign nations. This cooperation will of course be indirect since the responsibility for the administration of export

controls under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 is that of the Department of Commerce.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 20, 1948.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The special industry committee appointed by you in early December to study the critical petroleum situation subsequently rendered a report which contained many well considered recommendations for action to be taken by both Government and private interests to conserve fuel-oil supplies, and increase the transportation means engaged in the movement of these supplies.

Because of your keen interest and effective leadership in these matters you will, I know, appreciate a report of what measures the Navy Department has taken to comply with the suggestions made to you by the special industry committee. Accordingly I am listing below certain steps which the Navy Department had already taken in addition to those flowing from the recommendations of that committee:

(a) On November 6, 1947, issued a directive to all shore establishments regarding the necessity for utmost fuel conservation and included detailed instructions for achieving that result.

(b) On December 6, 1947, reemphasized the directive mentioned in (a) above and further directed that the installation of new or conversion fuel-oil-burning equipment be suspended immediately except in those cases where extreme hardship could be proved and approval for work continuance on that basis be obtained.

(c) On January 12, 1948, submitted Navy requirements for petroleum products for the second half of the current fiscal year to the Department of the Interior for notification to industry. These requirements have been searchingly scrutinized and now represent only the actual consumption needs of the Navy during the 6 months' period in question.

(d) On January 12, 1948, an agreement was reached with the Governor of Rhode Island and representatives of the Governors of the other five New England States whereby the Navy will release, subject to replacement in kind by June 30, 1948, a total of 940,000 barrels of petroleum products from Navy-owned storage in the New England area for emergency relief of distressed consumers in that area. This amount of fuel represents a distinct sacrifice of the Navy's inventory position and was made only after thorough consideration of the suffering and hardship which will prevail in the New England States should this fuel not be made available.

I regret to advise that it is wholly impracticable for the Navy to comply with that recommendation of the special industry committee regarding temporary employment in the Gulf Coast Atlantic service of some of the 50 tankers being reconditioned for use of the military services. As you are probably already aware, the program of reconditioning these vessels was initiated by the Navy department for the very purpose of aiding the critical petroleum transportation problem by releasing operating tankers regularly chartered by the military services from the Maritime Commission. It is difficult to understand, therefore, by what logic the special industry committee arrived at the conclusion that the Navy could release vessels formerly chartered from the Maritime Commission and at the same time, at least temporarily, the tankers obtained as replacements therefor. In this connection you will be pleased to note that in anticipation of the

availability of some of the 50 tankers being reconditioned the Navy has requested the allocation of only eight chartered tankers from the Maritime Commission for January liftings. This is in marked contrast with the 37 vessels assigned to the Navy by the Maritime Commission in December of which nine did not actually arrive at loading ports until early January thus making a total of 17 chartered tankers from the Maritime Commission in use during the current month.

The Navy Department is keenly aware of the serious situation confronting many sections of the country and stands ready to render any further assistance to alleviate hardship and suffering which is compatible with the Navy's basic responsibility in matters of national security.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN,
Acting.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 15, 1948.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The very excellent report, submitted by the committee organized by you of representative oil producers and distributors, which was forwarded to me in your letter of December 22, 1947, has received intensive study in the Navy Department. The recommendations submitted for alleviation of the current fuel shortage are most sound and extremely constructive.

Action to implement the recommendations made by your committee, as applying to the Navy, has been initiated and some effective results have already been accomplished.

Since early last summer, the Navy has been operating under directives to exercise the utmost economy with respect to the consumption of petroleum products consistent with the performance of assigned missions and training operations necessary to maintain the fighting efficiency of the fleet and naval aviation. Current requirements are being reduced to a minimum and during this period of critical short supply the Navy where it can is making oil available on a replacement basis. In addition, those Navy installations which can burn coal in lieu of oil are being shifted to coal.

Assistance to veterans' hospitals and other Federal institutions has been provided in the eastern seaboard States by the supply of fuel from Navy stocks. This form of relief has resulted in a correspondingly additional amount of fuel becoming available to civilian consumers from their regular commercial suppliers in those localities.

The 50 tankers recently acquired by the United States Maritime Commission are being placed in operation with the utmost dispatch. In anticipation of their readiness, the Navy released, during December, a considerable number of tankers that were under charter from the United States Maritime Commission which have been diverted to the transportation of commercial cargoes. Inasmuch as this tanker program has been temporarily delayed, the Navy is about 20 cargoes behind schedule for December. However, this delay is being accepted and reinstatement of chartered tankers has not been requested. During January an appreciable number of the 50 tankers will be in operation, and their addition to the world tanker fleet will contribute greatly to the solution of the transportation difficulties.

Please be assured that the Navy will keep the fuel situation under continuous study and will continue to institute any possible action consistent with protection of the national security toward rendering assistance in relieving the critical shortage of fuel which is now facing the country. The Navy is most desirous to cooperate with your committee in this common cause and to contribute in the accomplishment of the task.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1947.
The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oil and Coal
Shortage, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 20, to which was attached a copy of a report of the special committee appointed by you to inquire into the fuel situation and make suggestions to overcome it.

I think your committee has done a good job in making recommendations and feel sure that if they are carried out with the full cooperation of all participating agencies that they will go a long way toward ameliorating the fuel shortage.

I feel, however, that there should be some over-all committee and perhaps a small committee of the oil industry, car owners, and railroads that will attempt to equalize the supply between the several geographical areas where the shortage may develop, and to this end the Office of Defense Transportation pledges its full support to your committee and stands ready to meet with such a group whenever you may suggest.

Cordially,

J. M. JOHNSON,
Director.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C. December 23, 1947.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oil and Coal
Shortage, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have and thank you for your letter of December 20. Your courtesy in sending me a copy of the report presented to you by the committee which you appointed to consider and submit recommendations dealing with the threatened shortage of fuel oil throughout the country is appreciated.

This report has been carefully examined and I agree with you that a voluntary effort on the part of all concerned is the desirable way of dealing with this matter. You may be assured of the wholehearted cooperation of the railroads and this association with any and all groups which may be created for the purpose of taking such action as seems desirable. We are in position to be helpful in the movement of tank cars and shall promptly respond to any request which may require action so far as the movement of these cars is concerned. We have been in touch with the tank car companies, as suggested in your letter, since early in the summer and are cooperating with them in every way possible. You will probably recall the statement to this effect made by our representative at the conference held on December 9.

It occurs to me that it would be desirable if you would arrange to have someone named representing the oil industry from whom we may obtain information as to the transportation of crude oil and distillates. I believe it would also be helpful if you would arrange for the creation of a committee representing the tank-car owners, with representatives of the oil industry, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Army, Navy, and this association serving thereon. Through such a committee we should be able to meet and deal with any requirements which may arise so far as transportation is concerned. If this suggestion meets with your approval, I shall be glad, upon receipt of advice, to designate a representative of the association to serve as a member.

You indicate that both the Senate committee and the committee of oil representatives will continue in existence and keep in touch with one another. It would also be helpful and appreciated if you would advise me through what source I may contact the committee of oil representatives for the purposes of discussing the desirability of

meeting with the representatives of the oil industry, tank-car owners, ODT, Army, and Navy. I have in mind that possibly such a meeting would be helpful in setting up an arrangement which would be fully responsive to what you have in mind.

Sincerely,

W. T. FARICY,
President.

REPEAL OF INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS IN
CERTAIN PARTS OF MINNESOTA—
MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote taken today on House bill 1049, Calendar 866, a bill to repeal certain acts of Congress known as Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, January 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26, 1948:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

M. S. Szymczak, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1948. (Reappointment.)

Thomas Bayard McCabe, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1942.

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Nathan R. Margold, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF STAFF

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley to be Chief of Staff, United States Army, effective on date of appointment, vice General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE
UNITED STATES

To be major

*Lt. Col. Leo Murphy, XXXX, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army), with rank from September 7, 1947.

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Ralph Gunther Tross, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 3, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Holt Dolson, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 4, 1948.

First Lt. Leland Boyd Fair, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 4, 1948.

Capt. Joseph Daniel Hughes, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Thomas McAtee, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 5, 1948.

Capt. Clarence Ames Martin, Jr., XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Lester Wycoff, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Durell Benner Hartman, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Luther Leon Halbrook, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Lawrence Edward Spellman, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 9, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Edwin Cross, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 9, 1948.

Capt. Joseph Aaron Goldes, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 13, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Arnott Cady, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 15, 1948.

Capt. Norman Maynard Stephens, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 17, 1948.

First Lt. John Hamilton Burke, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 17, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Preston Davis, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 18, 1948.

First Lt. Gilbert Harry Amis, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 20, 1948.

First Lt. William Paul Hartman, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 26, 1948.

First Lt. William Thornton Coburn, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 26, 1948.

First Lt. William Carlton Wilkinson, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Henry Kelly, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 29, 1948.

Second Lt. Harold Elwin Maier, XXXX, U. S. Army, with rank from January 29, 1948.

First Lt. Alvin Carl Jensen, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. John Christian Wallman, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. Milton Max Nemky, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. Willard Almur Dodge, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Burnham Brewer, XXXX, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 31, 1948.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

*Col. Paul Herbert Martin, XXXX, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1947.

*Col. Otto Leonard Churney, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 29, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Richard Barr Jones, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 18, 1947.

*Col. Francis Patrick Kintz, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 4, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Augustus Alonzo Hall, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 20, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Frank Eric Hagman, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 22, 1947.

To be majors

*Lt. Col. Richard Irving Crone, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1947.

*Maj. George Augustine Goder, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 24, 1947.

*Lt. Col. John Randolph Hall, Jr., **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 11, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Lucio Ernest Gatto, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 12, 1947.

*Lt. Col. David Harry Naimark, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 14, 1947.

*Maj. Aniello Francis Mastellone, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 20, 1947.

*Maj. William Leroy Vogt, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 24, 1947.

*Col. Raymond Taylor Jenkins, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Col. Carl Bennett Stilson, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Robert Nathan Lehman, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Louis Franklin Saylor, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Maj. Raymond Bender Croissant, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Maj. Jon Olafur Stefan Sigurdsson, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Lt. Col. John Warren Guerin, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1947.

*Col. George N. Schuhmann, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 30, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr., **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 4, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Wilbur Dwight Dice, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 10, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Ralph Everett Reiner, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Joseph Robert Vivas, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 22, 1947.

*Maj. William Nelson Donovan, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 29, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Norman Clemm Veale, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 30, 1947.

To be captains

*Capt. Clarence Blake Hewitt, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 2, 1947.

*Capt. Byron Landt Miller, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 2, 1947.

*Maj. Carl Barry Weller, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 4, 1947.

*Maj. James Barnes Hartgering, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 7, 1947.

*Capt. Zbigniew John Baczewski, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 15, 1947.

*Capt. Wayne Robert Oelhafen, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 20, 1947.

*Capt. Charles Walter Metz, Jr., **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 8, 1947.

*Capt. Richard Earl Mardis, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1947.

*Capt. Robert Blair Franklin, **XXXX** Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 18, 1947.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

*Lt. Col. George Emil Naselli, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 13, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Wallace Jacob Morlock, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 15, 1947.

To be majors

*Maj. William Ralph Thomas Oakes, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 24, 1946.

*Maj. Benjamin Lee Brooks, Jr., **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1947.

*Maj. Arthur Hastings Vollertsen, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1947.

*Maj. Donald William Grove, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 5, 1947.

*Maj. Charles Stewart Jones, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 7, 1947.

*Maj. William Joseph McAllister, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 8, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Theodore Emmett Fischer, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 17, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Gerald Arthur McCracken, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Maj. Douglas Monroe Beebe, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Kenneth David Eye, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Maj. Virgil Gordon Walker, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Jack Menefee Messner, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Hal David Oakley, Jr., **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 12, 1947.

To be captain

*Capt. John Everett Gaynor, **XXXX** Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

*Lt. Col. Arvo Theodore Thompson, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (major, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 8, 1947.

To be majors

*Lt. Col. Don L. Deane, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 30, 1947.

*Maj. Don Lee Mace, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Maj. Howard Curtis Maxey, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 16, 1947.

*Maj. Karl Harry Willers, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1947.

*Maj. Manuel Charles Kastner, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Harry Ruyle Lancaster, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 26, 1947.

To be captains

*Capt. William Gordon Brooks, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 31, 1947.

*Capt. Samuel Garwood Forester, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 13, 1947.

*Capt. Elmer Richard Pede, **XXXX** Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 14, 1947.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Robert Newell Gilliam, **XXXX** Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Isaiah Anderson, [XXXX], Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from January 31, 1948.

ARMY NURSE CORPS
To be lieutenant colonels

Lt. Col. Kathleen Mitchell, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Margaret Elizabeth Aaron, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeanette Blech, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Florence I. Lee, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nora G. Freeman, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Velma Fay Grove, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 21, 1947.

First Lt. Anna Veronica Michelitsch, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 1, 1948.

First Lt. Geraldine Massingill, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 9, 1948.

First Lt. Keitha Pauline Zeisloft, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 15, 1948.

First Lt. Mary Ann Strauss, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 20, 1948.

First Lt. Nancy Carol Leftenant, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 22, 1948.

First Lt. Barbara L. Hughson, [XXXX], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 31, 1948.

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieutenant Margaret A. Kraybill, J18, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from December 20, 1947.

First Lt. Melina Adams Farmer, [XXXXXX], Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 1, 1948.

First Lt. Katherine Cecelia Ehrhart, [XXXXXX], Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 10, 1948.

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate prior to December 31, 1947, pursuant to the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 which prescribed that until December 31, 1947, Regular Army promotion list officers should continue to be promoted to and appointed in the permanent grades of lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant in accordance with previously existing provisions of law. The officers of the Army Nurse Corps being nominated for promotion to lieutenant colonel will be given dates of rank as of the date of their promotion.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Daniel Joseph Boyle, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 1, 1948.

First Lt. Patrick Henry Kenny, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 2, 1948.

First Lt. Bruce Wendell Pope, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 3, 1948.

First Lt. James Allen Burton, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 4, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Brice Moore, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 4, 1948.

First Lt. DeForrest August von Laufer, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 5, 1948.

First Lt. Mark Carlyle Noble, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 5, 1948.

First Lt. Armand Edouard Reiser, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Raymond Adolph Groh, [XXXX], United States Air Force, with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Julian Daniel Shofner, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur John Ulrich, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Russell Perrine Morris, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

Second Lt. James Theodore Seymour, [XXXX], United States Air Force, with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Roy Enright Guy, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 8, 1948.

First Lt. Lester T. Kearney, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 9, 1948.

Capt. Jack Byron Owens, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 9, 1948.

First Lt. Julian Franklin Berry, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 11, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Keith MacGregor, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 12, 1948.

First Lt. Russell Millward Heller, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 13, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Frank Holst, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 13, 1948.

First Lt. Hubert Neil Skidmore, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 13, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Francis Watson, [XXXX], United States Air Force, with rank from January 14, 1948.

First Lt. Jacob Milton Freeman, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Henry Leo Rauch, [XXXX], United States Air Force, with rank from January 16, 1948.

First Lt. John William Menard, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 17, 1948.

First Lt. Newell Dwight Mitchell, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 18, 1948.

Capt. Dempsey Ernest Ballard, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 19, 1948.

First Lt. Claude Merrill Trawick, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Eris Wilkie, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

Capt. John Raymond Kern, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

Capt. Harry Holt Moreland, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

Capt. Charles Francis Hoy, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 21, 1948.

First Lt. Conrad John Lindemann, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 21, 1948.

First Lt. John Scales Hardwick, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 23, 1948.

First Lt. James Marshall Anderson, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 26, 1948.

Capt. Doyle Dean Dickson, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

Second Lt. Richard David Klingenberg, [XXXX], United States Air Force, with rank from January 27, 1948.

Second Lt. Walter Thomas Gentile, [XXXX], United States Air Force, with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Richard Croft, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. Warren L. Simpson, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. William Francis Ramsey, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. John A. Saffell, Jr., [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 28, 1948.

Capt. Bruce Ward Carr, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 28, 1948.

First Lt. Warren Glenn Van Houten, [XXXX], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 31, 1948.

First Lt. Leroy Peter Zoller, **XXXX**, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 31, 1948.

First Lt. Hollie Alonzo Wilkes, **XXXX**, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 31, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Joe N. White, Beaverton, Ala., in place of R. B. Dennis, retired.

Robert L. Roberts, Boylston, Ala., in place of M. H. Wilson, resigned.

James Ernest Lambert, Darlington, Ala., in place of A. H. Lambert, retired.

William E. Smith, Glen Allen, Ala., in place of W. O. Smith, retired.

John J. Howell, Gordo, Ala., in place of R. G. Davis, transferred.

Leland M. Cox, Mentone, Ala., in place of S. E. Selman, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Willard C. Wall, Coal Hill, Ark., in place of H. M. Shrigley, retired.

Ernest J. Stroub, Lavaca, Ark., in place of Dayton Brewer, resigned.

Leo J. Schreick, Osceola, Ark., in place of G. M. Doyle, deceased.

Albert A. Hill, Scranton, Ark., in place of S. M. Heim, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Cecilia A. George, Castroville, Calif., in place of F. E. Faustino, removed.

June R. Dolcini, Davis, Calif., in place of V. F. Dolcini, deceased.

Paul R. Todd, Garberville, Calif., in place of D. E. Knapp, deceased.

LaVerna N. Strawbridge, Westminster, Calif., in place of M. M. Sitzer, resigned.

COLORADO

R. Terrell Ellington, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of C. D. Moslander, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Herman F. LeDoyt, South Coventry, Conn., in place of G. H. Robertson, deceased.

DELAWARE

Warren Francis Comstock, Farnhurst, Del., in place of R. R. Veasey, deceased.

Bertha M. Carrow, Saint Georges, Del., in place of G. E. Bright, resigned.

FLORIDA

Chandos W. McMullen, Bay Pines, Fla., in place of A. W. Martin, declined.

John F. Pelot, Belleview, Fla., in place of C. G. Hanson, resigned.

James L. Mayton, Carrabelle, Fla., in place of R. G. Bradford, deceased.

Theodore L. Latimer, Deleon Springs, Fla., in place of Flode Jones, retired.

Ruth F. Muir, Everglades, Fla., in place of A. W. Lewis, retired.

George P. Adams, Greenacres City, Fla., in place of E. M. Adams, deceased.

Willie H. Andreasen, Greenwood, Fla., in place of H. A. Stevens, retired.

Loice J. Jones, Killarney, Fla., in place of J. W. Jones, retired.

Billie S. Campbell, Lake Harbor, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bernice M. Stefurak, Rockledge, Fla., in place of A. C. Fiske, resigned.

John O. Rogers, Sebastian, Fla., in place of M. H. Futch, resigned.

Stanton M. Gideons, Webster, Fla., in place of P. A. Tompkins, resigned.

GEORGIA

Henry C. Geer, Bogart, Ga., in place of O. H. Bradbury, retired.

Eleanor K. Pitts, Chattahoochee, Ga., in place of H. E. Malair, retired.

Bernarr B. Adams, Dewyrose, Ga., in place of L. G. Brown, deceased.

James H. Sellers, Jr., Graham, Ga., in place of S. E. O'Quinn, resigned.

Walter E. Ard, Iron City, Ga., in place of T. A. Drake, retired.

Robert C. Harris, Leesburg, Ga., in place of Kate Harris, retired.

Daniel L. Murphy, Sr., Moreland, Ga., in place of S. K. Polk, deceased.

Tommie Louise Pressey, Rocky Ford, Ga., in place of W. E. Pitts, retired.

Julius M. Engram, Scottsdale, Ga., in place of J. S. Farrar, resigned.

Horace C. Kelly, Jr., Toombsboro, Ga., in place of W. H. Freeman, retired.

HAWAII

Robert K. Matsueda, Kahului, Hawaii, in place of L. W. Holt, resigned.

IDAHO

Charles E. Ruger, Bancroft, Idaho, in place of Z. G. Steele, resigned.

Marvin F. Crockett, Bliss, Idaho, in place of G. D. McIntosh, resigned.

Thomas W. Rogers, Glenns Ferry, Idaho, in place of H. H. Tate, removed.

Harold E. J. Wayne, St. Maries, Idaho, in place of M. H. Moshinsky, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Mabel H. Green, Alvin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ted Bauer, Benton, Ill., in place of J. W. Williams, resigned.

Winfred Hughes, Broughton, Ill., in place of R. M. McElvain, resigned.

Margaret Carlson, Bureau, Ill., in place of J. F. Fredrickson, transferred.

Albert J. Buehler, Chestnut, Ill., in place of L. C. Rentschler, resigned.

Leland Adams, Dieterich, Ill., in place of R. L. Graham, resigned.

Joseph J. Holloway, Elmhurst, Ill., in place of J. F. Grogan, deceased.

Ruth Sartain, Fithian, Ill., in place of O. E. Bantz, retired.

Mary E. McCarl, Kinderhook, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Richard R. Atkins, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom, retired.

Helen F. Gleich, Menard, Ill., in place of F. V. McNabney, deceased.

Adam A. Munsterman, Nameoki, Ill., in place of J. A. Miller, resigned.

Charles J. Murphy, Oak Park, Ill., in place of J. L. Lynch, resigned.

Joseph J. Smaron, Posen, Ill., in place of G. B. Livesay, resigned.

Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin, Ill., in place of R. C. Morris, removed.

Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville, Ill., in place of A. M. Akin, resigned.

Orville L. Glasford, Trivoli, Ill., in place of R. A. Swan, resigned.

INDIANA

Harlan C. Dodd, Charlestown, Ind., in place of J. C. McKillip, resigned.

Walter H. Fried, Corydon, Ind., in place of G. C. Rainbolt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

May Reiff, Deputy, Ind., in place of F. A. Anderson, deceased.

Margaret A. Horseman, Dublin, Ind., in place of G. A. Adrion, retired.

John Edgar Sachs, Evansville, Ind., in place of H. M. Mayer, deceased.

Henry O. Kipfer, Grabill, Ind., in place of G. R. Woods, resigned.

Arthur C. Welch, Lapaz, Ind., in place of I. B. Carbiener, resigned.

Geneva K. Gant, Laurel, Ind., in place of B. F. Russell, transferred.

Pearl L. Smith, New Market, Ind., in place of Ethel Martin, resigned.

Roy L. Strange, Plainville, Ind., in place of E. J. McWilliams, resigned.

Richard B. Miller, Rushville, Ind., in place of W. L. Newbold, removed.

Sylvia Swanson, Twelve Mile, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Vernon M. Zylstra, Bussey, Iowa, in place of Z. P. Way, resigned.

Francis L. Porter, Clarion, Iowa, in place of Richard Tomke, deceased.

Marion W. Palmer, Clearfield, Iowa, in place of J. S. Walton, removed.

William G. Strunce, Creston, Iowa, in place of T. M. Conway, deceased.

Baird Jennings Okey, Dayton, Iowa, in place of K. C. Warner, retired.

Frank E. Orwan, Lorimor, Iowa, in place of N. T. Nixon, deceased.

Harold A. Losgreen, Montezuma, Iowa, in place of R. A. Mortland, retired.

Wilda Stephenson, Packwood, Iowa, in place of L. L. Lockhart, retired.

James E. Brunt, Russell, Iowa, in place of G. J. Mettlin, transferred.

Fred J. Ehrhardt, Sac City, Iowa, in place of C. L. Anderson, resigned.

Pearl L. Smith, Woden, Iowa, in place of V. L. Eaton, resigned.

KANSAS

Victor A. Zeckser, Alma, Kans., in place of Louie Haller, removed.

Earle F. Hill, Altamont, Kans., in place of C. H. Kessler, transferred.

Wayne M. Stoffer, Haven, Kans., in place of L. C. Forker, resigned.

Howard D. Meisel, Haviland, Kans., in place of H. R. Ellis, declined.

Alvin A. Pfeiffer, Linn, Kans., in place of D. L. McGregor, transferred.

Ralph M. Plotner, McCracken, Kans., in place of E. W. Shoney, transferred.

Elmer G. Jackson, Manhattan, Kans., in place of W. E. Moore, retired.

Ola J. Canny, Mound Valley, Kans., in place of C. L. Hinds, transferred.

Wayne B. Blackburn, Rozel, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

David Mallory Howell, Winfield, Kans., in place of R. T. Henderson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Edna T. Holman, Cerulean, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James Paul Dodson, Scottsville, Ky., in place of Roy Dye, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Alton I. Carter, Jonesville, La., in place of E. R. Ford, retired.

Marion T. Files, Oak Ridge, La., in place of T. E. Barham, retired.

Harvey J. Rabalais, Simmesport, La., in place of L. L. Ehrhardt, resigned.

MAINE

Corice B. Feindel, Denmark, Maine, in place of M. L. Jack, retired.

Hurschel A. Ryerson, North Bridgton, Maine, in place of B. M. Kendall, resigned.

Delmar C. Ellinwood, North Windham, Maine, in place of L. H. Hern, resigned.

Ella Mae Quimby, Oquossoc, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Frank C. Creteau, Sanford, Maine, in place of L. J. Emery, deceased.

Cyril Paul Pelletier, St. Francis, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Robert M. Hegeman, Standish, Maine, in place of A. H. Butterfield, retired.

MARYLAND

C. Gorman Griffith, Gaithersburg, Md., in place of M. L. Ridgely, transferred.

Donald B. Canada, Glen Echo, Md., in place of S. E. Canada, retired.

Calvin Burns, Grasonville, Md., in place of T. H. Collier, declined.

Cora L. Sappington, Keymar, Md., in place of G. U. Koons, retired.

Milton W. Corkran, Mount Wilson, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William E. Spoerlein, Oakland, Md., in place of I. R. Rudy, resigned.

E. Raymond Bounds, Ocean City, Md., in place of L. D. Lynch, resigned.

Edward P. Harris, Snow Hill, Md., in place of E. W. Marshall, deceased.

Maybelle R. Baker, Union Bridge, Md., in place of J. W. Baker, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Maurice R. Savage, Buzzards Bay, Mass., in place of F. C. Small, retired.

Elizabeth S. Russell, Carlisle, Mass., in place of F. E. Daisy, deceased.

Bernard N. Powers, Hadley, Mass., in place of E. C. Pelissier, retired.

William J. Powers, Leicester, Mass., in place of J. A. Bell, retired.

Georgia R. Harvey, Lynnfield, Mass., in place of A. T. Doyle, resigned.

Hazel P. Tenney, West Townsend, Mass., in place of G. H. Tenney, retired.

Eleanor P. Hatton, Woronoco, Mass., in place of W. P. Hatton, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Perry F. Frownfelder, Adrian, Mich., in place of H. I. Bourns, resigned.

J. Willard Krause, Manistee, Mich., in place of E. J. Talbot, deceased.

August M. Huotari, Mass., Mich., in place of C. J. Maloney, resigned.

Lionel R. Haight, Mount Pleasant, Mich., in place of A. S. Warner, resigned.

Emanuel W. Rupprecht, Reese, Mich., in place of M. M. Rupprecht, resigned.

Clarence F. Bushman, Rochester, Mich., in place of J. M. Stackhouse, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Henning O. Mickelson, Carson Lake, Minn., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Walter L. Franti, Coleraine, Minn., in place of J. K. Sloan, deceased.

Otto W. Anderberg, Grove City, Minn., in place of D. G. Sundahl, resigned.

Alfred F. Ess, Hopkins, Minn., in place of F. D. Markham, resigned.

Leslie E. Toleen, Hopper, Minn., in place of Irene Pfeifer, resigned.

Edward S. Thomas, Nashwauk, Minn., in place of J. P. Lanto, resigned.

Carl S. Fischer, Sauk Centre, Minn., in place of B. F. DuBois, Jr., resigned.

Fred P. Schroeder, Sauk Rapids, Minn., in place of T. G. Schaefer, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Jennie S. Catching, Georgetown, Miss., in place of M. B. Catching, retired.

Dickson L. Hall, Hollandale, Miss., in place of Grant Hamilton, resigned.

Claude W. Johnson, Kilmichael, Miss., in place of William Liston, transferred.

Valley L. Carpenter, Morgan City, Miss., in place of J. J. Dent, retired.

Kay Eakin, Pattison, Miss., in place of E. E. Holder, retired.

Barney W. Burnett, Rienzi, Miss., in place of E. J. Robins, retired.

Norman Terrence Poore, Jr., Tunica, Miss., in place of G. O. Robinson, retired.

MISSOURI

Frank W. Wildhaber, Beaufort, Mo., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna M. Keesling, Bellevue, Mo., Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Henry H. Womack, Catron, Mo., in place of Ollie Bullock, resigned.

Fred V. Hogan, Flemington, Mo., in place of R. L. Whited, transferred.

George K. Evans, Gower, Mo., in place of Fannie McClintock, deceased.

Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin, Mo., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Willie L. Anderson, Green City, Mo., in place of V. B. Watt, transferred.

John B. Robinson, Half Way, Mo., in place of O. C. Gamel, transferred.

Willie R. Tapscott, Knox City, Mo., in place of C. M. Eoff, transferred.

Henry E. Bowers, Langdon, Mo., Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Elmer H. Temme, Leslie, Mo., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence E. Godman, Miami, Mo., in place of E. A. Hisle, transferred.

Desmond Earl Todd, Pevely, Mo., in place of V. G. Guidicy, resigned.

T. Ray Gourley, Phillipsburg, Mo., in place of F. E. Dennis, retired.

Archie Norman Cooper, Rushville, Mo., in place of L. D. Dyer, transferred.

Jefferson D. Marsh, Steelville, Mo., in place of A. E. Thurman, transferred.

Billie B. Cooper, Windsor, Mo., in place of F. L. Stafford, resigned.

MONTANA

Joseph Kelly, Glendive, Mont., in place of D. J. O'Neil, resigned.

Alfred E. Heikkila, Roberts, Mont., in place of J. C. Abrahamson, deceased.

Edwin Russell Bennett, Superior, Mont., in place of R. W. Spangler, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Viola Calhoon, Benedict, Nebr., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Mrs. Mina M. Paulson, Bloomington, Nebr., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mrs. Audrey Ida Babb, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters, retired.

Cyrus F. McDowell, Chadron, Nebr., in place of R. L. Isham, resigned.

Troy Kenneth McCown, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel, transferred.

Charles Edmond Rock, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koshler, resigned.

Harry L. Dresslar, Grant, Nebr., in place of U. V. Dobbs, resigned.

Henry A. Davis, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop, deceased.

Mary L. Wunderlich, Martell, Nebr., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adaline L. Breslin, Newcastle, Nebr., in place of J. A. Hoy, resigned.

Raymond Stevens, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strope, deceased.

Rolland L. Winkle, Pickrell, Nebr., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leslie W. Niel, Plattsburgh, Nebr., in place of M. W. Price, resigned.

Walter A. Aregood, Rising City, Nebr., in place of P. W. Barker, transferred.

Myrtle C. Stewart, Whitney, Nebr., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

NEVADA

Teresa A. Mahoney, Beowawe, Nev., in place of F. J. Smyth, retired.

Sue Smith, Fernley, Nev., in place of A. B. Jackson, resigned.

Thelma R. Studer, Gabbs, Nev., in place of G. P. McMichael, resigned.

Wilbert G. Silveira, Searchlight, Nev., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Carolyn W. Parshall, Stewart, Nev., in place of D. E. Larson, transferred.

Alice I. Strieby, Wellington, Nev., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rodney B. Wright, Brookline, N. H., in place of C. A. Morse, deceased.

Albert G. Blais, Gilmanton Iron Works, N. H., in place of F. A. Goodwin, retired.

NEW JERSEY

William A. Allen, Allenwood, N. J., in place of K. D. Morton, retired.

Edward N. Hoffman, Birmingham, N. J., in place of F. H. Hammell, resigned.

William F. Kuhn, Brigantine, N. J., in place of S. H. Smith, resigned.

Kathryn W. Haines, Browns Mills, N. J., in place of Delbert Bush, resigned.

Catherine Gleason, Cresskill, N. J., in place of R. A. McGrath, resigned.

Damon Caccese, Franklinville, N. J., in place of G. W. Karge, retired.

Edwin L. Glesner, Naughright, N. J., Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

John F. O'Donnell, Phillipsburg, N. J., in place of W. H. Fisher, deceased.

William A. Kearns, Ridgewood, N. J., in place of A. W. McNeill, deceased.

Henry O. Kopp, Riverdale, N. J., in place of J. W. Potter, resigned.

George Majoros, Jr., Roebling, N. J., in place of Eleanor Tarling, deceased.

Joseph E. Lyons, Vineland, N. J., in place of T. H. Hall, resigned.

NEW YORK

David E. Dodge, Apalachin, N. Y., in place of Asa Camp, resigned.

William A. Clukies, Bellmore, N. Y., in place of A. J. Lee, deceased.

Chester E. Canniff, Cairo, N. Y., in place of L. A. Timmerman, resigned.

Dorothy N. Lyke, East Bethany, N. Y., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Phoebe J. Varney, East Nassau, N. Y., in place of L. B. Pulver, deceased.

Mary H. Bunt, Elka Park, N. Y., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Elvira Reppucci, Glenwood Landing, N. Y., in place of F. J. Burns, Jr., resigned.

Elizabeth C. FitzPatrick, Hamilton, N. Y., in place of M. F. Dixon, deceased.

Doris D. Smith, Hemlock, N. Y., in place of D. D. Smith, resigned.

Arnold D. Case, Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.

Julia M. Conway, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., in place of Henry Karchner, deceased.

John L. Barrett, Minetto, N. Y., in place of Z. I. Seymour, Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Victor A. Willette, Mooers, N. Y., in place of P. F. Plante, transferred.

Carrie M. Bame, North Chatham, N. Y., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Mildred C. Sigrist, North Evans, N. Y., in place of S. M. Waltz, retired.

James F. Byrne, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. M. Bulger, deceased.

Robert G. Payne, Quogue, N. Y., in place of E. H. Stevens, resigned.

Robert L. Simmons, Ripley, N. Y., in place of I. R. Bennett, deceased.

Louise H. Allen, Sandy Creek, N. Y., in place of A. H. Wart, resigned.

Mae Carroll, Sound Beach, N. Y., Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Bert P. Wood, Springfield Center, N. Y., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Francis A. Brophy, Stony Point, N. Y., in place of Mary Lynch, removed.

Hyman Sasnowitz, Swan Lake, N. Y., in place of Frank Kilcoin, resigned.

William J. Yaeger, Webster, N. Y., in place of P. J. Smith, retired.

Frederic Francals, Westhampton Beach, N. Y., in place of M. B. Williams, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Raeford E. Brown, Burgaw, N. C., in place of S. H. Ingram, transferred.

Clairborne R. Oakley, Carboro, N. C., in place of T. N. Mann, deceased.

William E. Newton, Currie, N. C., in place of Minnie Brinson, deceased.

Henry D. Johnson, Farmville, N. C., in place of B. O. Turnage, deceased.

Thurman R. Smith, Hazelwood, N. C., Office established April 1, 1945.

Columbus Few, Hendersonville, N. C., in place of E. W. Ebanks, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mathilda A. Johnson, Adams, N. Dak., in place of N. H. Koppang, resigned.

Lloyd P. Aanrud, Balfour, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Driessen, transferred.

Vernon H. Lane, Carson, N. Dak., in place of Anna Holkesvik, resigned.

Virginia P. Allen, Coleharbor, N. Dak., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Esther A. Dahlen, Edmore, N. Dak., in place of A. S. Reynolds, resigned.

James A. Kreitinger, Golva, N. Dak., Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Carl V. Larson, Gwinner, N. Dak., in place of H. F. Nelson, resigned.

Merwin G. McGregor, Litchville, N. Dak., in place of L. J. Savage, resigned.

John J. Murray, Mandan, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Hudson, retired.

Edward N. Swanson, McHenry, N. Dak., in place of R. J. Leahy, deceased.

Norman N. Berg, McVille, N. Dak., in place of J. F. Swanston, resigned.

Nelmer L. Talmo, Portal, N. Dak., in place of S. A. Smith, resigned.

Daniel F. McMenamy, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Mealy, transferred.

Lewis E. Peterson, Wimbleton, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Mohr, transferred.

Herbert William Whalen, York, N. Dak., in place of S. M. Cascaden, resigned.

Henry Lemke, Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. H. Case, removed.

OHIO

Ralph C. Bennett, Amesville, Ohio, in place of W. L. Carpenter, resigned.

Harry B. Davis, Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of F. W. Thomas, resigned.

Woodrow E. Cecil, Caldwell, Ohio, in place of A. C. Barnhouse, deceased.

Robert S. Keadey, Centerburg, Ohio, in place of R. W. Litzenberg, resigned.

Mary C. Dick, Cleves, Ohio, in place of R. J. Schwing, declined.

Byron R. Phillips, Collins, Ohio, in place of G. M. Reer, retired.

Mary C. Debney, Corning, Ohio, in place of Virgil Davis, resigned.

Harry F. Schiewetz, Dayton, Ohio, in place of C. N. Greer, deceased.

Willis W. Hill, Dublin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Walter L. Bervinkle, Jr., Fort Jennings, Ohio, in place of C. B. Brockman, transferred.

Clarence N. Emrick, Germantown, Ohio, in place of R. V. Condrey, transferred.

William R. Hapner, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of E. V. Miller, resigned.

William Schroeder Warren, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

J. Gilbert Coil, Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of G. W. Blessing, resigned.

Ivor W. Cowell, Lake Milton, Ohio, in place of O. A. Holzbach, resigned.

Mildred C. Sellars, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of P. A. Bond, retired.

William C. Simon, Metamora, Ohio, in place of E. L. Churchill, transferred.

Homer E. Omen, Millfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Albert D. Borer, New Riegel, Ohio, in place of A. C. Klein, retired.

Howard B. Acker, Perry, Ohio, in place of M. C. Hickman, resigned.

George J. Stoll, Piketon, Ohio, in place of G. E. Leist, resigned.

Ella L. Clare, Richmond, Ohio, in place of J. R. Simpson, retired.

Robert E. Erwin, Richwood, Ohio, in place of M. L. Dickason, transferred.

Glenn G. Rex, Rome, Ohio, in place of J. P. Statler, deceased.

Philip F. Dickerson, Scio, Ohio, in place of L. H. Duswald, resigned.

Robert N. Stroup, Spencer, Ohio, in place of G. N. Stroup, resigned.

Eugene Victor Grevencamp, St. Henry, Ohio, in place of A. J. Beckman, resigned.

Lena G. Konneker, Sawyerwood, Ohio, in place of A. L. Milhoan, resigned.

John M. Daly, State Soldiers' Home, Ohio, in place of A. M. Speir, removed.

Laura V. Tipton, The Plains, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Roger M. Crites, Tuscarawas, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ermel Ward, Vinton, Ohio, in place of H. D. Devore, retired.

Lester Gerber, Walnut Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Elijah H. Jackson, Waverly, Ohio, in place of A. S. Keechle, resigned.

Harry A. Hahn, Waynesburg, Ohio, in place of H. C. Brubaker, resigned.

Glen M. Haas, Woodville, Ohio, in place of J. K. Faist, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Glenn H. Newell, Nash, Okla., in place of Roy Rine, resigned.

Ina L. Snyder, Piedmont, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edward P. Soulligny, Ponca City, Okla., in place of W. B. Lucas, resigned.

William R. Smith, Tryon, Okla., in place of Loyd Barclay, transferred.

OREGON

Joseph Omlin, Jr., Gold Beach, Oreg., in place of Vincent Byram, deceased.

Chester O. Stallard, Nelscott, Oreg., in place of O. C. Gardner, declined.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas J. Zimmerlink, Allison, Pa., in place of Steve Latsko, Jr., removed.

Pearl E. Chappell, Barnesville, Pa., in place of Orabel Rarick, retired.

Harry E. Grim, Boyertown, Pa., in place of H. L. Breidenbach, resigned.

Ruth Findley Stem, Buckingham, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Claude B. Maurer, Colmar, Pa., in place of L. C. Rosenberger, retired.

Clarence R. Tobin, Cresson, Pa., in place of E. C. Bishop, resigned.

Joseph Ersagovich, Crucible, Pa., in place of W. D. Thompson, retired.

Emerson K. Musser, East Earl, Pa., in place of C. P. Shirk, resigned.

A Chester Dietrich, East Petersburg, Pa., in place of E. S. Harry, resigned.

William E. Zediker, Eightyfour, Pa., in place of W. A. Johnston, resigned.

Gladys M. Parry, Elrama, Pa., in place of D. C. Buell, resigned.

Wilma Nan Stuart, Emeigh, Pa., in place of E. M. Krug, resigned.

Leonard R. Devilbiss, Fawn Grove, Pa., in place of L. E. Devilbiss, deceased.

Douglas James McHenry, Fort Washington, Pa., in place of M. M. Kavanagh, resigned.

John Allen Habel, Garrett, Pa., in place of L. B. Habel, resigned.

David T. Herlehy, Glassport, Pa., in place of W. P. Kohler, resigned.

Edna I. Keefer, Grantham, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kenneth E. McQuiston, Home, Pa., in place of Iolabell McElhoes, declined.

Harry T. Ritzhey, Hyndman, Pa., in place of M. D. Rees, resigned.

Jane E. Steuart, Irvine, Pa., in place of J. J. Myers, retired.

Mabel S. Merz, Ivyland, Pa., in place of A. C. De Hart, resigned.

Erma K. Hay, Jennerstown, Pa., in place of J. H. Palmer, resigned.

Clarence R. Miller, Mont Clare, Pa., in place of M. H. Wahl, resigned.

Louis Joseph DePaul, Mount Pocono, Pa., in place of W. S. Mervine, resigned.

Anna L. Splain, Mountville, Pa., in place of J. W. Hoover, retired.

Steve J. Vrotny, Natrona Heights, Pa., in place of J. J. Roll, retired.

Raymond T. Stuckey, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy, deceased.

Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr., Oxford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William G. McCurdy, Pitcairn, Pa., in place of L. H. Deviney, resigned.

Winifred C. Brendel, Reinhards, Pa., in place of S. E. Hornberger, retired.

Jane M. Martin, Saint Thomas, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

George H. Davis, Saxonburg, Pa., in place of A. G. Lassinger, resigned.

Abram Miller Kurtz, Scotland, Pa., in place of A. M. Kurtz, resigned.

Mildred E. Thomas, Shelocta, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clarence K. Kratz, Silverdale, Pa., in place of Herman Gerstlauer, resigned.

Ronald R. Vogelsong, South Enola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles W. Henne, Strausstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Howard A. Rathburn, Sugargrove, Pa., in place of W. C. Jamieson, deceased.

Leon D. Kingsley, Townville, Pa., in place of L. L. Childs, deceased.

Albert Howe, Vanport, Pa., in place of J. A. Jones, retired.

Benjamin F. Sherick, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of R. E. Funk, deceased.

Eugene Patrick J. McMahon, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, declined.

Marian H. Van Wyk, Whitford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Thurlow C. Brenneman, York Haven, Pa., in place of M. E. M. Busser, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Della S. Beaty, Crescent Beach, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

John Woods, Marlton, S. C., in place of P. W. Johnson, deceased.

Alfred D. Parker, Sr., Pacolet Mills, S. C., in place of W. W. Goudelock, retired.

Raymond W. Coleman, Pamplico, S. C., in place of L. G. Myers, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Otto Weller, Eureka, S. Dak., in place of E. L. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mildred M. Abernathy, Gannvalley, S. Dak., in place of B. A. Drips, resigned.

Ralph G. Garvey, Gayville, S. Dak., in place of T. M. Cowman, retired.

Rubin A. Madsen, Lake Preston, S. Dak., in place of S. A. Archer, removed.

Herby J. Bakkehaug, McIntosh, S. Dak., in place of M. W. Funk, resigned.

Wilbur E. Prann, Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of Agnes Schirber, resigned.

TENNESSEE

John G. Hughes, Clifton, Tenn., in place of W. B. Miller, deceased.

Samuel G. Bazemore, Cordova, Tenn., in place of J. L. Arrington, resigned.

Samuel A. Leftwich, Hampshire, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edgar W. Marshall, Surgeonville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Richard A. Bowers, Caldwell, Tex., in place of G. R. Kocurek, removed.

Louise I. Lintelman, Crosby, Tex., in place of C. A. Fortner, retired.

Euna C. Kelly, Freer, Tex., in place of M. H. Freeman, resigned.

William R. Ginnings, Frisco, Tex., in place of F. P. Shrader, retired.

Sam S. Deval, Hallettsville, Tex., in place of Joseph Kopecky, resigned.

Ernest A. Cryer, Jr., Hamshire, Tex., in place of O. H. Brent, resigned.

Herschel P. McCown, Kerens, Tex., in place of J. C. Clayton, resigned.

Robert A. White, La Porte, Tex., in place of C. M. Boyle, resigned.

Roy B. Hennington, McCaulley, Tex., in place of L. H. Rector, retired.

Homer O. Gainer, Melvin, Tex., in place of J. A. Able, resigned.

Marvin C. Warncke, Needville, Tex., in place of Effie Rasmussen, transferred.

Pearl H. Hardy, Shepherd, Tex., in place of Verna Appling, resigned.

Dessie K. Bowden, Whiteface, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Kenneth W. Brady, Bakersfield, Vt., in place of A. C. Wells, retired.

Bernard H. Lilley, Hyde Park, Vt., in place of O. N. Campbell, resigned.

John R. Kennett, Montgomery Center, Vt., in place of W. J. Wright, retired.

Marguerite D. Wolcott, Orwell, Vt., in place of J. J. Cain, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Willie W. Paulette, Drakes Branch, Va., in place of N. H. Fulton, resigned.

Archie W. Arthur, Evington, Va., in place of A. G. Davey, deceased.

John P. Arehart, Fairfield, Va., in place of E. R. Flippo, deceased.

Louis H. Suddith, Jr., Highland Springs, Va., in place of W. D. R. Proffitt, retired.

David J. Lee, Middleburg, Va., in place of J. D. Simpson, resigned.

Olive G. Kidd, Roseland, Va., in place of M. B. Harvey, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Charles O. Jackson, Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec, resigned.

Emanuel A. Anderson, Carnation, Wash., in place of J. B. Simmons, retired.

Emanuel Lindberg, Custer, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Malcolm P. Hutton, Edwall, Wash., in place of J. F. Hall, retired.

Ernest W. Wendelin, Grays River, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Esther L. Coleman, Harper, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Virgil M. Newman, Kingston, Wash., in place of M. R. Joyce, resigned.

LeRoy P. Jensen, Lopez, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

James C. Banta, Millwood, Wash., in place of A. H. Byram, resigned.

David N. Judson, Jr., Oak Harbor, Wash., in place of D. N. Judson, deceased.

Daniel F. Coulter, South Bend, Wash., in place of H. M. Connor, removed.

Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish, Wash., in place of R. I. Matheson, deceased.

Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith, Wash., in place of L. B. Kelly, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick C. Page, Beechbottom, W. Va., in place of J. W. Thomas, resigned.

Herman A. Stowers, Griffithsville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Linkous, resigned.

Charles H. Callison, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of G. L. Carlisle, retired.

Andrew J. Nemeth, Osage, W. Va., in place of J. L. Badzek, deceased.

Marie N. Fox, Prenter, W. Va., in place of M. J. Nutter, resigned.

May H. White, Roderfield, W. Va., in place of H. A. Hetherington, retired.

Jane B. Graham, Thurmond, W. Va., in place of B. M. Gwinn, resigned.

Gloria C. Greene, Ward, W. Va., in place of E. G. Hilton, resigned.

L. Stanley Gibson, Widen, W. Va., in place of Louis Knakal, retired.

WISCONSIN

William George McCoy, Brookfield, Wis., in place of F. W. Plank, deceased.

Robert S. Grogan, Kaukauna, Wis., in place of R. H. McCarty, resigned.

Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of R. H. Wirth, deceased.

Ernest H. Thorpe, Mattoon, Wis., in place of G. A. Prenzlow, resigned.

Harry A. Nohr, Mineral Point, Wis., in place of Levy Williamson, deceased.

Mervin J. Helgerson, Mount Sterling, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Louis W. Kurth, Neillsville, Wis., in place of L. W. Kurth. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Albert G. Willgrubs, Norwalk, Wis., in place of H. T. Karis, deceased.

Joan T. Sullivan, Ojibwa, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Gordon J. Hansen, Oregon, Wis., in place of C. A. E. Manion, removed.

Jay P. Phillips, Palmyra, Wis., in place of C. S. Thayer, resigned.

August E. Mecikalski, Pelican Lake, Wis., in place of M. A. Whalen, removed.

John H. Hennessey, Roberts, Wis., in place of W. R. Johnston, declined.

Casimer C. Ruthe, Somers, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Florence E. Dexter, Trevor, Wis. Office made Presidential July 1, 1946.

Otis M. Rude, Viroqua, Wis., in place of R. L. Graves, resigned.

Richard W. Gillett, Wausau, Wis., in place of O. L. Ringle, resigned.

Otis L. Holman, Westby, Wis., in place of R. M. Grimsrud, resigned.

Richard R. Williams, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of M. A. Potter, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Lord and our God, as man has a hard time getting through this distracted world, with Thy sheltering arms come to the bewildered and the perplexed. Keep them within our Creator's will, with no impatience or evasions of Thy moral law, which is perpetual in its obligations.

We pray for that longed-for mysterious power which lifts men into the comradeship which shares the higher bread of life. Grant that those who are overborne with care, with privations and afflictions, may find comfort in the compassion of the more fortunate, who are led by the inspiration of a common Saviour and the vision of a common destiny. Let us rid ourselves of our enemies by making them our friends, and Thine shall be the praise.

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 22, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FOM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1842. An act to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the

disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Federal Communications Commission.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
9. Office of Selective Service Records.
10. United States Maritime Commission.
11. War Assets Administration.

REMOVAL OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS FROM GERMANY BY WAY OF REPARATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Department of State, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

JANUARY 24, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By his letter of December 19, 1947, the Honorable John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, forwarded an attested copy of House Resolution 365 of the Eightieth Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives on December 18, 1947. The resolution requests the Secretaries of State and of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practical moment certain information, specified in 11 questions set out in the text of the resolution, regarding the removal of industrial plants from Germany by way of reparation.

The Department of State, for itself and the Department of Defense, herewith respectfully submits a basic reply to the questions asked by the House of Representatives. Every effort has been made to obtain to the fullest extent and as rapidly as possible the information requested by House Resolution 365. Because of the urgency of putting the requested information before the House, the submission has not been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, to which, however, copies are being sent.

It will be observed that much of the detailed information requested is lacking regarding the British, French, and Soviet zones of occupation in Germany. Through both diplomatic channels and through the office of military government (United States), the British and French Governments have been asked to supply the additional information needed. These Governments have not been able to comply quickly with this request, because their occupation authorities have not maintained such data in the form in which it is desired by the House of Representatives. The representatives of these Governments have given assurances, however, that they will make every effort to obtain the information which is presently lacking. This additional information and the checking of the information herewith submitted will probably require further communications to the House of Representatives from the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

No official information on reparation removals is available for the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany, nor has there been in response to the resolution a request to the Government of the Soviet Union for such information. Since the Soviet Government has repeatedly, the most recently at the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers at London in December 1947, refused to comply with requests of this nature, it was

not considered that a reiteration would be effective.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Under Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Human Events.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

WATER AND POWER SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in yesterday's Washington newspapers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress will provide, and I shall support, vast sums to restore the economy of European nations. At the same time, we should provide adequately for our own economy and our national defenses. On Saturday last, I made a statement before the Subcommittee on War Department Civil Functions Appropriations which is directly related to this situation in California.

Flood control as it applies to semiarid California means conservation of rain and snow waters which normally come in that State during the short season from October to April. To hold these waters for beneficial usage instead of permitting them to run unharvested and at times cause great damage in their mad rush to the Pacific Ocean, means large storage dams, including dams for multiple purposes, are imperatively necessary. They will serve a dual purpose—not only protecting valuable farm lands, but also assisting in meeting the critical shortage of power.

There is both a critical water and power shortage from one end of the State of California to the other. A primary cause of the growing demands for both water and power in California is the tremendous increase in population taking place in that State. Census statistics show that there were 6,907,387 persons in California in 1940. By July 1, 1947, this population increased 43 percent to 9,876,000. In the single year from July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1947, the population of California increased by over 350,000, which means people have been entering the State at a rate of over 6,000 per week. It is, therefore, imperative that not one acre-foot of water be permitted to run wild into the sea and that every kilowatt of potential hydroelectric power be produced to meet this enormous and unprecedented shift in population which has been taking place in such a short period of time. This population movement exceeds any shift in population that has taken place throughout our entire history in a similar

length of time. It is a condition over which California has absolutely no control.

The critical situation California is already facing is being made more severe by the drought now taking place. An Associated Press dispatch of January 24 from Los Angeles calls attention to the fact that there has been no rainfall whatever for the 31 preceding days in that section and the preceding 39 days in the San Joaquin Valley at the southern end of the great Central Valley. This drought is occurring in the middle of the normal wet season. The following quotation from that dispatch indicates how gravely critical the situation is:

THIRTY-ONE-DAY DROUGHT PLAGUES FARMERS AS HEAT CONTINUES IN CALIFORNIA

Thirty-one days without rain and not a drop in sight was the parched picture today as southern California moved deeper into its winter of dry discontent.

The dryness has been accompanied by near-record heat—rising to 85 several days in Los Angeles. It was 80 in San Joaquin Valley, and 73 today in San Francisco, the warmest January 24 the bay city has had since 1899.

With closest rains expected somewhere in Utah and moving eastward, the weatherman was unable to brighten the outlook for agriculturists, frankly worried as they have not been in years over crops which last year grossed \$120,000,000.

Winter grain crops were stunted or drying from lack of moisture, and orange growers increased irrigation by 25 percent over last year. * * *

Three cities—Santa Barbara and Ventura in the south and Benicia in northern California—have adopted forms of water rationing. It was the thirty-ninth rainless day for southern San Joaquin Valley.

There has been only 1.92 inches of rain since July 1, as compared to a southern California norm of 6.68 inches.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, hats off to the civilian or producing population of France for throwing the International Monetary Fund out the window.

By forcing their politicians to make the official value of the franc conform more nearly to its true or black-market value in spite of fund opposition, the French workers—those who produce the necessities of life—have rendered an invaluable service to the workers of all countries.

The repudiation by France of the monstrosity called the International Monetary Fund comes as no surprise to those of us who opposed the measure creating it. We expected it and said so. This is clearly shown in the hearings.

This repudiation of one of the pet schemes of the American one-worlders ought to have a sobering effect upon them. It is doubtful, however, that it will because we already hear suggestions for an international monetary conference to do, I suppose, what was promised

the International Monetary Fund would accomplish but failed to carry out.

It is too early to know just what the international repercussions will be from the action taken by France. All we can say now is that the printing-press-money pot all over the world is boiling. I wish this might be a sign that a vigorous movement has been started to put a torch to all the fiat money in the world and restore to the people their gold for making their exchanges and settling their contracts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

THE AVIATION INDUSTRY

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Westwood Hills Press, Westwood Hills, Calif., of January 15. The headline carries a grim warning to America and to Americans. That headline is as follows: "Drastic cut at Douglas. Skeleton force of 2,600 by mid-April seen by officials."

This plant, which contributed with the rest of the aviation industry so much to the winning of the war, is to all intents and purposes ready to close. This plant, which at the peak of its production employed 41,000 technicians and skilled workers in the aviation industry, is about to bow out of mass production. Our American wings carried the free world and carried the Allies to victory. They played a major role in the winning of the war. The lack of those wings, unless we take immediate and drastic action, may lose us the peace. In a world in turmoil we must protect the aviation industry or suffer again the consequences of inaction and inertia.

A TEACHER'S EXPERIENCE WITH COMMUNISM

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are doing all we can to help the other countries of the world gain enough strength to withstand communism in their midst. It would seem as if we should be careful to be certain of our strength at home.

I want to read from a letter written by a teacher in this country:

I was thrown by the recommendation of the Harvard appointment bureau into the educational front of the Communist underground, for although on the surface, I was teaching in a sleepy New England village—in reality, the headmaster was a friend and classmate of John Reed—and thought as he did. I now know that he chose an inexperienced teacher to mold in the Communist pattern but my background and a thorough course in all of Russian history at Harvard Graduate School were my weapons with which I fought the fight until the end of the year and then resigned.

Being in the so-called progressive movement of education, I was thrown once again into the Communist front in a midwestern city where I signed a 3-year contract. This principal told his teachers not to go to church. I went. He assembled them at his home not for teachers' meetings but to talk communism. Countless are the times I have argued against his ideas—just so that someone on the faculty would still think and not be taken in. The only contract I ever broke was with this man. I'm informed that one of the archbishops of the Catholic Church (whose nuns were attending the summer school at that same place) when told of the true state of affairs there stopped their attendance.

Having been on leave of absence from the New York schools I joined Textile High School (not five blocks from Communist headquarters) simply taken over by the Communist teachers, the hammer and sickle on the blackboard of every classroom, the principal threatened with his life if he told on them.

Their ablest leaders concentrated on "getting" me. They told me how terrible capitalists were and, of course, I knew so many more than they did that I simply laughed at them. Then they pestered me with literature, including *In Fact*. My constant answer was the brief, capitalist phrase, "not interested." I never entered a teacher's room that I was not approached at once.

Not having to continue there I returned to my own city and entered its public-school system in 1939. Many school officials wonder why I have taught so many places. Communism in our schools and colleges, as you must know, is the answer. The reason is simple—there are too many schools in which communism is taught and I will not teach communism.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks

in the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "The Fulcrum of Democracy."

SENATOR BUSHFIELD'S SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. 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 South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, thousands of South Dakotans read Senator BUSHFIELD's statement, Friday, withdrawing from the political arena, with deep regret. People may not always have agreed with HARLAN BUSHFIELD but they always knew where to find him. He has been what is known as a strong man, firm in his convictions, fearless in his opinions, and able in his advocacy of any cause.

Senator BUSHFIELD became chairman of the Republican Party in South Dakota for the 1936 campaign when Republican strength was at an all-time low. Under his leadership, South Dakota became the spearhead of a Republican revival that was gradually to sweep the Nation.

Leslie Jensen took the brunt of the battle and was elected Governor with Don McMurchie as Lieutenant Governor and Roy Doherty joined J. J. Murphy as railroad commissioner. The New Deal clung to most of the other State offices. I was elected to Congress, one of two new Republicans that year to come from west of the Mississippi.

It was the start of a great comeback for the Republican Party.

Two years later, BUSHFIELD, himself, was elected Governor with a complete slate of State officers, while CHAN GURNEY and KARL MUNDT were elected to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. BUSHFIELD was reelected Governor in 1940 with an increased majority and in 1942 was elected to join GURNEY in the United States Senate.

In Washington, Senator BUSHFIELD quickly demonstrated his ability and today holds high rank in the Committees on Agriculture and Finance, as well as party councils. His decision to conserve his energies for his official duties is characteristic. When he announced early for reelection, doubtless he hoped for a second term without the strain of a primary contest. When circumstances decreed otherwise, he placed his official responsibilities first. When he retires at the conclusion of his term, he will be entitled to the rest he has earned and to the respect of the people he has served.

THE FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks we have heard almost daily complaints from

colleagues who represent constituents who are suffering property damage and personal discomfort because of the unjustifiable fuel-oil shortage.

This morning I want to take just a minute to commend one of our colleagues, the gentleman from the First District of Massachusetts, JOHN HESELTON, for the effective work he has done week after week in an effort to get to the bottom of this unhappy situation. Sundays, holidays, and evenings JOHN HESELTON has been hard at work searching out the truth and trying to find a solution to the problem, so that we won't face these shortages in the future.

Without in any way casting reflections on the fine work done by other Members of this House, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and extend to him the well-known orchid.

EXPORT OF GRAIN TO CANADA

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is about time the American housewife learns that the greatest competitor which she has today when she goes to purchase a loaf of bread or a pound of meat is the United States Federal Government.

I want to give you a few figures that were contained in the Times-Herald under date of January 24, 1948. Listen to these exports of corn to Canada:

In August 1946, I will read only the round figures, 255,000 bushels.

In 1947, the same month, 816,000 bushels.

In September 1946, 63,000 bushels.

In September 1947, 542,000 bushels.

In October 1946, it was 23,000 bushels; in 1947 it was 592,476.

In November of 1946 it was 261,745; in 1947, 573,658.

In December of 1946 it was 379,246. For the same month in 1947 it was 730,611.

And listen to rye. What do you suppose they made out of this rye? I will let some of the Congressmen on my right tell me.

In August of 1946 we shipped 666 bushels. In August 1947, 1,977 bushels.

In September, October, November, and December of 1946 we shipped exactly none, but listen to these figures for 1947: September, 194,259 bushels; October, 744,096 bushels; November, 436,815 bushels.

Now let me give you the totals: The total for the year 1946 was 2,378,858 bushels of corn; for 1947, 8,085,768. For rye the total shipped for the entire year 1946 was 666 bushels; in 1947 it was 1,433,356 bushels.

It is about time the American people began to understand who is getting this grain and where it is going.

For your convenience in studying these figures, I set them forth in the table from which I read:

If you want to know where the United States grain went that was alleged to have been saved by restriction on United States industry, read the following:

[Bushels]

	Exports of United States corn to Canada		Exports of United States rye to Canada	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
August	255,338	816,687	666	1,977
September	63,418	542,046	0	194,259
October	23,095	592,476	0	744,096
November	261,745	573,658	0	436,815
December	379,246	730,611	0	(1)
Total for year	2,378,858	8,085,768	666	1,433,356

¹Embargo.

WHAT IS AN INSIDER?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, what is an insider? Some profess to not know what this word means. Ordinarily when you or I want to know the meaning of an ordinary word the customary place to turn is the dictionary. "Insider" is an ordinary word. Webster's New International Dictionary, second edition, unabridged, page 1285, defines an "insider" as:

A person inside; hence, one in a position to have first-hand information; opposed to an outsider.

An "insider" is thus found to mean a person in a position to have first-hand information. Mr. Speaker, that definition exactly fits Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, Special Assistant on Procurement and Reparations to the Secretary of the Army, Democratic national committeeman from California, and formerly United States Ambassador at Large on Reparations, and treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. It is apparent therefrom that during all times pertinent to the pending inquiries Mr. Pauley was an "insider."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

THE FUEL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, all the newspapers published in New England last Friday, which I have seen, carried warnings of the blizzard which struck that storm-weary region this week end. Today's reports are that be-

tween 12 and 14 inches of snow were added to the from 49.8 inches in Boston up to 85.9 inches elsewhere, which has blanketed New England to date. All this was accompanied by low temperatures, ranging from zero to 45° and was accompanied by high winds from 30 to 60 miles per hour. The storm here, which brought 5 inches of snow and a low of 10°, tied activities up rather badly and resulted in 34 greater Washington families sending emergency calls for fuel oil as supplies dwindled, was a slight imitation of the one in New England. What the results were in New England so far as their fuel-oil supplies are concerned remains to be seen.

Uncomfortable as this storm was here, it may have a healthy effect in at long last making clear to some persons in authority how serious the situation has been, is, and will be in other parts of the country unless effective action is taken even at this late date under the authority vested in the Secretary of Commerce under the Export Control Act of 1940, as amended (50 Stat. 463) and extended to February 29, 1948, by this Congress by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (Public Law 188, 80th Cong., July 15, 1947), and to February 28, 1949, by the action in December (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.).

In the same New England newspapers, another interesting dispatch was carried with a Washington date line. I am confident that the news dispatch is entirely correct. If it was read in full, it would be clear that the comfortable warmth in the House and Senate Chambers and in our offices is supplied from coal, not fuel oil. But we all realize the tendency to read headlines only, and I am confident you will recognize the possible impressions left on those readers who were trying desperately to obtain fuel oil to heat their homes, hospitals, schools, and industries up there.

I have in my hand the article appearing in the Boston Post. I wish it could be reproduced exactly in the RECORD, with the 1/2-inch block headline, "Solons' offices will not be cold." I will ask for the return of the clipping to my office so that any of you receiving letters about the warmth of your working conditions may see it. And I shall include in my remarks at this point the full article and the headline:

SOLONS' OFFICES WILL NOT BE COLD—OIL SHORTAGE MAY HIT OTHER AREAS, BUT CONGRESSIONAL BUILDING IS HEATED WITH COAL

WASHINGTON, January 22.—There may be a fuel shortage in some parts of the country but don't worry—your Congressman is cozy.

His office, as well as the House and Senate Chambers, is heated by coal, not fuel oil.

For that reason he is not affected by President Truman's recent order that the temperatures of oil-heated Government buildings must be held down to 68° during the working hours and 60° at night.

A spot check of thermometers in the House wing of the Capitol showed that nowhere was the temperature below 72°. One just outside Speaker JOE MARTIN's office registered 76° this afternoon.

Of five thermometers in the House Chamber, four have been broken and contain no mercury. In a fifth the mercury stood at 140°, but it seemed to be broken, too.

In the two House Office Buildings, where individual Members can control the tem-

perature through room regulators, the readings ranged from 60 up to the high 80's.

Timothy Murray, engineer in charge of the Senate wing, assured a reporter that "We have plenty of coal."

"We keep the Senate Chamber at 75°," he added. "They like it a little warm in there."

The Pentagon, frequently described as the world's largest office building, also uses coal. The engineer said he tries to keep the heat up to 74° or 76°.

At the White House, served by a central heating plant which supplies several other Government buildings, the thermostat was set at 68°.

Let me now read some other sample headlines: Boston Herald, "Congressmen cozy and warm"; Hartford Courant, "Congressman cozy in fuel shortage"; Worcester Telegram, "Thermometers broken in United States House Chamber."

I suggest that you may want to make a note of the page number covering these headlines. While I was not here, I understand those who were, received considerable correspondence when the campaign for bundles for Congress was on and also when the debate as to assigning gasoline-ration cards to Members of Congress was raging. Some of us may have to face another kind of blizzard—correspondence on this subject of heat in the Capitol and office buildings.

Three sentences from an editorial appearing in one of these papers are interesting and possibly prophetic. They are:

The tempers of thoughtful New Englanders do not improve when they study this terrible winter in terms not of snow and ice but of dollars and cents. * * * Little wonder that the patience of New Englanders snaps now and then. The other day a Rhode Island man seized a gun and went out shooting icicles.

I hope that a companion article may be prepared covering the facts as to the amount of floor space owned and operated by the Federal Government, apart from the Capitol and the office buildings, and covering how much of that space has been heated by oil. Certainly we of the New England delegation know that as early as December 13 we requested an investigation of the possibility of conversions in all Government buildings, not only in the affected areas but throughout the country, to determine the wisdom of such means of relieving the fuel-oil situation and that we urged vigorous action be taken to that end. We know that we repeated that request on December 19. We regret that, as of this afternoon, the only affirmative steps reported to us were those taken by the Navy at four of its installations, as reported in the letter of January 9 from Acting Secretary of the Navy Kenney, and the less vigorous action taken by the Army at Fort Myer, Va., and Stewart Field, N. Y. The latest authentic report is that the Government controls, owns, or operates approximately 138,000,000 gross square feet of space in over 5,800 buildings in our country. My latest advice is that there are about 1,700 average rooms in the four buildings here. I doubt if all four contain as much gross square feet as the Navy Annex. Certainly they are dwarfed by the gross square feet in the 360 Federal Government buildings operated by the Federal Works Agency in the District

of Columbia; too, it should be mentioned that while the power plant heats the Capitol and the three office buildings, it also heats the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the Washington City Post Office, the Supreme Court Building, the Annex to the Library, and the Botanic Garden while burning coal to heat these four buildings. The latest figures on the employees in the executive departments are 1,999,853 people. In contrast to the 435 Members of the House and the 96 Members of the Senate, with their committee and personal staffs, it is doubtful if there are more than 3,500 persons working in the Capitol and in the respective office buildings, heated, incidentally, exclusively by coal. I think it safe to assert that the relative heating problem is about 1 to 1,500 as to buildings alone.

In his letter of January 19, Mr. Steelman advised that the final report of the Federal Works Agency, which is conducting the requested investigation, should be available to the White House shortly after January 22. Perhaps our friends of the press can help us develop the facts.

WE MUST RAISE THE PAY OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, two apparently unrelated news stories in yesterday's press prompt me to join them together in order to draw therefrom an observation, the soundness of which is supported by each.

Mr. T. P. Wright announced his resignation as Civil Aeronautics Administrator assigning as his principal reason the inadequate salary provided for the position. He has accepted private employment at almost twice the \$10,000 Government pay. This is a common story. Almost every week an able administrative officer of the Government quits for the more remunerative field of private employment. Indeed, in resigning, Mr. Wright observed that his case was not unique but rather the rule with those in Government posts who do not possess independent wealth.

The second story from Washington concerned a high Government official who does possess independent wealth, Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army. It was charged, and I believe proved, by former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, that Mr. Pauley, largely through his Government associations, was able to profit personally on the commodity markets of this country to the extent of almost \$1,000,000.

My observation is that we must do something in the field of legislation in order to attract and retain able and honest Government administrators. They should come, principally and preferably, from the ranks of those who do not possess great wealth. Ten thousand dollars

a year is not commensurate pay for a proven top-flight Government official.

To engage an inordinate number of independently wealthy persons to help administer our laws is neither consonant with our accepted concept of democratic ideals nor conducive to the most vigorous and disinterested execution of those laws.

The remedy lies in raising the pay of Government officials. We have been penurious employers long enough. If we want good government in America, we must hire good men at good pay to run that government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I received permission to extend in the RECORD an article on reclamation. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE FUEL SITUATION

Mr. WOLVERTON. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, just before the Christmas recess last December I informed the House in detail of the hearings by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce upon the current petroleum situation, culminating in the recommendation by the committee of a nine-point program which it believed would provide much relief if the program were speedily carried out by the executive agencies involved. As I said at that time, the committee and its staff would diligently pursue the situation during the holidays and ensuing weeks to determine what more, if anything, need be done.

I am today filing a detailed report by the committee covering both the immediate and longer-range situation, and making five specific recommendations:

First. The prompt execution of the nine-point program recommended by the committee on December 19 to alleviate the immediate petroleum situation.

Second. The immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products until it can be determined whether they are at the expense of our national economy or national security.

Third. The deferment of making any foreign commitment involving the supply of petroleum and petroleum products until a complete review has been made of the entire petroleum problem to determine to what extent such commitments can be made without injury to our national economy or security.

Fourth. The immediate authorization of additional funds and continuing authority to the Department of the Interior for accelerating the program of development of oil from coal, shale, and other substances.

Fifth. The immediate establishment of a congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy.

Recommendation 1 involves the execution of the nine-point program adopted by the committee December 19 to meet the immediate situation. Briefly, these nine points are:

First. The export-control authority should be exercised to prohibit or curtail the exportation of fuel oil and other petroleum products to alleviate the present shortage.

Second. Navy vessels should be employed to transport fuel oil.

Third. The Maritime Commission should defer transfer of tankers to foreign purchasers.

Fourth. The Maritime Commission should arrange for tankers sold to be temporarily returned to the United States trade.

Fifth. The Secretary of the Interior should coordinate his and other activities of the Government with those of State fuel coordinators.

Sixth. Voluntary petroleum industry committees should be established to secure most efficient use of petroleum facilities.

Seventh. The Office of Defense Transportation should secure most efficient use of tank cars.

Eighth. The President and departments and agencies of the Government should take all other possible and appropriate steps in alleviating the shortage;

Ninth. The Maritime Commission should be authorized and required to repair and operate its laid-up tanker fleet.

We understand that some action has been taken on each recommendation, such as: Some reduction in export licenses covering petroleum products, some reduction in exports of fuel oils to Canada, assistance from Navy stocks and tankers, retention of American tankers in the American trade, placing in service of the laid-up American tanker fleet, meetings with State fuel coordinators, and meetings of the industry. In committee hearings starting tomorrow full reports on action taken on these matters will be made by the heads of the respective agencies involved. I shall report promptly thereafter on the action which the committee finds has been taken and recommends further must be taken.

In the midst of much conflicting testimony given to the committee regarding the nature of the causes of the shortage and ability to meet this winter's demand, one thing has stood out regarding the situation, especially in the Middle West and on the east coast. This is the fact that the industry estimates of available

supply and probable demand, even taking into account reduction in household temperatures, rested upon favorable weather conditions without any undue cold snap. The weather we are experiencing has wiped out whatever margin there might have been. The committee, accordingly, in recommendation 2, is calling for immediate cessation of exports until it can be determined whether they are at the expense of our national economy.

The Middle East situation currently looks far from good, with the Moslem reception of the partition of Palestine raising considerable doubt as to the security of further transportation of oil. This is important inasmuch as under the European recovery program the Middle East was heavily counted upon as a source of supply for the expanding petroleum requirements of Europe. Testimony recently has been offered by responsible governmental authorities that if this source cannot be counted upon, Europe must receive its supply of oil from the United States, which would mean rationing here. Committee recommendation 3, accordingly calls for the deferment of any foreign commitment covering petroleum and petroleum products until the world-wide demand and supply picture, and the reliance hitherto placed upon the Middle East as a source of supply, can be reviewed.

The longer range petroleum supply situation does not look much more favorable during the next few years at least. For the first time petroleum and natural gas have so risen in dominance in our economy that they are supplying more than half of the Nation's fuel and energy. Although further examination into this area as well as that of alternate and substitute sources of fuel and energy is required, we do know at this time that we are possessed of vast oil shale and coal deposits susceptible of being converted into oil. The committee, therefore, in recommendation 4, calls for the immediate acceleration and expansion of the current Bureau of Mines experimental and developmental work into the commercial practicability of extraction of oil from coal, shale, and other substances.

The committee's fifth recommendation relates to further examination into the entire field of fuels and energy. We have been informed that the petroleum shortage of this past winter is likely to be recurring during the next 4 or 5 years at the very least. So far it is not apparent to the committee that either the Government or the industry has given this problem the energetic attention which it deserves.

From the evidence it appears that there are shortages of facilities all along the line: First, at the refineries which, if there were additional oil today, could not handle more; then in tanker, tank car, and barge transportation facilities which, if there were additional products, are insufficient to handle more; in pipe lines for the transport of either additional crude or products; and in the final distribution system of bulk stations, storage, and transport. If all of these facilities, on which the industry indicates it proposes to expend some \$4,000,000,000 over the next few years, were available,

however, it is still far from clear that assured additional crude oil is provided at the well-head source to flow through and fill these enlarged facilities. Nor is it at all evident that adequate supplies of crude remain in the ground long to sustain such flow.

The committee does not believe that we are forced to accept the panaceas which so far have been offered to us by Government and by industry, namely: the cheerful acceptance by the consuming public of the inevitability of these tight situations; the leaving to industry to work out without governmental interference this problem which for some time now they have assured us would not arise and the solution to which they so manifestly so far seem unable to reach; or acquiescence to the superficial remedy suggested of allocating or rationing available supplies without maximum effort to effectuate a real cure through bringing supplies and demand in line.

The shortage of natural gas in many areas is all too well appreciated by consumers dependent upon this source of fuel. Utilization of electric energy also has increased at unanticipated rates with the country getting by this past December only through great efforts by the industry and much good luck, and with entirely too low reserve capacity.

The fast increasing requirements of our expanding economy for fuels and energy, plus ever-important considerations of national defense, therefore warrant comprehensive study of all fuels and energy sources, their supply, their demand, and their interrelationships. Such study is prerequisite to a national fuel policy, the formulation of which cannot be delayed. This study the committee embarked upon through its staff some weeks ago, the outline of which is carried in detail in the committee's report of today. In such outline the committee has had the cooperative assistance of all industries involved.

While the committee is specifically charged with the responsibility, under the Reorganization Act, of a large share of our fuels, it recognizes that many committees properly have interests in many separate phases of the fuel problem. Some dozen committees in both Houses currently are in various aspects of the problem. This is not a problem which can be approached piecemeal. It must be essayed at once. The committee, accordingly, recommends the establishment of a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy.

In this connection, at the committee's direction, I have today introduced a House Concurrent Resolution to establish such committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "A Redeclaration of Rights."

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement appearing in the Wall Street Journal entitled "A Statesmanlike Appraisal."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Oregon Daily Journal.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject Pertinent Observations Concerning the Taft-Hartley Labor Law.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] be granted leave of absence on account of official business.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we all want to get rid of the Communists, in and out of the Government. The President wants to do the same thing, but he wants \$50,000,000 to do the job.

I have been thinking a good deal about this, and I believe that the President, our Secretary of State, and other executives in the Federal Government could get rid of most of the Communists without spending any money.

The Civil Service Commission, in its regulations, should require as the first qualification of an applicant, or present officeholder, a certificate or statement from an election-board official indicating that they are registered voters, registered with one of the two major parties, and exercising their privilege to vote granted them under the Constitution.

Someone might ask: Why registered with one of the two major parties? The answer is simple. It is essential in our system of government that we have two parties, but we do not need more than two parties. As for the 12,000,000 registered nonpartisan voters, they could present a sworn statement that their voting is within the two major parties.

I believe that this would get 98 percent of the Communists out of the Government and keep them out. Apparently the Government is employing many people who do not have sufficient interest, loyalty, or patriotism to vote on election day, and I am convinced that any man or woman in America who holds a position and is receiving public funds for his services should at least take sufficient interest in his government to vote regularly.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of this letter dated January 20 from an oil company in Texas.

The letter reads in part:

DEAR MADAM: The voluntary response to assist in bringing about the release and transportation of the inventory of finished fuel oil at our Texas City refinery and the resumption of production at the refinery of vitally needed fuel oil was indeed praiseworthy. Your contribution was of such value that had it not been for this effort, great distress might have occurred.

Your assistance and cooperation have been of untold value in the public interest and your efforts in that direction must be sincerely appreciated by and gratifying to all concerned. Thank you sincerely.

Respectfully yours.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the long-range program that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has brought forth. His House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to be congratulated in recommending an immediate ban on all exports of petroleum products. I say that today we need action in getting oil to the people for their burners. The embargo of the exporting of oil for the immediate emergency I recommended weeks ago. The Administration's recommendation to convert from oil to coal is slow and unsatisfactory. The Government cannot do it in many instances as it would take several months. When it can be done, it is an enormous expense to shift from oil to coal and from coal to oil and back again. The embargo against the shipment of oil to foreign countries is necessary so that the American people will not have to endure the terrible suffering on account of the cold. The delay in issuing the embargo has been incredible and outrageous.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, righteous indignation and the pent-up wrath of the American people will compel the Con-

gress to repeal the unconstitutional, unjustifiable tax on oleomargarine. I do not complain so much about the fact that we have to pay 15 cents tribute to the butter interests on oleomargarine. We can do that and get it. But, this morning I have introduced a resolution repealing the law which makes it prohibitive to serve the armed forces with oleomargarine even though they cannot get butter. That bill will be referred to the Committee on the Armed Services, it will be reported out, and I venture the opinion and the prophecy that this Congress will repeal the law making it prohibitive to serve oleomargarine to the armed forces of our country even if they wanted to serve it. Remember this, you do not get Bang's disease from oleomargarine; you do not get tuberculosis from oleomargarine. You get a lot of good calories. Get on my wagon now before it gets loaded. I am now taking applications.

UNIFORMITY OF FEDERAL PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to call the attention of the Congress particularly to one aspect regarding our pension system that is at long last receiving the serious consideration of many Members. That aspect is uniformity of Federal pensions.

In fact, I do not feel that it is going too far to say that any Federal grant which does not apply uniformly among recipients is not really a pension at all. It is therefore proper that we characterize our present old-age benefits as old-age assistance rather than pensions.

Old-age assistance is a dole, not a pension. While I am in no way discrediting old-age assistance, or discounting the benefit that it has been to millions of our people, I do charge that it is not what many of us consider an honorable American pension. I charge also that it is not large enough. It is not adequate even where the largest or maximum grants are paid to meet the requirements for the mere necessities of life. I believe that all Members will agree to this. How would a Member of the Congress like to live an entire day and night on what might be termed only about half the price of a reasonable meal? How would one like to do that every day and every night? Yet this is not the aspect that I started out to talk about. Even though payments now are small, and should by all means be increased now, they should also be uniform. That is, whatever amount we pay to one recipient we should pay to everyone qualified to benefit under our legislation. There should be no discrimination, regardless of State or residence. We should not only increase the amount of benefits now, we should also change our old-age assistance to a uniform American pension. We should do both now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Clarence Poe from the Progressive Farmer.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by Bishop Kearney, of Brooklyn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter he wrote to a constituent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes this morning I want to discuss Federal aid to education. Two bills have been drawn up with great care and introduced in both Houses of the Congress, House bill 2953 and Senate bill 472, providing for Federal aid to education. These bills differ in some minor details, but either of them would be a great help to our school children at a time when they are suffering from educational neglect.

In my own State of Oklahoma our educational system faces a financial crisis. This same situation exists in many of the other States. This is manifested in Oklahoma by a shortage of teachers, low salaries, run-down and inadequate school buildings and equipment, and most all of this stems directly from a lack of funds.

President Truman stated, in part, in his state of the Union message on January 8, 1948, that "another fundamental aim of our democracy is to provide an adequate education for every person." This fundamental aim is not being provided in many States because those States and local communities cannot provide the funds to anywhere near adequately support their school systems. In most instances it is simply a matter of not being able to foot the bill.

The Federal aid to education program throughout the Nation would work much like the equalization program in some of our States, including my own State, Oklahoma. I grew up with this problem. My father taught in typical small country schools in Oklahoma for 27 years. I remember well how much it meant to him as a teacher, to his pupils, and to the entire community when a minimum school program was established in Oklahoma about 1926. It meant that at last State funds would be used to develop educationally all of the people in the State of Oklahoma. It meant that these funds would be used to maintain better schools in the poorer communities, thus bringing the educational opportunities of the underprivileged children nearer the standard of those who were fortunate enough to live in the richer communities.

There has been expressed by some the fear that Federal assistance to education would mean Federal domination of public-school systems. I would point out that such domination cannot be achieved without the consent of Congress and that the Congress is never likely to give that consent.

In that connection I would like to point out that the two bills, H. R. 2953 and S. 472, give protective guaranty that State control will be continued. Under the terms of those bills every one of our States will be given some assistance as the Federal money will be distributed on the basis of need, economic ability, and effort to support the schools.

I can think of no valid reason for delaying action on the Federal aid to education bills in view of the conditions existing in this country today. Under the Constitution the Federal Government is authorized to levy taxes to provide for the general welfare. Education is included in this category. The revenue resources of the Federal Government have increased at a much greater rate than the sources of revenue within the States and local governments upon which the causes of public education must depend. These States must be helped. Every day of postponement of action on the Federal aid to education bills is costly because every day of good schooling that is missed is a loss that cannot be replaced.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress, hearings were held on S. 472 and more than 50 witnesses, representing educational, civic, agricultural, labor, church, and other organizations were heard. Those witnesses were virtually unanimous in agreeing that Federal assistance for schools is needed. If we had any doubt as to the need for Federal aid for the schools, or apprehensions as to the practicability of it, they should have vanished during the convincing arguments presented at the hearings on this pending legislation.

Under the provisions of S. 472 the State of Oklahoma would receive in allocations approximately \$9,195,000 per annum. Since education is the basis of our national security and our economic welfare, this amount of money being allocated to the State of Oklahoma to augment her own educational financial structure would mean that she could assume her basic responsibilities in these respects along with the rest of the Nation.

It seems incredible to me that Congress will fail to act upon a measure upon which so much depends, and the time for action is now. I sincerely hope that the Federal aid to education bill will pass at this the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized Republican tax bill is about to reach the floor. It was originally what the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee described as an across-the-

board cut. The Democrats revealed the inequity of such a bill, and the Republican majority has yielded and included just half of the relief to low income-tax payers that President Truman asked. The part of the bill that gives relief to the masses was forced in by the Democrats.

The other substantial tax cut in the bill is a bold and brazen appeal to the voters of the higher income groups in politically doubtful States. The bill proposes to give reductions in non-community-property States without asking those taxpayers to assume the obligations of community property.

The interesting feature to this vote-getting device is that it gives reductions only where the Republicans can hope to get votes in return. Texas and Louisiana were evidently considered hopeless, so the bill made no effort to get votes there. This bill is clearly intended to give tax relief only in return for Republican votes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper prepared for him by the office of the secretary of state of Rhode Island.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on the life of Matthew Fontaine Maury, Robert Edward Lee, and Thomas Jonathan Jackson.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement with regard to the proposed restrictions as well as the already existing restrictions on the manufacture of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with the European recovery program, and to include therein an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Little Rock, Ark., entitled "The Price of Defeat."

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to extend his remarks with reference to the late Honorable Josephus Daniels, in another to include part of the proceeds at a national meeting of the Junior Chamber of Commerce together with an address by Mr. Edward Wimmer, and in another instance with reference to the Federal Housing Act.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered by him before the medical association.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper editorials.

SLACK-WATER ROUTE FROM THE GULF OF MEXICO TO THE GREAT LAKES BY WAY OF THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY—RELIEVE THE OIL SHORTAGE IN THE NORTHEASTERN STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Members from many of the Northern States are complaining, and justly so, of the inadequacy of our transportation system to furnish fuel oil to their areas. People are actually suffering for the want of heating facilities. This situation must be corrected. It never should have been permitted to exist in the first place.

We have a project that was authorized by the last Congress which will go a long way toward relieving the situation. I refer to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway. When completed it will provide what amounts to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all other points on the upper Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers.

We are asking for funds with which to begin the construction of this great project, which, as I said, when completed will provide what is virtually a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, as well as to Minneapolis and St. Paul on the upper Mississippi, and to Pittsburgh, Pa., on the Ohio. These may sound like astounding statements, but I can show you they are correct.

The Army engineers say that there is not another project on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. They have sent up a statement of the amount needed to

begin this work, and the Bureau of the Budget has sent up an estimate.

This new project would provide a slack-water route from Mobile, Ala., up the Tombigbee River to the Tennessee River, 481 miles, and a downstream route from where this project enters the Tennessee River to Cairo, Ill., on the Mississippi River, 262 miles. It is only 218 miles from Cairo to where the Illinois River intersects the Mississippi. That 218 miles is upstream, but it is more than offset by the 262 miles down the Tennessee River from where this project connects with that stream to Cairo, Ill.; and then you have a slack-water route along the Illinois River 326 miles to Chicago on the Great Lakes.

There are seven locks and dams on the Illinois River which provide this slack-water route, and then there are 26 locks and dams between St. Louis and Minneapolis and St. Paul which provide a slack-water route to those points on the upper Mississippi.

It is 215 miles from where this project connects with the Tennessee River downstream to Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio River. There are 46 locks and dams on the Ohio River above Paducah, which provide a slack-water route all the way from Paducah to Pittsburgh. This simply means that downstream traffic from

all of those points, including Sioux City, Iowa; Omaha, Nebr., and Kansas City, Mo., would take advantage of the swift current of the Mississippi from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, La., 869 miles, for downstream traffic, but would return by the way of this slack-water route, in order to save the expense of fighting the swift current of the Mississippi.

Now let us see what that would mean.

A 14,000-ton barge would save \$9,800 on its fuel bill alone in going from New Orleans to Cairo by way of this slack-water route, up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then down the Tennessee to Cairo. That would mean that every bargeload of wheat, corn, rye, oats, and other commodities going down from any of the Western States would save \$9,800 on its fuel bill by returning by way of this slack-water route to Cairo, if it carried a similar load of, we will say, cottonseed meal, sulfur, bauxite, or any other material.

If it went from Mobile, it would save \$20,160; and if it went from Birmingham, Ala., to Cairo, or from Demopolis, Ala., to Cairo, the saving would be \$28,140 on a 14,000-ton load.

That means that oil from those vast new oil fields in southeastern Mississippi and southwestern Alabama would be transported by barges into the Great

Lakes by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway at 67 cents a ton as against \$2.68 a ton that it now costs them to fight their way upstream against the swift current of the Mississippi River.

That means that this oil could be transported into the Great Lakes for one-fourth the amount it now costs to take these barges back up the Mississippi.

Going from New Orleans to Paducah, one of these 14,000-ton barges would save \$11,760 on its fuel bill alone; going from Mobile to Paducah it would save \$22,160 on its fuel bill alone; going from Birmingham or Demopolis to Paducah, the savings would be \$30,100 on the fuel bill alone.

The traffic would move counterclockwise, going down the Mississippi, in order to take advantage of the swift current of that stream, and returning by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway in order to take advantage of the slack-water route.

I am inserting at this point a table, worked out by the Army engineers, showing the tremendous savings which this great project will provide. It shows the savings on the small tows of 3,500 tons and also on the large ones of 14,000 tons.

The table referred to follows:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex.	Cairo	\$2.34	\$8,190	\$1.94	\$6,790	\$0.40	\$1,400	\$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.74	9,590	1.60	5,600	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
Mobile, Ala.	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
Demopolis, Ala.	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	3,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,000
Columbus, Miss.	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
Aberdeen, Miss.	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
Fulton, Miss.	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

I hope every Member of the House and Senate will read this table carefully and see what this great project will mean to their people, now and for generations to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4127) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended," with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr.

BUTLER, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE.

REPEALING REPRESSIVE LAWS AGAINST OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is evident there is widespread interest in this question affecting the continuance of the iniquitous tax on oleomargarine. It is really not a revenue provision; it is a repressive measure intended not only to injure but to deliberately put out of business a legitimate industry which manufactures the wholesome edible product known as oleomargarine.

On tomorrow morning in executive session I intend to present before the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the tax bill an amendment to repeal all Federal excise taxes levied upon oleomargarine. If the interest of this House is what I think it is and what it ought to be, you will immediately get in touch with your member on the Committee on Ways and Means and ask his support of my proposal, which will once and for all wipe out what should never have been on the statute books of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each certain clippings.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—BEN W. COLBURN (H. DOC. NO. 511)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 645, a bill "for the relief of Ben W. Colburn."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of \$4,529.55 to Ben W. Colburn, of Tulare, Calif., by reason of losses alleged to have been sustained by him in connection with the purchase of certain smoke generators from the Treasury Department under contracts dated May 12, 1944.

It appears that Mr. Colburn purchased a total of 7,417 smoke generators under two sales contracts for a total contract price of \$7,529.55; that the smoke generators were located at Fort Hahn, Calif., and San Diego, Calif.; that bids on this commodity were invited on the basis of "as is, where is," without recourse; that the description of the generators was based on the best available information, but no warranty, written or oral, was given or authorized by the Treasury Department as to the exact quantity, quality, condition, size, or description of the property, or that it was in condition to be used for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

It appears, moreover, that Mr. Colburn, in reliance on a private report as to condition of the generators failed to avail himself of an opportunity to inspect the property offered for sale. Since he did not avail himself of the opportunity offered for inspection of the property prior to entering into the contracts but relied on a report of a third party as to the condition of the property, there appears to be no legal or equitable basis for charging the Government with the consequences of his negligence. So far as concerns the condition of surplus goods offered for sale by the Government on an "as is, where is" basis without warranty or guaranty of any kind, the law is clear that a bidder who fails to take advantage of an opportunity to inspect cannot subsequently recover on the ground that the goods are of an inferior quality.

In view of the facts and circumstances as set forth above, and since the bill selects a single purchaser of surplus property for special treatment by directing the payment to him of a refund denied to others, all others similarly situated being discriminated against, there appear to be no circumstances which would warrant the granting of the relief authorized by this bill. I am therefore constrained to withhold my approval of the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1948.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message, together with the bill to which it relates, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OSCAR AND ANNA CARLBLOM (H. DOC. NO. 510)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3754, entitled "An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom."

The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$32, or such other sums as he has, or may hereafter, collect from Oscar and Anna Carlblom of Lisbon, N. Dak., as income tax for the calendar year beginning January 1, 1944, and ending January 1, 1945. The bill asserts that for the stated taxable year the taxpayers had no net income that was subject to taxation, their total net income being \$489.96.

An examination of the records indicates that the parties to whom relief is afforded by the bill filed Form W-2 (Rev.) as their income-tax return for the calendar year 1944. The filing of Form W-2 (Rev.) constitutes, under the law, an irrevocable election to take the optional standard deduction, and, accordingly, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is without authority to permit a change once the election has been made. The record in this case further shows that even if the taxpayers could have been allowed to file a Form 1040, itemizing deductions, only part of the tax paid could have been refunded since a part of certain deductions which the taxpayers proposed to itemize would not have been allowable under the law in any event.

The Congress has specifically provided that the election to take or not to take, the optional standard deduction shall be irrevocable. The granting of the proposed relief would constitute a discrimination against many similarly situated taxpayers and would set an undesirable precedent.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
The WHITE HOUSE, January 26, 1948.

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message, together with the bill to which it relates, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 431, providing for the consideration of H. R. 4044, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of

the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to consume any considerable period of time in presenting this rule. I realize, of course, that the gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 30 minutes, which I yield to him at this time.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4044 has been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As announced by the Clerk, it is a bill looking toward amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The bill is divided into three titles. The first title is highly important, and with the possible exception of a committee amendment, which will be open for discussion when the bill is read for amendment, is intended to make the policy of the United States with respect to the treatment of enemy-alien property conform with agreements already reached between the Allied Powers with respect to such property found within their respective borders and certain other agreements relating to enemy-alien property found within neutral countries at the termination of the recent war.

Title II of the bill provides for the creation, temporarily, of a commission to study a very difficult and complex problem; that is the proper procedure by which the Government of the United States, including the Congress of the United States, may proceed to accomplish a solution in accordance with sound policy of the claims of American citizens against enemy countries and nationals.

The third title relates to the extension of certain relief to American citizens, nonmilitary, who suffered fearful punishment and torture in certain detention camps maintained in American territory by the Japanese during the recent war, American civilians who were caught as it were in the Philippines, on the island of Midway, and at Wake, and perhaps one or two other places.

That in brief is a recital of the general purposes of the bill. I do not intend to discuss it in detail, believing, as I do, that the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who have studied this for a good many months are far better equipped to do so than I am.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the adoption of the pending rules resolution, but I do wish to direct attention to title I

of the bill, consideration of which House Resolution 431 makes in order.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has told you what the bill contains. I regret that he did not elaborate his views upon title I. I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the policy laid down in title I is a policy for which this Congress can take little credit. It is an abandonment of a policy heretofore followed by civilized nations with respect to the property of nationals of enemy countries. Hurriedly looking over the report which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce filed on the bill, I find a statement to the effect that title I violates no international understanding of what constitutes good morals. I hope this is so. Mr. Speaker, we are at this moment practically endeavoring to win the favor of all the peoples of the world. We are spending billions of dollars to carry the impression to other peoples that we are just and fair. We are doing this because we desperately need their support. We are in greater need of this support than our people have been told or that is understood. I do not believe that the amount of property that this Government would acquire through the confiscation of enemy alien property as this bill provides will compensate us for the damage that it may do.

The other provisions of the bill, of course, are entirely satisfactory to me, and I take it that this House will adopt the bill as a whole. But I would call attention to studious and serious-minded Members of this body, interested in the protection of the good name of our country, to see if title I cannot be so framed as would insure that the bill be not left in such shape as to have it characterized as legalized robbery. I know that under the existing state of public feeling, it is difficult to sustain the position that I suggest, but nevertheless I do have these misgivings. We are here proposing to take the property of aliens, nationals of enemy countries, which represents investments made in this country, in thousands of instances upon the invitation of our country, and we are going to confiscate that property and cover it into the Treasury of this country for no reason in the world other than that owners happen to be nationals of alien countries. Many perfectly innocent people will, under the bill, lose their all.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I appreciate the concern the distinguished gentleman from Georgia feels, but I cannot agree with him that the procedure suggested in section 1 is at all out of line with precedent, nor can I agree with him that it marks a change in American attitude toward the properties of enemy aliens.

Mr. COX. Certainly, it is a complete reversal of the policy we pursued following the late war.

Mr. GEARHART. I understand that Professor Borchard in some of his writings made statements in line with the gentleman's contention, but eminent in-

ternational lawyers of just as great repute challenge his statements, and they are borne out by the fact that the Versailles Treaty, which was signed by all the countries involved in World War I, contained just such a provision; and, although the United States did not sign it, we did later sign a treaty with Germany, known as the Treaty of Berlin, and in that treaty some provision was carried and was partially executed, until another scheme was entered upon later, which resulted in our losing 20 percent of the German assets and in \$100,000,000 of American claims going unsatisfied.

Mr. COX. I am not disposed to combat the position the gentleman takes. He may be right. I would, however, like very much if the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] would find it agreeable to elaborate upon the statement he made, which was that title I is in keeping with an understanding formally arrived at by the Allied countries in the late war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, may I quote from a letter which was addressed to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] by the State Department, in which there is quoted the language of certain agreements made between the Allied Powers during this recent war. For example, article 6 (A) of the final act of the Paris Conference on Reparations for Germany, to which this and 17 other governments are signatory, provides as follows:

Each signatory government shall, under such procedures as it may choose, hold or dispose of German enemy assets within its jurisdiction in manners designed to preclude their return to German ownership or control and shall charge against its reparation share such assets.

May I call the attention of the gentleman to that language, "to preclude their return to German ownership or control and shall charge against its reparation share such assets."

Mr. COX. In spite of the fact that it is my profound conviction that the agreement is in violation of good morals, I withdraw even such suggestion of opposition as may have been carried in the remarks I made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, there are other documents which bear upon this situation and which defend the bill most definitely. It was stipulated in one of those agreements that Germany undertakes to compensate her nationals with respect to the detention or sale of their property rights or interests in allied or associated states.

The government assumes the duty to reimburse its nationals for loss due to its own action in waging war. It has become perfectly apparent, Mr. Speaker, that war today is total war and that the people of a country that goes to war under the government of that country must share the responsibility for what happens. It is along those lines and in conformance with other agreements which I shall not take the time to read now because I would prefer to permit the gentleman from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to do so that this bill is offered.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman had made this very clear statement before the Committee on Rules when the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] appeared asking for a rule, I would not have taken the position that I have expressed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in view of the reference made to my appearance before the Committee on Rules in behalf of this bill, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia that after my appearance I immediately called the Department of State to ask for a full explanation on this subject as it was by recommendation of the Department of State, I believe, that this title was included in the bill. They sent me a letter which I transmitted to the Committee on Rules before the Committee on Rules took action on the bill. I assume that the letter having been sent to them, it was made known to all those who were present, and I believe, although, of course, I do not know, that the action of the Committee on Rules was taken subsequent to the receipt of this letter from the Department of State.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the gentleman that I did not see the letter and was not present at the time the rule was granted. In view of the statements made, may I say that so far as I personally am concerned I can see no basis for opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I too deplore the necessity, as does my colleague the gentleman from Georgia, of taking over the property of enemy aliens. I wish that it would not be necessary, but I know that the matter has received a great deal of consideration and study on the part of those upon whom we must, after all, rely. It has also received careful study and consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which unanimously reported the bill. I would prefer, if there is any property owned by any individual that is worth less than \$5,000, that it should be exempted from the operation of this act. But, as I understand, this legislation applies to 355 pieces of real-estate property and about 129 pieces of unimproved property in the custody of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman will be pleased to know, I am sure, that in title I of the bill, section 1, the last line provides:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.

Section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act exempts a great deal of property from being taken over by the Alien Property Custodian. Any property that has been wrongfully taken over from a friendly alien living in the United States I understand may be returned to him.

Mr. SABATH. I am thankful to the gentleman for calling my attention to the provisions of section 32, although I had been familiar with it heretofore, but somehow it had escaped me.

If ever a committee of Congress was justified in reporting a bill to take over alien property, it has surely been justified in this instance against the German-Nazi and Japanese owners. These two nations have been guilty of the most brutal war against us which took 300,000 American lives and inflicted 700,000 casualties, saying nothing of the forced expenditure of \$280,000,000,000, now reduced to \$258,000,000,000, which the American taxpayers will continue to pay beyond the lives of us here before this tremendous debt is wiped out.

I concur in the viewpoint of the gentleman from Georgia that we should demonstrate to the world that we are even now financing and aiding in world rehabilitation; that we are fair and do not wish, as has been stated by someone, however, without authority, to deviate from our old-established policy.

I feel that no one can accuse us that we have not been extremely fair, liberal, and humane with the peoples of the world, including those, who, as I stated before, viciously and murderously and without provocation or justification, warred against us—whilst their representatives were talking peace in Washington, they attacked us at Pearl Harbor.

The leaders of these nations with the approval of at least 95 percent of their peoples massacred, murdered, poisoned, and burned millions of innocent men, women, and children. The Japs murdered our boys who were obliged to surrender, and in defenseless position were tortured in a manner that exceeded the atrocities of barbarians of olden days. But even with that inhuman treatment, I feel that there may be some alien enemy nationals who have not been guilty or sanctioned those atrocities who should receive fair consideration in the disposition of their property. However, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] certain exemptions are provided in section 32, and such alien enemy nationals may be exempted from the operation of the act.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult for me to understand how some Members and some people permit themselves to be influenced by the propaganda, emanating from the same sources as after the First World War but now with still greater determination and resource-

fulness, in behalf of the very leaders who originally supported Hitler to war against nearly the entire world. A few of these leaders have been convicted, some are now on trial, but there still remain hundreds who represented the Farben interests that aims again to rebuild their war industries and attain the power and influence that may enable them within a few years to start another war.

I read in today's paper a statement by General Clay that we have turned over a billion of dollars of surplus property for about 20 cents on the dollar which is to be paid for, if I am not mistaken, in 20 years. I am constrained to say that there is no more assurance that this money will be paid than their failure to pay their obligations and reparations after the First World War. I feel that the value of this surplus property exceeds that of the property now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian which the bill before us provides to be taken over by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that men in high positions should show such interest in rebuilding Germany in the hope that she may cooperate with us in any future conflict with any other country? I think it is but wishful thinking on their part. I have the utmost sympathy for the innocent hungry and starving people, and especially for the children, and am willing that they be aided, but I am unwilling that we should lend aid to the militaristic group controlled by the Farben cartel interests. At the same time we must be mindful that we have in this country—the greatest and richest in the world—thousands of children, orphans, and old people that we must not neglect while we are aiding the starving peoples of other nations that are striving to establish a real democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation is in the right direction, and I compliment the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who have brought this bill before us.

I am in favor of the rule as well as the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing to the floor legislation dealing with this very, very important problem.

Following World War I, we blundered and blundered badly in the handling of alien property, alien assets, and alien funds that were seized during the course of that war, with the result that today the United States Treasury holds a \$500,000,000 German gold bond, and American claimants, with claims totaling \$100,000,000, have gone totally uncompensated for their losses, all the consequence of enemy action.

I am, however, not in accord with all of the provisions of the act. I cannot accept the procedure without protest. So bad is the procedure that I am constrained to and will at the proper time

offer an amendment to the bill which will provide an entirely different method of establishing the legality of claims and for their satisfaction by the Treasury. I offer this amendment setting up a new procedure because of our unhappy experiences, disastrous as they were, in meeting similar situations by use of the so-called claims commission procedure.

If the bill made in order by this rule is passed as now written it will end up with the establishment of an international claims committee with men appointed who will strive for the rest of their lives to keep their business going, and American national claimants will wait, and wait, and, like the claims arising out of World War I, will, in all probability be waiting until their dying days. Their claims against the enemy powers, the result of enemy action, will be paid, if they are ever paid, not to the claimants who suffered the damage but to their heirs. It is the way of claims commissions.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am mighty glad the gentleman has seen fit to bring that point up because this very day we have a record that shows that more than \$2,000,000 has already been returned to people some of whom were not American citizens. That which the gentleman is talking about is taking place already; this very day we are returning property to so-called friendly nationals of other countries while at the same time we are setting up a commission to study the claims of our own citizens.

Mr. GEARHART. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Every minute that we delay in the paying of these claims is a minute when crafty gentlemen in the employ, undoubtedly, of foreign nationals, enemy nationals at any rate, will be busily engaged in devising, by one method or another, ingenious schemes to repossess their foreign clients of this property; to get it away from the United States and back into the hands of those who a short time ago would have destroyed us in war.

Mr. Speaker, as between our fellow American citizens who have suffered detriment as a consequence of enemy action and those foreign nationals who but a short time ago would have destroyed us, there should be no difference in opinion. We owe it to ourselves to see to it that our fellow citizens do not lose as we debate fanciful questions. If the former owners of this vast estate are innocent of wrongdoing and suffer inconvenience as a consequence of this procedure, let them look to their own government for reimbursement and redress, not to us.

Here is the procedure that will be applied if my amendment is adopted, and I offer it with the endorsement of a great number of eminent lawyers: Our American citizens will be permitted to go into their own American courts and present their claims and establish them by proof as Americans are accustomed to and in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice; and when they have established their claims, and the courts have rendered judgments upon them, the

procedure which my amendment would authorize would then be satisfied out of the funds on deposit in the Treasury, funds which have found their way into the Treasury as a consequence of the sale of seized alien property. This is a simple procedure and it is an American procedure, one which if adopted will meet the situation completely. It is an efficient method. Our American claimants will get their money within a reasonable time, within their lifetime, if you please. Remember, 2 years and more have already gone by since the fighting in the Second World War was brought to a triumphant conclusion—and nothing has yet been done.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I know the gentleman has studied this matter thoroughly and I want to supplement that which he has already said.

On March 8, 1946, we had a law come into being, and also on August 8, 1946, we had a law come into being, whereby the kinds of people the gentleman is talking about can get this property back and it is being given back.

This morning our committee discussed a bill (H. R. 4903) to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act and a part of an amendment we considered is as follows: After the words "citizen of the United States" the following would be inserted "or an individual who at any time after December 7, 1941, and prior to the expiration of the time during which return may be properly made under this act has been or is deemed to be a citizen of the United States."

In other words, we have another bill that would broaden the scope of those eligible to get property back. The effort is already in the making to invite those people to come in and get back the property just like they did at the conclusion of World War I.

Mr. GEARHART. The evil forces are again at work. The gentleman's presentation is not only convincing; it is alarming. I am suggesting the opening of our constitutionally established tribunals to allow American national claimants to go into their courts and, in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice, to there establish their claim. Is there anything wrong in that? It is not considered a wrong method by so eminent a jurist as the late Chief Justice of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, who in penmanship endorses the principles of my amendment. Neither is it not considered a wrong method by the Chief Justice of the United States Court in the District of Columbia, Mr. Justice Bolitha J. Laws.

Mr. Justice Laws in his letters affirms his faith in our courts in no uncertain terms. Let me read it into the RECORD. These are his words:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

HAROLD G. ARON, Esq.,
1620 I Street NW.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR ARON: Because of my absence from the city on cases of the United States Emergency Court of Appeals, I have been delayed in receiving your letter of August 9 and

therefore have not been in a position to make answer to it.

I have read the article written by you and Frederick W. Eisner entitled "American Property Claims Against Germany and the Coming Peace Treaty" and have found it most interesting and instructive. I feel there can be no question of the advisability of setting in motion a definite plan for the liquidation of claims against German nationals and against the German Government.

Your suggestions with respect to the manner of adjudicating claims impressed me as being both fair and expeditious. While the Federal judiciary doubtless will have unusually heavy dockets following the war, yet claims of our citizens against German interests and property are of great importance, frequently are for large amounts, and it would seem entirely appropriate that Congress should confer jurisdiction upon the Federal courts to hear them.

I feel that you and Mr. Eisner made a real contribution to a constructive program by your timely article.

Very sincerely,

BOLITHA J. LAWS.

I may point out at this time that Mr. Harold G. Aron, a very eminent and outstanding lawyer of both New York and Washington, in collaboration with Mr. Frederick W. Eisner, also a New York lawyer, wrote the article to which these two eminent jurists refer for the American Bankers Magazine. In that article they stressed the necessity of devising a new method for the adjudication and satisfaction of claims against foreign nationals arising out of war action, this as the years of cruel miscarriages of justice and the indeterminable delays attending the commission method of procedure. They suggest as a substitute the adoption of a judicial procedure, which, as I stated a moment ago is endorsed by the late Chief Justice Harlan Stone, and by Mr. Chief Justice Laws of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he will make in Committee certain letters and other matter.)

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4044, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that the time on this side will be under the control of the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] served as chairman of the subcommittee that drew up this legislation, has given considerable time to its study, and will be in charge of the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental purpose of the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4044, is to provide a means by which American citizens, having war claims against either Germany or Japan, may be compensated out of the property of Germany or Japan and their nationals which has been taken over by the Government of the United States.

Title I of the bill provides that no property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States Government at any time after December 17, 1941, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, nor shall the United States pay compensation therefor. It further provides that the net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of the law of any such property or interest therein shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Title II of the bill establishes a War Claims Commission, to be composed of three members to be appointed by the President and who shall hold office for 1 year. The Commission shall cease to exist after the expiration of 1 year after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may by Executive order fix an earlier expiration date.

It shall be the duty of the Commission to inquire into and report to the President with respect to war claims arising out of World War I or World War II, as follows:

First, the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and, second, the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

It is also provided that the report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to, first, categories and types of claims, if any, which should be allowed and the legal and moral bases therefor; second, the administrative method by which such claims should be adjudicated and paid, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and, third, any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of interest or fees in connection with such claims.

Furthermore, the Commission is to include in its report recommendations as to the policies which, in its judgment, should be followed in the national interest with respect to the application of any property or interest vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian, or the proceeds thereof, to the payment of debts owed by the persons who owned such property or interest immediately prior to such vesting or transfer, and shall make such proposals for legislation

as it deems appropriate for carrying out such recommendations.

In addition thereto, the Commission shall include in its report, first, such other recommendations as it deems appropriate; and, second, such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

It can be readily seen from this brief description of titles I and II of the bill, that there is no intention to determine by the legislation now before us any general or specific policy with respect to the character of claims to be recognized, or, priorities as between different categories or types of claims, or the basis on which the amount of compensation is to be determined. The testimony before the committee revealed so many different classes of claims with conflicting rights, and alleged priorities, and so varying in degree, that it seemed unwise, if not impossible, at this time and without further study to lay down hard and fast basic principles to govern the disposition of the enemy assets now in the hands of the Government among the numerous and varied claimants. The questions and issues that have been raised are too technical and complicated, both from a legal as well as a factual standpoint, to permit of decision without the fullest information and most careful consideration. The only intelligent and common-sense way, in the opinion of the committee, is to provide for a commission to make the necessary detailed study and examination of facts and principles that is necessary if justice and equity are to prevail.

The committee, however, does recognize that there are some claimants who stand in such an acknowledged position of priority of right, and who are so greatly in need of immediate relief, that it would be unfair and unjust not to recognize their claims immediately and provide emergency relief.

Therefore title III is set up under the terms of the bill to care for such cases as I have just described.

It provides emergency relief benefits to those American citizens who were taken by the Japanese on Midway, Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippines, or while in transit to or from any such places and were interned. Persons who went into hiding in order to escape internment are treated on the same basis as those who were interned.

The committee held extensive hearings in which testimony was presented as to the suffering of many American civilians who were taken in the Philippines and other American territories and possessions, and were interned by the Japanese for the duration of the war. Innumerable acts of almost unbelievable cruelty were perpetrated by the Japanese upon many of the internees. In addition, in the final battles of our troops to liberate our people from the Japanese, many of our internees were killed or seriously wounded. Beyond that, however, there was the general suffering caused by starvation and the deliberate withholding of medical care.

About 3,000 calories are required for the average man on light labor. Many men in the camps were required to do heavy labor and yet they did not receive

even the 1,750 calories which the Japanese military had promised to supply daily. By September 1944, for example, in the Santo Tomas camp, the internees received an average of about 1,350 calories; in October and November, 1,100 calories; and in December 1944 and January 1945 the ration was reduced to 650-800 calories per day. By that process of slow starvation the average weight lost for men was 51 pounds, and for women 32 pounds. Witnesses testified that in spite of repeated requests and remonstrances, medicines and hospital supplies and equipment were refused the internees by the Japanese. What little was received, was supplied by the American and Philippine Red Cross.

The committee has also been deeply impressed by the medical expert testimony received by it with respect to the actual and potential after effects of the prolonged starvation. For example, it has been known that sometimes it takes several years before the symptoms of beriberi, the most frequent disease resulting from malnutrition, disappear. Heart diseases and conditions quite commonly result from extended malnutrition, and many deaths are yet expected to occur as a direct consequence of starvation. Likewise, various kinds of eye conditions have been manifest.

While not each and every internee has been seriously affected, it is the considered opinion of medical experts that a great many of them will in years to come suffer serious ill health from the latent effects of the prolonged starvation experienced by them. Many have died already and the life expectancy of most of these internees is expected to be materially shortened.

In the course of the hearings, a letter was received from Mr. Francis B. Sayre, diplomatic adviser of the State Department and United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, prior to the outbreak of the war, stating that these civilians were left in the Philippines. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 21, 1947.
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: In connection with the hearings on bill H. R. 1823, may I send you this word to urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to such relief as is possible to those civilians who, caught in the Philippine Islands by the Japanese, suffered personal injury at the hands of the enemy.

As United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands during the time, the unfortunate and unhappy position of American and Filipino civilians weighed heavily upon me. During the months immediately preceding the war, it proved impossible, as High Commissioner, to give official notice that American civilians should leave the islands. At that time it was impossible to predict whether a direct attack would be made upon the Philippines by the Japanese, when such might occur, or, indeed, whether hostilities would break out. Although I seriously debated in my own mind issuing such a notice, my advice from Washington was not to do so. Washington felt that with due regard to the national interest it would be advisable to issue such a notice. As a result no such official notice was issued.

A number of Americans called upon me to ask my personal advice. I could only reply that no one at the time could foretell whether an attack would occur or, if so, when, and that I must leave it to each individual citizen to decide for himself whether or not it was wise to return or send his family back to the United States.

When the Japanese did attack in early December 1941, it was too late for civilians to leave the islands. By that time all commercial sailings had been interrupted by Japanese action and when I conferred with Admiral Hart, the commander of the East Asiatic Fleet, I was informed that it was quite impossible for the Navy to get the civilians out of Manila under the war conditions then prevailing.

As a result, American civilians found themselves entrapped in the Philippines with no way of escape.

Many American civilians thus trapped by the Japanese suffered pitifully at their hands. I urge that Congress take such action as is appropriate for the relief of those American civilians still in distress as a result of their injuries and losses suffered in the Philippines.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS B. SAYRE.

The record shows that while as a matter of national policy no warning was given to American civilians to leave the Philippines and other American Territories and possessions, ample warnings were given to American civilians who resided in Europe and Asia. The State Department press releases are set forth in the appendix of the committee report. It may therefore be said that the American Government discharged its obligation to American citizens who resided in Asia and Europe and that they chose to stay on at their own risk. It will be the duty of the War Claims Commission established pursuant to title II of this act to advise the Congress as to the rights of those citizens. On the other hand, it appears to your committee that the United States Government has a clear moral obligation to relieve the distress of those citizens who resided in the Philippines and other American Territories and possessions and who, as a matter of national policy, were not given any warnings to leave and who consequently, as stated by Mr. Sayre, "found themselves entrapped."

Title III makes it clear that any relief provided thereunder is by no means to be considered in satisfaction of any war claims which those citizens have against the Japanese Government and which are to be considered by the War Claims Commission established by title II of this bill.

Title III makes applicable to the case of internees who are entitled to relief the provisions of the act of December 2, 1942, with some changes to meet specific conditions. The act of December 2, 1942, provides for benefits for detention, disability, and death in respect to employees of Government contractors. The conditions which that act was designed to meet are substantially parallel to the cases of civilian internees which title III intends to cover. The measure would be administered by the Federal Security Administrator, who presently administers the 1942 act.

The act of December 2, 1942, utilizes and integrates the provisions of two earlier acts, namely, the Employees' Com-

pensation Act of September 7, 1916 and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of March 4, 1927. The first of these—Employees' Compensation Act—provides the administrative features and sections dealing with the furnishing of medical care; the second—Longshoremen's Act—furnishes the provisions which control the payment of benefits for disability and death. Reference to the act of December 2, 1942, furnishes some additional provisions, such as those dealing with detention benefits, time limitations, and other procedural matters. Title III of the bill utilizes all three of such acts, and at the same time provides such additional checks and balances as are deemed necessary to meet the specific case situations with which the title deals.

Furthermore, both the Employees' Compensation Act and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act are Federal workmen's compensation acts. The Longshoremen's Act benefit provisions were adopted because they are full and complete with respect to proper indemnities to be payable for disability and death. The amounts payable as such benefits are in accord with proper concepts of indemnity for injury and death as reflected in State workmen's compensation laws. Rather than to adopt an entirely new scale of benefit payments or a new concept of indemnity, the committee adopted a tried and proven plan. In addition, considerable advantage is obtained by reason of judicial constructions and interpretations which greatly facilitate administration; moreover, there would be no necessity for the creation of an administrative agency to administer title III, as experts in this field are presently carrying out similar functions. This factor should expedite materially the payment of benefits and reduce greatly the cost of administration.

The cost of the benefit payments provided for under title III is approximately \$50,000,000. The net proceeds which will be covered into the Treasury of the United States pursuant to title I of the bill are estimated to amount to between \$235,000,000 and \$275,000,000.

In the work of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] our distinguished colleague, has rendered very worth-while service before the committee in preparing this legislation. We have, likewise, had the very helpful interest of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. Both of these gentlemen introduced legislation dealing with this matter in the early part of this session and this bill H. R. 4044, now before the House, is the outgrowth of these two bills, plus the long and careful consideration of the entire committee. Nor should I overlook the suggestions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] in connection with the legislation he had introduced on the subject.

The bill now before the House is so worth while in purpose, and so necessary if real justice is to be done in behalf of these war claimants, that I ask for its approval by the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New Jersey has said, this subject when brought before our committee appeared to be and was found to be exceedingly complicated. There were so many ramifications to the claims and claimants as well as to past actions, laws, treaties, and international agreements that it was considered by the committee that it would be necessary to have a Presidential commission appointed to study the types of claims, and the international laws and customs and precedents and the various relationships that might follow them, and that that commission should properly prepare itself to make recommendations to the Congress for legislation. Frankly, while the committee worked long hours and weeks on this bill and employed its staff to the utmost, it was unable to spare the time to make a full and complete study. Therefore, the recommendation for a commission to make this study and make recommendation to the Congress was incorporated in the bill. It originally provided that the recommendation be made by March 31, 1948. Obviously, that could not be done, so the committee has authorized me to offer an amendment later giving the date January 3, 1949, as the date of reporting by this commission.

There were many worthy claimants for reparations and damages. This bill does not in any way attempt to settle or make payment for any claim of damages or reparation. That should be understood. My beloved colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] proposes to offer an amendment to establish a method of settling these claims and damages. It is possible that his method would be the method ultimately recommended by the commission. I do not know. Personally, I think the matter should go to the commission for its full study and complete report, and I will discuss that matter further when the amendment is offered.

When we were debating this matter under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] mentioned a letter from the Department of State, which was transmitted to me, in which the State Department sets forth its reasons for supporting title I, section 1, of this bill.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, under a previous unanimous-consent request, I shall insert in the RECORD the letter from the State Department, under date of January 19, 1948, in full. This letter sets forth the reasons why the State Department agrees with this bill, that all of this property should be liquidated and turned in to the Treasury of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 19, 1948.
The Honorable CARL HINSHAW,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign
Commerce, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HINSHAW: The Department understands that in connection with congressional consideration of H. R. 4044, a bill "to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases," objection has been raised with respect to section 1 of the pro-

posed measure which contains an express declaration of legislative policy that no vested property of Germany or Japan, or of any national of either, shall be returned to the former owners, and that the United States shall pay no compensation therefor to such former owners.

I may say that the Department has repeatedly reported to committees of Congress its agreement with the basic policy stated in section 1 of the proposed measure. The Department understands that similar reports have been made by other interested agencies of this Government, including the Treasury Department, the War Department, and the Department of Justice. With respect to the position of this Department in relation to the matter of enemy external assets, attention may be invited to the following international commitments entered into by this Government.

1. In the Potsdam agreement it was stipulated that with a view to compelling Germany to compensate to the greatest possible extent for the loss and suffering that she had caused to the United Nations "and for which the German people cannot escape responsibility":

* * * * *

3. The reparation claims of the United States, the United Kingdom, and other countries entitled to reparations shall be met from the western zones and from appropriate German external assets."

2. Article 6A of the Final Act of the Paris Conference on Reparations from Germany, to which this and 17 other governments are signatory, provides as follows:

"Each signatory government shall, under such procedures as it may choose, hold or dispose of German enemy assets within its jurisdiction in manners designed to preclude their return to German ownership or control and shall charge against its reparation share such assets (net of accrued taxes, liens, expenses of administration, other in rem charges against specific items and legitimate contract claims against the German former owners of such assets)."

3. The United States, the United Kingdom, and France were designated by the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency to act as trustees for the 18 countries which are members of that Agency, to carry out the following resolution of the Paris Conference on Reparation:

"That the countries which remained neutral in the war against Germany should be prevailed upon by all suitable means to recognize the reasons of justice and of international security policy which motivate the powers exercising supreme authority in Germany and the other powers participating in this conference in their efforts to extirpate the German holdings in the neutral countries."

Pursuant to this obligation, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have signed accords concerning German assets with Switzerland (May 25, 1946), and Sweden (July 18, 1946), and are currently negotiating with Portugal and Spain. Under the Swiss and Swedish accords, those countries are obliged to liquidate German assets within their territory. Under the Swiss accord, 50 percent of the proceeds of liquidation is to be placed at the disposal of the Allies for the rehabilitation of countries devastated or depleted by the war," and 50 percent is to accrue to the Swiss Government. Under the Swedish Accord, substantial contributions were to be made by Sweden from the proceeds of liquidation of German assets for the rehabilitation of countries and peoples devastated by the war. Both of these accords provide for indemnification of the Germans whose property is affected by payment in German money.

It may be observed that in the annex to section IV of part X of the Treaty of Versailles (the rights and benefits of which were accorded the United States by the treaty between the United States and Germany concluded August 25, 1921) the Allied and Associated Powers reserved the right to retain and liquidate all assets of German nationals within their respective jurisdictions, such liquidation to be carried out in accordance with the laws of the allied or associated state concerned. It was also stipulated that:

"Germany undertakes to compensate her nationals in respect of the sale or retention of their property, rights, or interests in allied or associated states."

While a portion of the German assets in the United States after World War I were returned, a portion thereof is still retained by the United States pursuant to the Harrison resolution approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1267).

In the Treaties of Peace with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, which came into force September 15, 1947, each of the Allied and Associated Powers are accorded the right to "seize, retain, liquidate, or take any other action with respect to all property, rights, and interests" in its territory of these former enemy nations or their nationals, and to apply such property or the proceeds thereof to such purposes as it may desire within the limits of its claims and those of its nationals against the particular former enemy country or its nationals. Each of these treaties stipulates that the former enemy country will undertake to compensate its nationals whose property has been retained by the Allied Powers.

It will be noted, therefore, that the policy of nonreturn of German and Japanese assets in the United States, as provided in section 1 of H. R. 4044, is in accord with that stipulated in international agreements in relation to external enemy assets concluded by the United States and other countries as a consequence of World War II. Moreover, it is assumed that any peace settlements with Germany and Japan will contain provisions for the nonreturn of German and Japanese assets, as well as provisions requiring Germany and Japan to pay compensation to their respective nationals for such assets.

In conclusion, I may observe that the amount realized from the liquidation of German and Japanese assets in the United States, which would constitute the major portion of reparations receivable by the United States, will doubtless represent only a very small proportion of the losses and damages sustained by the United States and its nationals as a consequence of the war which those countries waged against the United States. I may add that, as you know, several measures are pending in the Congress which contemplate that the proceeds obtained from the liquidation of German and Japanese assets shall be utilized in satisfying claims of American nationals against those countries for losses and damages sustained by them as a consequence of the war.

Because of the urgency of the matter, this communication has not been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, to which a copy is being sent.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. LEA. If this bill is enacted as proposed, would it be within the jurisdiction of the commission to recommend payment to interned Japanese in compensation of property taken from them? That is, Japanese interned in the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would say if they were American citizens, they would.

Mr. LEA. If they were aliens, would it be within the jurisdiction of the commission?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. Any alien who has a claim against the property of his own government can settle that with his own government, as I understand it, and it is no matter of concern of the United States, unless the claimant came under the provisions of section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, in which case he has a right to make application now for the return of his property, or the equivalent, as I understand section 32 of that act.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. I am impelled to question about this letter that you have from the State Department. I agree that probably they have removed any doubts as to the strict legality of the procedure contemplated here. However, I do think a word of commendation is due the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] as to the strict morality of taking private property to settle these claims. I think it speaks well for his natural sense of justice.

On the question of the matter just raised as to whether this fund can be used to remunerate Japanese who were detained in this country during the war by this Government, I think I will have to disagree with my distinguished colleague from California, because an entirely different situation exists there. The Japanese that we interned were treated with the strictest consideration, according to our various conventions with other countries. They were treated well and fairly. In this case we have civilian internees who were treated with cruelty, men and women, whose stories I have heard—

Mr. HINSHAW. I must interrupt the gentleman; I did not yield to him for a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I suggest to the gentleman that he read title 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. I recognize with him that the Alien Property Custodian who is now in the Department of Justice, has certain powers in reference to seized property of persons who may be enemy aliens in a technical sense but who were nevertheless friendly with the United States. If those people prove to be unfriendly to the United States which we consider to be inimical to our interests, I am sure there will be nothing done for them.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wish to know whether under the provisions of this bill individuals who suffered losses and damages because of the attack on Hawaii on December 7, 1941, will be in a position to be heard?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed they would under title 2 of the bill. Their claims should be considered by the Commission

and the recommendations made by the Commission to the Congress for legislation to handle such claims will then be heard by the Congress and the matter settled.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I assume from the gentleman's statement, then, that persons who have suffered can look forward to presenting their claims when and if this bill is enacted into law.

Mr. HINSHAW. They will have an opportunity of presenting their claims for the purpose of information when the commission is established, but the claims would not be adjudicated until after the Commission had reported the proper machinery for the adjudication of those claims and enabling law enacted.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. GEARHART. In further consideration of the subject raised by the Delegate from Hawaii, I do not believe the gentleman wants him to understand that title 2 will validate claims of that type.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is nothing in the bill anywhere that validates any claim. I have not said so.

Mr. GEARHART. That is true; and under title 2 a Commission is set up which will decide whether or not claims of that type shall be considered by the Congress, and recommend legislation accordingly.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Commission does not decide anything; it makes a recommendation to Congress.

Mr. GEARHART. And recommends to Congress accordingly.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right, that is perfectly right.

Now, I would be very glad to answer to the best of my ability any questions the Members may have in mind concerning any portion of the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Under title 2 of the gentleman's bill is it not correct for me to assume that those men who were in the armed forces and who were prisoners of war and victims of atrocities, especially at the hands of the Japanese, will have their day in court to present their claims?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not for adjudication of the claim but for the presentation of the type of claim for consideration by the Commission in connection with its recommendations to the Congress for handling such claims. They are entitled, in my opinion, of course, to the greatest measure of damages of any persons in the United States who suffered damages at the hands of enemy governments; and I trust that the Commission will in its report recommend that priority No. 1 be given to the claims of members of the armed forces who suffered so horribly at the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the gentleman will yield for another question.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not proper for me to say that title 2 was written into this bill mostly because of the highly complicated problem confronting the

committee in its effort to perfect a bill which would set up the machinery to take care of the claims of former military prisoners of war.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is, of course, absolutely correct. It was written in the bill, not in the terms of the language of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania known as H. R. 1000, but his having called that subject so forcibly to the attention of the committee as an exceedingly important type of claim made it incumbent upon the committee to order the study made and a probability that in the course of this study to be made by the Commission that such claims as the gentleman refers to would be given priority No. 1.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. That does not in any way indicate that there might be a change in the present law with reference to the responsibility of the Government in connection with the compensation paid to men of the service who for one reason or another have become disabled.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not quite understand the gentleman. There is no reference to compensation of servicemen in this bill. They are compensated under Veterans' Administration laws and regulations.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand it, this proposes to set up a war-claims commission whereby anyone who receives injuries, whether in the military service or otherwise, and who becomes disabled because of the action of the Japanese or the Germans, may file a claim for damages for that injury.

Mr. HINSHAW. The veterans of the war are now taken care of under veterans' legislation by the Veterans' Administration and by laws that were passed in the interest of the armed forces. There is no question, in my mind, but what such persons who engaged in the march of Bataan, and other similar horrible cruelties, are entitled to reparation and damages for violation of the Geneva Convention. However, this committee in its inability to spend sufficient time to go completely into the subject has recommended the commission to make a complete study and report to the Congress.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I insert a resolution adopted by the American Legion at its national convention last August. The resolution follows:

Resolution 811

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in New York City, N. Y., August 28-31, 1947, That the legislative committee urge the Congress to expedite prompt consideration and fair settlement of the claims of American citizens and their dependents who were interned as civilian prisoners by enemies of the United States during World War II, and further urge the Congress to immediately consider and determine their requests for rehabilitation and relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EFFECT OF BECKWORTH COMMITTEE AMENDMENT
TO TITLE I OF H. R. 4044

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, prior to the passage of section 34, American creditors had recourse to section 9 of the act, which permitted them to sue the Custodian for payment of their debts. Section 34 took away this right and substituted an equitable distribution principle for the first-come-first-served principle. In order to be eligible as a claimant under section 34, the creditor must be an American or Philippine citizen, resident, or corporation. The statutory scheme also provides for a system of priorities in the event the vested property account of the debtor is insufficient to pay all the claims. Under this priority schedule, wage and salary claims under \$600 and all other claims for services rendered, for expenses incurred in connection with such labor or services, for rent, for goods and materials delivered to the debtor, and for payments made to the debtor for goods and services not received by the claimant are to be paid prior to the payment of any large creditors. The experience of the Office of Alien Property has been that the average claim asserted is a small claim in connection with services rendered, such as claims for wages and salaries in fairly small amounts, and claims for goods sold and delivered.

After the passage of the statute, the Office of Alien Property took extensive steps to notify American creditors that their rights under section 9 (a) no longer existed and that the sole procedure was under section 34. Approximately 80,000 claim forms have thus far been distributed to the public upon request. No forms have been distributed except on request. Approximately 30,000 debt claims have thus far been received by the Office. It is anticipated that 50,000 claims will eventually be filed. These claims total approximately \$400,000,000. Although it is difficult to estimate the amount which will eventually be paid out as the result of the allowance of debt claims, it is believed that a maximum of \$35,000,000 will be paid to American creditors under section 34. A great many of the claims will be disallowed because of ineligibility of claimant or invalidity of the debt. Other claims, while allowed in full, will not be paid in full because the debtor's account is insolvent in respect to the amount of claims asserted against it.

The energies of the Office of Alien Property have been directed to answering requests for information concerning the program and preparation of necessary procedures for its successful and efficient operation. An average of from 8 to 10 attorneys have been working on all aspects of the debt claims program, and the services of 35 administrative personnel have been utilized. This personnel has been receiving and docketing debt claims, processing the claims to eventual allowance or disallowance, and

handling correspondence with reference to claims. More than 2,000 letters a month have been sent in response to inquiries from the public.

The statute provides for the issuance of bar orders barring claims in respect of particular debtors named therein. Thus far, three bar orders have been issued and a fourth is in process:

First. Bar Order No. 1, affecting 308 debtors, fixed September 2, 1947.

Second. Bar Order No. 2, affecting 50 debtors, fixed December 17, 1947.

Third. Bar Order No. 3, affecting 150 debtors, fixed February 25, 1948.

Approximately 1,500 creditors' claims are involved in the issuance of these orders. Eleven claims, totaling \$17,000, have been allowed thus far. Processing of eleven additional claims have been completed and they are now before the Director of the Office of Alien Property for approval. All the claims against the debtors listed in the three bar orders have been processed to some extent, and many of them are in their final stage. In excess of 200 claims are presently being actively worked on by the debt claims personnel.

It would be impossible to estimate the amount of money expended by the Office of Alien Property on the debt claims program, or the amount of money spent by persons to assert and perfect their claims filed in reliance on the statute. The statute, in general, is designed to protect the interest of the small American creditor. Many claims have been asserted by holders of bonds issued by the German or Japanese Government, and individual concerns of these countries. These claims by the American investor will not be allowed until the smaller claims have been allowed in accordance with the statutory priority.

The effect of the amendment would be to place Congress in the position of having reneged on its promise to satisfy the valid claims of American creditors, while at the same time having deprived them of their previous right of suit under section 9 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

I understand this amendment, suggested by Representative BECKWORTH, was passed by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by a slender margin.

The Judiciary Committee, which considered a similar amendment, when that committee presented its bill concerning enemy alien property in the last Congress—which bill passed—rejected it decisively in committee. That was August 1946. The Congress passed the bill without the amendment. What we rejected then, should we accept now?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LOY HENDERSON: THE MAN WHO RUNS OUR STATE DEPARTMENT'S NEAR EAST DIVISION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, for many months we have been hearing charges and denunciations of our State Department's Near Eastern Section. Usually

the name of Loy Henderson, Director of Near Eastern and African Affairs, is repeated as the man who has been willfully and wantonly distorting the foreign policy of the United States as enunciated by the Congress and the President.

Today, at last, we have a careful analysis of the facts, a sifting of the evidence regarding the record of this controversial State Department official. I am referring to the current series of articles in the New York Post entitled "Man in the Saddle, Arabian Style," by Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler, in which a meticulous and dispassionate study exposes the true danger involved in permitting the direction of the enormously powerful and strategic Near Eastern Section to rest in the hands of Loy Henderson.

HENDERSON HAS POLICY OF HIS OWN

The Van Devander-Wechsler series does not indicate any deep Machiavellian plots by Henderson; they do not show any instances where this man has personally gained or profited by distorting our foreign policy. They do show that Henderson has been working with fanatical zeal, for a backward and decayed policy—out of conviction. This man Henderson has a foreign policy of his own, based on such deep-seated prejudices and biases that he functions as a virtual propagandist for feudalism and imperialism in the Middle East, in conflict with progressive principles and democratic interests of the United States.

Essentially, the charge against Henderson is that he is pro-Arab League, that he is a fellow traveler of the British Colonial Office as regards Palestine, that he has built up an organization within the State Department which has persistently aided and abetted Anglo-Arab policies in Palestine and elsewhere. This group has thwarted every practical attempt to assist the Jews in Palestine, and to support any program of political change in the Near East. I know not, and care less, what Mr. Henderson's motives may be. Presumably he believes that he can best serve his country's interests by yoking us to every wazir, satrap, and pasha of the Near East. We are not interested in motives, but in results, and the evidence has now been presented which clearly demonstrates that this man is completely unfit, on the basis of his record and performance, to develop a policy in accord with our interests and traditions.

ARGUMENT FALLS APART

In closing I should like to point out that Henderson will probably justify everything he has done by claiming that he has been building a "bulwark against communism." This argument falls apart when one realizes that it is the British-Arab feudal policy in the Middle East which is the greatest cause for communism among the Arab masses. We, the United States, must not be trapped into the belief that we can check communism in the Near East by subsidizing barbarism, polygamy, savagery, and banditry. If it is Mr. Loy Henderson's pleasure to advocate such a course, let him do so on his own as a private citizen and not as an official of the State Department and a servant of the American people drawing public pay.

Since we are so economy minded, I strongly recommend that we find out if we are not throwing our money away by tolerating a key official in the State Department whose very presence is a stumbling block to the effective execution of American foreign policy.

I call on the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate the entire role of the Near Eastern Division and Henderson in particular, and further, I urge that the House Appropriations Committee consider their appropriation for Henderson's division in the State Department in the light of the findings of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—1
LOY HENDERSON RUNS OUR STATE DEPARTMENT
NEAR EAST DIVISION
(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—Loy Henderson's name is seldom in the headlines. Most Americans have never heard of him; and few would include him in their list of men who today are decisively shaping great world events.

This comparative obscurity is of Henderson's own choosing. It is one of the significant and enlightening facts about the man who, more than any other individual, influences day-to-day American foreign policy in the critical hot spots of Greece, Palestine, and the whole Near East.

Behind his private silken curtain Henderson pursues certain deeply held objectives for America with selfless intensity. When, as sometimes happens, his personal foreign policy deviates from the basic principles laid down in higher echelons of the Government, few rounds of the resultant struggle seep out through the muted walls of the State Department.

There is no front-page crisis that might precipitate a show-down over who is really running American foreign policy.

Represents the firm hand of United States foreign policy

Henderson occupies one of the more luxurious offices in the new State Department Building. The card on the door identifies him as director of the department's "Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs." After he passes through this portal at an early 8 o'clock each morning, the director's glance sweeps around a large room in which the spectacular decorations are a brilliantly colored tiger-skin rug and an 8-foot oil painting of a nineteenth century Bey of Tunis. In one corner is an intimate grouping of leather sofa, chairs, and coffee table for relaxed conversation.

As he crosses to his desk, Henderson's gaze lingers for a moment on a glass-covered table-top map of the vast territory throughout which he represents, not the disembodied voice but the very material hand, of American foreign policy. Henderson almost automatically directs attention to this map as he discusses his work with visitors. The territory there outlined starts with Greece in the west, crosses the Dardanelles to Turkey, embraces Palestine, Iran, and Iraq and sweeps on to include Pakistan, India, Ceylon, and Burma, newly freed from British rule and established as an independent state. Southward Henderson's sphere of influence within the State Department includes all of still-somnolent Africa.

It's a big responsibility, taken very seriously

For United States relations with this tremendous area, Henderson accepts a personal responsibility, and it is a responsibility that he takes very seriously. He has more than the normal career diplomat's contempt for the lack of information, and the possibly ulterior motives, of political superiors who may not share his approach to any given problem.

When there is disagreement a process of patient attrition sets in, which almost inevitably results in Henderson's winning a partial, if not a total, victory. After all, the Secretary of State and even the President are dependent on Henderson's office and its consular outposts for information about events and forces in the Middle East, as well as for the execution of established United States policies in that area.

In carrying out the duties of his vitally important and strategic office Henderson is guided not only by the directives of established authority but equally by the inner prickings of an exceptionally severe and stubborn conscience which from earliest boyhood has made it either difficult or impossible for him to deviate from what he conceives to be the line of duty. There is no record of his conscience ever having won less than a draw against high Government policy.

Henderson is not a product of political patronage. As a civil-service employee he has steadily risen in the State Department's ranks through the administrations of five Presidents—Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. The results of next November's elections are unlikely to affect his position or diminish his influence, though it may be suspected that he would be happier with a Taft in the White House.

One of his guiding principles is a firm belief that friendly relations with the Arab world are of great, if not overriding, importance to the people of the United States. Problems in the Near and Middle East are likely to be inspected chiefly in the light of what he calls "our Arab policy"—a fact which has not increased the confidence of Jewish groups in his impartiality on the burning issues of Palestine. That the suspicion with which these groups regard him has some justification is indicated by his admonition to a new colleague several years ago that American espousal of a Jewish state would "wreck our whole Arab policy."

When the issue of partitioning Palestine recently came before the United Nations for decision Henderson tacitly recognized a widespread distrust of his motives by requesting Secretary of State Marshall to relieve him of any direct participation in the United Nations discussions.

Palestine case settled, no talk of resigning

The Palestine issue has now been adjudicated, and the United States is committed to a solution of Arab-Jewish rivalries which would appear to confront the Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs with a personal problem. He has shown no disposition to resign, however, and his superiors apparently are willing to leave the day-to-day conduct of Palestinian policy in his hands, although there are unconfirmed rumors that a transfer to another post may be in the works.

Henderson's passion for anonymity has provided a shield against widespread criticism. One of the few frontal attacks on him was made last year by Bartley C. Crum, liberal Republican lawyer who served on the joint Anglo-American Committee on Palestine.

Bart Crum, writing of his experience in The Silken Curtain, reported initial briefing, included this admonition from Loy Henderson:

"There is one fact facing both the United States and Great Britain, Mr. Crum. That is the Soviet Union. It would be wise to bear that in mind when you consider the Palestine problem."

Bartley Crum's guns clearly aimed at him

This interesting insight into Henderson's approach to the Palestinian issue was allowed to pass without challenge; but when Crum later charged flatly that State Department officials on the "middle level" were deliberately sabotaging Palestinian policies laid down by the President and the Secretary of State and conveying private assurances to the Arabs, there was a resounding backfire. Al-

though Crum did not name names, his guns clearly were aimed at Loy Henderson.

Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, intercepted the attack. He replied with considerable heat that the responsible officials of the State Department stood behind everything that went out from the Department.

The incident demonstrated, as perhaps Loy Henderson's whole career proves, that an able, single-minded, and determined individual can swing a lot more than his own weight as long as he is able to give the boss the right answers at the right time. The career organization of the State Department provides exceptional opportunities for such exceptional men.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—2
HENDERSON'S FORTUNES SAG IF UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN AMITY GROWS

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—To people who meet him socially, Loy Wesley Henderson seems like an orthodox member of the striped pants diplomatic club. The director of the State Department's Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs is amiable, urbane, and mannered, as if conscious that he is the wearer of an old-school tie. His personality is concealed—or perhaps illuminated—by a sort of gray protective coloration.

He has a faint gray mustache and sparse gray hair, starting well back from the forehead. He dresses in conservative grays and wears sedate ties.

If the portrait conforms to the stereotype of the wealthy young man of the upper classes who has set the prevailing fashion in our diplomatic league, it is slightly deceptive; or perhaps simply an evidence of Henderson's adaptability. He is in fact—as his middle name inevitably suggests—the son of a Methodist minister. There were no silver spoons around at his birth, and he toiled at a variety of jobs—in a steel mill, a rubber factory, and the Kansas wheat fields—to help finance his own education.

Henderson and an identical twin brother, christened Roy, were born not quite 56 years ago—the date was June 28, 1892—on their grandfather's farm in the foothills of the Ozark Mountains 3 miles from Rogers, Ark. Their grandfather, who was of Scotch (and some Irish) extraction, was a veteran of the Indian, Mexican, and Civil Wars who had taken his family south in reconstruction days. Loy remembers him as a valiant soldier, blind in his old age, who told fascinating stories of Indian warfare.

As a minister's son he believed the old legend

Loy's father was not the typical Methodist minister, which may explain why Loy has confounded all of the form players by his sober and painfully conscientious progress through a quarter-century up the State Department's career ladder, instead of going to the dogs as ministers' sons are—perhaps fictionally—supposed to do.

The Reverend George Milton Henderson, who now is retired and resides in Colorado, was only 22 and just finishing his theological studies when the twins were born. The young minister was a hearty extrovert, a man of broad social consciousness and of virtually no bigotry. In most of the middle-western towns where he preached during his active career, the local Catholic priests became his closest friends.

The budding diplomat whom he had fathered turned out to be a serious, introspective, and studious youth. Young Loy discovered Shakespeare early in life. By the time he was 13 he had read most of the English classics and was eager to go on to Latin and Greek. The ancient classics still are his favorite bedtime literary fare.

Death of twin brother altered course of his life

Loy Henderson would have become a lawyer, and doubtless a shrewd and successful one, if it had not been for the death of his twin brother in 1920. This was a deep personal tragedy which altered the whole course of the surviving twin's life. And in view of the powerful and highly individual influence which Henderson has since acquired over vital phases of American foreign policy one is tempted to consider his personal tragedy as an event of more than passing importance in world history.

The twins were physically identical and spiritually closely attached to each other. They shared a passion for individuality which was constantly thwarted by their similar tastes—not only in clothes, but in girl friends. Minor problems which arose from this struggle for individuality were settled by the toss of a coin. As the result of one such chance judgment, Loy grew an adolescent mustache, while Roy went clean-shaven.

The boys had decided to study law and set up a partnership. Loy, after being graduated from Northwestern University, was in his second year at Denver University Law School, and Roy was at Harvard Law, when the United States entered the First World War in 1917. Both promptly volunteered. Roy was accepted for officers' training camp, but in the course of his training suffered an injury from which he later died after he had resumed his studies at Harvard.

Loy was turned down by the Army because of a partial stiffness of his right arm—the permanent result of a boyhood fall from a tree. He thereupon joined the Red Cross and was sent to France and later Germany, where he also served after the war as a member of an interallied commission for reparations and for repatriation of prisoners of war.

Upon his return to the United States in the fall of 1921, Henderson decided to abandon law and to seek a career in diplomacy. The springs of that decision went back many years to the summer of 1904, when Loy was a boy of 12 and his father was pastor of a church in Jefferson, Ohio. The leading citizen of Jefferson was the American author and editor, William Dean Howells. That summer Howells' brother, a United States consular official, visited Jefferson and excited the romantic imagination of all of the small boys by appearing on the streets as an exotic figure in shorts, with helmet, and deep tropical tan.

He took the civil-service examination in January of 1922, and 4 months later received his first appointment. The assignment was a disappointment, because Loy had asked for service in eastern Europe, and he was sent to Ireland instead.

His fortunes go down when alliance thrives

Looking back, it is significant that Henderson's chief interest as long ago as 1922, was in eastern Europe. Way ahead of his fellow citizens he had spotted the new Soviet Union of Russia as the villain in the world drama. During the twenties and the thirties, when he served in many parts of the world, his intellectual hobby was to keep track of the activities of the Communist International. His premonitions were strengthened into a firm conviction during 2 years he served at Riga, the outpost from which we kept an eye on the Soviet homeland during the long era of nonrecognition, and later by 2 years in the Embassy at Moscow.

To some extent, Henderson's fortunes in the State Department have gone up and down in reverse ratio to the cordiality of United States-Soviet relations. His influence was in temporary eclipse during the period of the wartime grand alliance, when he was shunted off to Baghdad for 2 years as Ambassador to Iraq.

It was in mid-April of 1945, just as prospects of postwar differences began to cloud United States-Russian relations, that he was recalled to Washington and placed in his present key office, from which he directs United States policy in the tinder-box area.

Responsibility for the steady deterioration of relations between the world's two greatest powers since that time cannot be isolated in Moscow or Washington and certainly not in the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs. The downward course of those relations has, however, had the result of increasing the prestige and strengthening the hand of the man who now has no doubt that he was right all along about Russia.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—3
ATMOSPHERE ABOUT HENDERSON AGGRESSIVELY ANTI-SOVIET

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Loy Henderson, wife of the State Department's Director of Near Eastern and African Affairs, frequently is referred to by casual acquaintances as a White Russian. This is a technical error, but the political connotations are accurate enough. Mrs. Henderson is forthrightly and, for a diplomat's wife, even indiscreetly anti-Soviet in her feelings.

She is a Latvian by birth, the former Elise Marie Heinrichson, daughter of a once well-to-do landowner whose fortunes have shrunk as a result of German pillaging and Communist expropriation. She and Henderson met when he was a United States consul at Riga in 1927-29, and she was a music student at the conservatory. They were married in 1930 and she is now an American citizen.

As such she was with her husband in Moscow from 1934 to 1938 when he served as second secretary and, later, first secretary in the American Embassy. Mrs. Henderson apparently made very little effort to conceal her political dislike of her Communist hosts during that period. Several years later, when she was back in Washington, diplomatic circles buzzed eagerly with the story of how Mrs. Henderson, a charming and gracious figure in Capital society, had verbally and almost physically assailed Mme. Oumansky, wife of the then Russian ambassador to the United States, at a dinner party in the home of Joseph E. (Mission-to-Moscow) Davies.

The incident occurred when the ladies had retired to the drawing room for after-dinner coffee. A horrified butler summoned Davies from his brandy, and an actual physical encounter was averted.

His anti-Soviet emotions are constantly cropping out

While Henderson's own anti-Soviet feelings are necessarily suppressed in public, his colleagues in the State Department are well aware that he shares his wife's personal reaction to the present Russian regime. His strong emotions on this subject constantly crop out in top-level staff meetings, even on details which do not fall within his own territorial sphere of influence. In several specific cases with which he was not directly concerned he has argued vehemently against granting visas for known Communists to enter—or leave—the United States.

Publicly, Henderson makes no secret of the fact that he has viewed world Communist activities with alarm for some 30 years. His early concern apparently sprang from a basic political conservatism, but in the present atmosphere of Washington this consistently held bias can readily be made to pass for keen foresight.

The Hendersons tend to associate with persons of similar views. One of his closest friends is Constantine Brown, venerable conservative diplomatic columnist for the Washington Star, who regularly indoctrinates his readers with the inevitability, if not the desirability, of an armed decision with Russia.

Enjoys all of his work, including the soirees

Mr. and Mrs. Henderson live unpretentiously at the Blackstone Hotel in Washington. They attend diplomatic social events, but as a rule only those relating to the Near and Middle Eastern countries which constitute Henderson's chief area of responsibility in the State Department. Henderson regards attendance at such affairs as a duty, but not necessarily as a chore. It is just another part of his work, all phases of which he enjoys.

The Hendersons share an interest in music. He studied violin from the age of 6 until 16 and became more than ordinarily proficient. He never touches the instrument now, because he cannot spare the time for regular practice, and he thinks there is nothing more unpleasant than poor violin playing. Their indulgence in music consists of attendance at concerts and an occasional evening of recorded music—usually the works of Brahms, Beethoven, or Tchaikovsky. They go to the movies only three or four times a year. Henderson likes "good" movies—a category from which he specially excludes tawdry musicals in technicolor.

A social smoker and drinker, has little time for exercise

Henderson is moderate in his self-indulgences. He smokes four or five cigars a week, usually in the afternoon when he has a visitor in his office. He never thinks of smoking when he is alone. Drinking is on a similar basis. He takes a social drink—preferably a dry martini—only when the occasion seems to call for it. He gets very little exercise. He has played golf from time to time in the past, but without ever taking the game seriously.

All of this adds up to the picture of a man who finds complete outlet for his energies in his work. Henderson arises at 6 and his normal day at the office is from 8 a. m. to about 7 p. m. He retires by midnight, and finds that 6 or 6½ hours' sleep a night is sufficient.

The extensive State Department organization over which Henderson presides is a remarkably tight-knit unit of men who agree generally with each other and with the chief. Its ideological and political orientation has changed little under Henderson; his predecessor as head of the office, Wallace Murray, was a Foreign Service officer of very similar views.

His staff joins in calling for friendship with Arabs

The Near Eastern and Middle Eastern Divisions of his office are packed with men who share Henderson's outlook on the world in general and on the overriding importance of our relations with the Arabs in particular. Many of the east Asian specialists are sons of missionaries who labored long in Arab territory. To them Beirut is the capital of Arab nationalism and a crucial zone in the world diplomatic struggle. They have grown up to believe that there is, as one of them is reported to have observed, no point in risking our friendship with 80,000,000 Arabs for the sake of a few thousand Jews.

This attitude is deeply engraved in the minds of most of Henderson's colleagues in the Near Eastern Division, in which the counterbalancing influence of pro-Zionist partisans is notably lacking. The explanation—if one were ever made—of the virtual exclusion of Jewish employees from the division would probably be that they are likely to suffer from bias. And it would be strongly emphasized that there was nothing personal in this comment.

In the past, anti-Zionist voices in the State Department have skillfully exploited the divisions among Jewish organizations as justification for American apathy, and this tendency still continues. Henderson, for example, is now inclined to attribute Arab intransigence to the agitation of Jewish revisionists, a comparatively small faction

which spurns the UN partition plan and would like to extend the Jewish state to all of Palestine and Transjordan.

He has been known to suggest that there would be infinitely greater chance of a peaceful conclusion of the Palestine strife if the Arabs were convinced that the Jewish homeland would be permanently confined within the boundaries laid down by the United Nations. Meanwhile, Henderson fears that if there should be any armed clash between Americans and Arabs over Palestine it would embitter relations between this country and the Arab world for generations.

**MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—4
GREEKS MUST HAVE A WORD FOR HENDERSON'S
ENTHUSIASM**

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—For 25 years Loy Henderson has served in widely scattered areas of our diplomatic network. He has accumulated a substantial body of fact, local lore, and incidental intelligence. He has not been subject to congressional cross-examination, campaigns for reelection, or any other grueling review.

He is a member of the United States foreign-service "club," one of the most tightly knit mutual protective associations ever formed anywhere. He has seen Cabinets, Secretaries of State and department heads rise and fall.

In most other areas of Government his own fortunes would have been affected by these fluctuations. But while the State Department changes at the top and bottom (there was, for example, an influx of young liberals into lower-echelon places during the war) it remains extraordinarily constant in the crucial middle. That is where the civil-service career men hold sway.

And the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, which Henderson took over in April of 1945, after two wartime years in the relative oblivion of Iraq, is peculiarly loaded with members of that fraternity.

Two big diplomatic fights involve his department

In the ensuing 2½ years, Henderson's division has been intimately involved in two of the fateful diplomatic battles of the postwar era—the Greek crisis and the fight for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The record of his deeds in these affairs is not spelled out in public communiqués. In accordance with State Department protocol, he formally depicts himself as an agent carrying out orders shaped by men of higher rank than himself.

These reticent disclaimers are not entirely justified. For the fact is that, in the long and decisive intervals between top policy decisions, day-to-day judgments are made, cables are dispatched, answers to inquiries are drafted. Even if a superman were designated Secretary of State he could scarcely be expected to read and review all the documents that are sent out under his name.

Both the Secretary and the Under Secretary must perforce rely on division heads for guidance and information as well as for the performance of carefully defined chores. With the advent of Secretary Marshall this dependence was increased; the Secretary would be the first to admit that he had not been briefed on all the complex facts of international life before he took office. Unlike former Secretary Byrnes, Marshall does not attempt to carry the State Department in his brief case.

His enthusiasm centers on our role in Greece

Just what part Henderson played in the formulation of the so-called Truman doctrine of aiding Greece and Turkey to resist Communist encroachments is not a part of the public record; presumably it was substantial. In any event, he has accepted the Truman doctrine, with its scarcely hidden threat that this country might use force to pre-

serve Greek and Turkish national integrity, with an enthusiasm that has not always characterized his views of high policy as laid down by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Henderson is much less alarmed over the prospect that United States troops might have to be sent to Greece than he is, for instance, over the possibility of their employment against Arabs in Palestine; which he thinks would be a major tragedy.

Opinions differ as to his real position

Evaluations of Henderson's role in the execution of some phases of the Greek-aid program differ markedly in the Capital. For example there are those who regard him as a supporter of the rightist government, but men who were identified with Paul Porter's early economic mission found to their avowed surprise—that the head of the Near Eastern Office appeared sympathetic to the desperate need for economic reconstruction and reform in Athens as a corollary of our anti-Communist stand.

Last autumn Henderson flew to Greece to iron out a sharp clash between members of ex-Governor Griswold's administrative group and the embassy crowd over the extent to which we should unofficially insist on a broadening of the Government and a clean-up of corruption. He is credited here with being instrumental in bringing the elderly Liberal leader, Themistocles Sophoulis, into the Government as Premier. But whether this was an actual concession by the ruling bloc in Athens, or whether Sophoulis merely became a prisoner of the rightists are matters of current controversy.

The greater question is whether Henderson and his prototypes in the State Department have really accepted the concept to which they so often pay lip-service—the notion that effective resistance to communism requires a genuine tolerance of non-Communist leftists who may be committed to varying degrees of social change.

Historically our emissaries abroad have wined and dined with kings and rarely felt the common touch. They have tended to identify American interests with maintenance of the economic status quo everywhere. In the light of his background in that service an address which Henderson delivered last October on some current problems of modern Greece may be revealing.

He challenges aspersions on Greek politicians

After declaring that the people of Greece still cherish the ideals of tolerance and democracy, he went on:

"This spirit of liberalism is not the monopoly of any Greek party or group. It is deeply imbedded among both royalists and republicans and in most of the political parties of the present parliament regardless of whether such parties are in the center or to the right or left of center."

In the same address, Henderson challenged the widespread American belief, which he is inclined to attribute to skillful Communist propaganda, that most Greek politicians are venal. He agreed that there are some unworthy politicians "in Greece as elsewhere," but he added emphatically:

"I have come back from Greece with the firm conviction that among the political leaders of that country can be found the same spirit of lofty patriotism and broad statesmanship as exists among political leaders in the United States or in any other country the government of which rests upon the freely expressed will of the population."

Steeped in classics, puts finger on changes

For an appropriate comment on that statement one can turn to the Saturday Evening Post's correspondent Demaree Bess, who in the January 3 issue wrote with scornful amusement of Americans who got along so well with Greek Government politicians that they described them to me as just like our politicians at home. As most SEP readers know, Bess is anything but a leftist.

It has been mentioned earlier in this series that Henderson still enjoys reading the ancient classics and contemplating the change in mores since ancient times. One of the significant changes that he likes to point out is that the ancients judged men solely by what they did, while our law and custom gives major weight to the question of intent.

Henderson regards our modern standard as an advance in jurisprudence, but he still philosophizes, somewhat tritely, that a man who means well can do as much harm as one bent on evil. Time will show whether or not that may be for himself a fitting epitaph.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with what has been said before that this legislation is worth while. It is good legislation. It should have been passed immediately after the conclusion of the war rather than at this late date, in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, a number of Members of the House have indicated a great deal of interest in the passage of legislation that will bring about a definite policy with reference to alien property. I have spoken to quite a number of the Members. Often it is said that this is a complicated subject, which is true. It is one of the most complicated subjects to handle, if the individual Members of Congress undertake to be fair to all concerned, but because it is complicated is no reason why the Congress should not undertake to solve it in a just and equitable way.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], for the good work he has done in the past on this question. I am aware of the fact that long before most of us were paying much attention to the enemy-property problems he was doing a very substantial and constructive work with reference to this important subject.

The policy that we shall have as our own with reference to alien property, if this legislation passes, will be a just and fair policy. Much has been said about confiscating property. We are not confiscating any property. The property already is the property of the American Government. It is our job now to try to handle it in a fair and just way, being fair to everyone who feels he has an interest in this particular property.

Let us examine for a moment some of the values of property which our Alien Property Custodian contends we now have in our alien-property fund.

The report to which I refer was issued March 7, 1947. It showed that we have in round figures \$205,000,000 worth of German property; Japanese property of \$56,000,000; Italian property of \$17,000,000; Hungarian property of \$2,000,000; Rumanian property of \$1,000,000; Bulgarian property of about \$600,000, and over \$4,000,000 of property of nationals of formerly enemy occupied countries, making a total of some \$288,000,000. Of course some Italian property is in the process of being returned. That is a good deal of property which this Government already has title to.

Now, with reference to the question of claims, I have a clipping here which illustrates the kind of claims that are sometimes advanced. This headline

says, "Swiss firm sues United States for release of \$4,000,000." I will just read a part of it:

A Swiss firm said to be controlled by Germans asked the district court yesterday to compel the Justice Department to release securities said to be worth more than \$4,000,000. A court injunction was asked by the trustees for Henkel & Cie., of Basel, Switzerland. The company said the securities were seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act. However, the company contends it is not controlled by enemies as defined in the act.

I want to make this point at this time. Of course, a person who is seeking to recover enemy property today is not going to admit that he is an enemy of this Government. No. When he undertakes to get it back he comes as a friend. He comes alleging it was a mistake for our Government to have taken over his property. Of course, with a good deal of property available there are going to be hundreds of smooth and smart people coming in and presenting claims. You cannot censure anybody that has even a remote chance to recover for presenting a claim against a sum of money of around \$300,000,000. So the claims are coming in again as they did at the conclusion of World War I.

What took place after World War I? That is very significant with reference to enemy property. Incidentally, may I say at this point that in March and August 1946—I feel sure the dates are correct—laws were enacted on the statute books whereby our Alien Property Custodian could return enemy property and already he is giving enemy property back. With reference to what took place after World War I, I think you will find it mighty interesting to note this. Our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], a very able man, presented before the Congress not long ago a bill which has just been passed recently. The report has this significant paragraph in it. This bill, mind you, was before our committee in July:

The purpose of the Reed bill, H. R. 4043, as amended, and reported by the committee, is to change the order of the remaining unpaid priorities under section 4 of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 so as to place claims arising out of World War I of American citizens ahead of German claims.

That is a significant statement. The Congress had to pass a law with reference to World War I as late as July of 1947 to place the claims of American citizens ahead of German claims. How the Congress back in the years gone by ever came to the conclusion of placing its own citizens at a disadvantage to the citizens of a country that we fought, I cannot understand. But we had to do it; we passed the law to which I refer in 1947. What was said with reference to that legislation by its proponents?

German nationals as a result of World War I made claims against the United States for about \$650,000,000 as compared with \$1,500,000,000 of American claims against Germany. The claims of German nationals were allowed to the extent of \$453,000,000 as compared with \$275,000,000 allowed to American nationals on their much larger claims, and German nationals have actually been paid approximately \$409,000,000 as compared with only about \$173,000,000 to American nationals.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. While the gentleman is talking about World War I, what is the effect, the intent, or the purpose of extending at this time the provisions of section 203 (a) to war claims arising out of World War I?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am not sure I understand the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. I am referring to page 4 of the bill. Title II is entitled "War Claims Act of 1947," which is the subject of the legislation that is presently proposed. Section 203 (a) proposes to authorize the Commission that is established hereby to submit information also with respect to war claims arising out of World War I. What is the point of it?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Some claims of American citizens have not yet been settled, claims which arose out of World War I. That is just exactly what the Reed bill was trying to get at—to give some American claims a preference over German claims they did not have.

Mr. MACKINNON. Claims against the United States Government?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No; claims against the German Government by American citizens.

Mr. MACKINNON. Does the gentleman believe there is any possibility of recovering any money on these claims?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not know. We passed the Reed bill in July of last year, undertaking to help American citizens in that connection. Yes, I feel this legislation stands a chance to help American claimants to which the gentleman refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I want to read a little bit more from Mr. REED's statement. Speaking before our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said:

I call attention to the fact that following the passage of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, heretofore referred to, and the release of the bulk of the property pledged for the American awards and claims, the United States concluded with Germany an agreement, heretofore referred to, known as the Debt Settlement Agreement of 1930 (45 Stat. 500). The United States under this agreement accepted German Government bonds, to be paid in 103 installments over a period of years, as evidence of Germany's indebtedness to American award holders and claimants and agreed "to accept the full faith and credit of Germany as the only security and guaranty for the fulfillment of Germany's obligations."

Germany paid only three of the 103 installments required to be paid by the Debt Settlement Agreement of 1930, its last payment being the installment due March 31, 1931.

Yes; I say it is incumbent on the Congress to take care of its own citizens who have claims against the nationals or against the governments that fought us. Under this legislation we can certainly do that.

I introduced a bill about 2½ years ago that included and would include our military personnel who suffered at the hands

of the enemy inhuman treatment. I definitely feel that the boys on Bataan who suffered inhuman treatment at the hands of the Japanese, and our soldiers in Germany and other European countries that suffered inhuman treatment at the hands of the Germans and others in European countries, should profit under the terms of legislation like this. Personally, if I had my way about the legislation, I would enable them to get something now. I think they deserve it. But this bill does better than nothing in that respect in that it gives them a chance to come before the Claims Commission and to present their claims. Of course that is not a lot of help. The fact that a person has a right to go before a Commission and present his side of something does not necessarily mean that he is going to get anything to satisfy his claim. One thing I hope for, however, by the terms of the legislation which we have before us is to retain in the bill an amendment which will stop the return of property "to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany"; also, I would like to do the same thing with reference to Japanese property. We passed alien-property bills in 1946, and, in my opinion, that was a great mistake, because already over \$2,000,000 of property has been returned. As I pointed out when the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] was addressing the committee a while ago a bill was discussed before our committee that morning having for its purpose the return of alien property to a person who "has been or is deemed to be a citizen of the United States." Who knows whether it will pass? If enough weight is brought behind it, it might pass. As the situation stands today, we are actually giving back to so-called foreign friendly nationals property they contend is theirs and at the same time saying to our own civilians and our own servicemen, "You wait, we want to study this question, and maybe then we will give you a chance to adjudicate your claims." My amendment should remain in the bill in the interest of keeping this property intact and giving all legitimate claimants an even break. I might mention this, that at the beginning of World War I, we took over a certain enemy property. At the beginning of World War II, we again took over property from some of the same companies, mind you, the same companies. I hope we will not have to take it from some of those same companies a third time.

A way to prevent that is to be careful about the return of the property.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman's statement that we should retain in the bill the amendment which will keep the property intact until we can adjudicate those claims. But there is one thing that is not clear in my mind about this bill. We set up a Commission here to do something, but they do not have any power to adjudicate those claims, do they?

Mr. BECKWORTH. They do not. They just study them.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then what happens?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Well, you know what may happen or could happen. The same thing might happen as in the case of the study of a commission which made a report on transportation headed by a fellow named Webb, from Kentucky, with reference to freight rates. Nothing was ever done, which I regret. There is no guarantee that anything will happen. That is the reason I say that my original bill carried a provision, and I am still in accord with that original bill, which would definitely help our service people at this time and our civilians, too. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] said, even though we shall pay or give emergency relief to a group of these people who suffered in the Philippines and on Wake, Guam, and Midway, yet we are not undertaking to say that we are adjudicating their claims at all by this legislation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to clear up one matter. On page 6, section 302, of the bill, we find the following:

The term "civilian" means only a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this title, was a citizen of the United States.

I would like to know if the Filipinos before they obtained their independence were considered citizens of the United States and would therefore come under this title.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am not sure I can give you an accurate answer on that, but I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] to answer that question please.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Filipinos were not.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean he has finished debate on his side?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No; I did not mean that. I simply meant I did not have any requests for time just now.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, we have used more time on this side than the gentleman has used. Will the gentleman use some of his time?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was being considered I appeared before the committee, because the committee was also considering the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and the bill which I had introduced, which would give the same relief to veterans who were prisoners of war of the Japanese that it would give to civilians.

As the bill has been reported out, I am very much disappointed that al-

though the relief given by title III is very meager, nevertheless, the veterans who were prisoners of war have been left out. I propose to offer an amendment so as to give them some relief. Those veterans who served under the flag of the United States in the Philippines were made prisoners of war and were maltreated almost beyond description. For example, one of the boys from New Mexico who came back, was maltreated by the Japanese. While a prisoner of war and while he was unconscious, they drove a nail through the top of his head. Fortunately, he did not die, but returned to this country after being a prisoner of war for many, many months; but he suffered continuously. Finally, he was taken to the hospital in Denver and the doctors there X-rayed his head and found this nail right in the top of his head. They drew the nail out. The result was that he became paralyzed completely for a period of time. Fortunately, he has recovered the use of his hands, but he has suffered beyond description.

Like this youngster, there are any number of cases of boys who were prisoners of war in Japan. I do not understand why we are going to leave them out. It may be said that they have received from the Federal Government some relief, but where they have so received some relief, this bill will permit the administrator to deduct the amount that has been received.

I hope that when the time comes the amendment which I will offer will be accepted by the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman is under some misapprehension.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I hope I am. I hope they are included.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a matter of fact, as has been stated on the floor before, this bill does not intend by its terms to provide for the payment of any reparation or any damages whatsoever. It provides for study of that question which is to be completed within 10 months and at the beginning of the next session of Congress a report will be made to the Congress concerning its recommendations about such things as priorities, standards, law, and, finally, legislation to provide for such priorities.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I understand that, and that is the reason I said the bill was not satisfactory. But, nevertheless, by title III you do give some relief to certain civilian internees, prisoners of war, but you excluded veterans from that category.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can assure the gentleman that the relief provided in title III for internees who were citizens of the United States in a lawful place, under the flag of the United States, is no more than has already been provided such people as are veterans, war contractors' employees, and others.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the veterans have been paid a sum because of their suffering, it can be deducted under this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no payment in title III of the bill that has anything to do with suffering. This is relief to people—Americans—who are destitute and sick because of long internment, starvation, and maltreatment at the hands of our enemies. In no sense is this a reparations bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Call it injury if you will, but the veteran should be entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is a disability payment just as the veteran's compensation is a disability payment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The veterans have not been paid disability payments commensurate with the suffering and injuries they received at the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the veteran is found to have a disability that entitles him to compensation under the provisions of the present law he is taken care of, is he not?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Certainly, and under the bill those payments would be deducted and he would be paid only the difference between what he has received and what the administrators determines to be the amount due for the actual injury. As I say, the amount the Federal Government pays for disability does not begin to pay for the suffering they underwent.

Mr. HINSHAW. Neither will the amounts to be paid under this bill compensate for the damage suffered by civilians. The claims for damages and reparations of the military personnel and the civilian internees and all others constitute another subject that is provided for as best we may at present under title II.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as I have seen several times during the course of the discussion of this bill and its provisions, there is a considerable amount of confusion in the minds of many people as to whether reparations or damages for suffering for maltreatment and so forth will be paid to the internees, the civilian internees in the Philippines.

There is no such intent in the bill. They have a claim or will have a claim which they can make for damages for maltreatment similar to the claim that will be made by a member of the armed forces who found himself being horribly maltreated by the Japanese military. Title 3 merely provides that certain civilians who were on their lawful enterprises, on United States Territorial soil, under the flag of the United States, and who were in fact encouraged to remain there, who were not warned to leave, and who performed noble and valiant service of a different kind than military to the United States, who now find themselves destitute and homeless, in want and suffering, and dying—just as the other people who were placed in internment camps and prisons—are entitled to such relief as the United States can give them;

but it is no greater certainly than the relief proposed for veterans of the war who had similar and even worse treatment, or for the employees of contractors of the Navy who have already been taken care of under another bill passed in 1943. It merely makes current the condition of the civilian internee. They have claims for damages for maltreatment. The veterans have damage claims for maltreatment. The employees of the contractors who were taken on Wake and Guam and elsewhere have claims for reparations and damages against the Japanese Government; and I trust and hope that those claims with all of the other varieties of claims for damages and reparations which will no doubt be presented to this commission will be considered and proper standards drawn for, let us say, the guidance of any court or any international reparations commission, and that furthermore, they will recommend to the Congress of the United States what shall be desirable on the part of our Government in the nature of additional reparations from the Japanese Government certainly, and perhaps also from the German Government, which is not now contemplated as receiving them.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of this bill presented here today. It is a good bill and, as the gentleman from Texas said, one that should have been enacted into law some time ago. I call attention to the fact that it is a technical bill. There are some phases of it that are somewhat difficult to understand but when we keep our thought on just what the bill proposes to do after all it is not so difficult to understand.

In the first place, there was something like \$235,000,000 to \$275,000,000 taken over by the United States on December 17, 1941, belonging to the Japanese and German Governments and the nationals of those governments. That money has been impounded. The question of what to do with it has arisen and, of course, up until now has not been definitely settled.

This bill proposes that the money shall be placed in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States. In other words, it becomes a part of the general fund out of which a determination later will be made as to what shall be done with it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has given a great deal of time and study to this important bill and the Nation is indebted to him for his efforts not only during this year but in the last session of Congress for bringing to the attention of the people the importance of this legislation and how this money should be expended in order to compensate those who we feel are justly entitled to receive it.

The question then arises as to the war claims commission, what kind of recommendations it will make and what will be done after those reports and recommendations have been made. It is important to remember, as I tried to bring out a few minutes ago in colloquy with

the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that there is no intention whatsoever that this proposal will change or offer any indication of changing the compensation that veterans receive under veterans' laws. This would merely place them in the category of receiving consideration in dispensing of these funds of the German and Japanese Governments and their nationals for damages sustained and injuries suffered during the time they were interned and in many instances suffered grave disabilities.

Mr. Chairman, we then have the problem as to what claims will be registered against this fund. There is some indication that the claims will go far beyond the amount of money available. This bill provides that the commission shall make a report and the Congress will have at least 6 months to make a determination as to what claims shall be paid, to whom, the priorities, the amounts, and so forth, under an amendment which the committee adopted offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. We might well keep in mind that at that time, according to the report here, it will be the prerogative of the Congress to determine if the Treasury of the United States will be called upon to pay not only the money that has been taken from the German and Japanese Governments and their nationals but any additional money that the commission might report and the Congress might determine justified to pay the entire claims presented to the commission. That is an important provision that the Congress should not overlook.

This provision and others that have been discussed are very well worth considering in adopting the policy contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this matter I think it has become apparent to everybody that this is a matter of considerable complication. It is a bit obscure to try to find out what the very meat of this thing is. I will therefore try to address myself to two of the portions of the bill which perhaps are most obscure to me, in the hope that in illuminating my own mind I can, perhaps, assist some of you who, like me, are asking questions of yourselves.

In the first place let me say this, that after listening to the witnesses before the committee there was no doubt in the mind of any member of the Committee, but that there was a great need for legislation on this subject. My command of the English language is utterly insufficient to portray the cruelties, the tortures, the hardships, and the indignities that were heaped upon our nationals, civilian and military, in this war. There is a great variety in those just claims for wrongs done by the enemy. They are as different as day is different from night, and that is a very poor parallel. They are as diverse as the human mind could imagine.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has pointed out, the

committee felt that in order to classify these claims, and in order to get some rationality out of this situation, the claims should be classified by experts who are qualified so to do; men who could spend a considerable amount of time, certainly much more time than the committee could spend, to determine the categories of claims that should be allowed.

Accordingly, the bill provides that a commission shall be set up for that precise purpose of determining the categories of claims which ought to be allowed, and that the commission shall then report back to the Congress as to what further legislation ought to be passed to implement those categories and claims which they might designate. Admittedly that is a slow process and is not going to come to fruition right away.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. As a matter of fact, that commission will not be able to complete its work and report to this Congress. Whatever report it renders will be submitted to another Congress which might be of an entirely different frame of mind than we are.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That may be very true, but of course we have to act in the light of the information we have at this time.

Mr. GEARHART. That is the very reason why I am suggesting in my amendment that we confer jurisdiction upon the Federal courts and allow them to proceed to adjudicate these claims and render judgment. They can be adjudicated against the cash which will be on deposit in the Treasury.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will perhaps have something to say at the time the gentleman offers his amendment on that subject.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe, according to the language in the bill, that any claimant for a fishing boat, a fishing boat that was sunk by German submarines, would have a proper opportunity under this bill to make a claim?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman has suggested one of a very great number of claims that might be presented for this Commission to recommend to the Congress. That is what this committee, which passed upon this legislation and prepared it, felt it was not qualified to pass upon. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not have the time to go into all the ramifications and the great variety of claims that might be presented.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But the Commission, under the provisions of this bill, would have the right to recommend and consider such a claim.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes, and they come back to us, setting up the kind of claims and categories which they think should be considered as proper claims.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. We now come to a very important matter, and that is the question that was raised by our colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He questioned the morality of taking the private property of alien citizens for the satisfaction of claims of American citizens as distinguished from claims of the Government.

Admittedly this is a very complex and difficult question. I have been able to convince myself that such a procedure is proper and morally correct, but I recognize quickly that there may be differences of opinion.

Let us consider it from the standpoint of whether it is morally objectionable for the United States Government to liquidate the assets now held or to be held by the Alien Property Custodian to be used for the claims of American citizens. In the first place, let it be said that from one standpoint there is no such thing as private property during time of war. Indeed, we nearly found that out in the United States, because our Government actually during the war periods, both in 1917 and 1941, took what it needed to carry on the war and to bring it to a successful conclusion. Most of us would recognize that as proper, whether morally right or not. The exigencies of the situation demanded it. We all know that there are few limitations on the power of the Government in time of war.

A rule which has been alluded to by the gentleman from Idaho in his discussion with another speaker on this subject originated, as I read history, back in the days when the Hanseatic League, a trading league in Europe, was in its ascendancy, toward the end of the Middle Ages. The wars of those days were matters between petty principalities primarily and to a considerable extent were private affairs.

So the international law grew up that private property, particularly as it applied to members of the Hanseatic League and the merchants trading in that League, should be inviolate in time of war. But I call your attention to the fact that now, under the situation in which we now live, as our warfare is now carried on, there is no such thing as private property in the sense that it is not subject to the exigencies of war.

From the standpoint it is morally proper for the United States Government to take the property of Japanese or other enemy aliens and apply it to the legitimate claims of American nations to compensate them for the hideous wrongs which were perpetrated on them.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. May I preface my remarks by saying that I favor the bill in general, but there are some doubts I should like to have removed? There

is no question about the right to take private property due to the necessities of war, but there is an equally strong right to give just compensation for that particular property.

Mr. DOLLIVER. To my mind, the obligation to make just compensation for the taking of that private property rests not with the United States Government but with the enemy government. If there is a Japanese national whose property is taken from him by the United States in the exigencies of war, then the duty to compensate that Japanese national rests not with us but with the Japanese Government.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It occurs to me that the gentleman is perfectly correct in what he says, that if there had been any issue as to whether or not this Government has a right to take someone's property, that issue should have been resolved when the war began because, according to the Department of Justice in a letter written June 18, 1947, this is the current status of the property. If the gentleman will bear with me I will read just a short paragraph:

The Department is unreservedly in favor of the principle of this title.

Reference is there made to title I of the bill.

The property of enemy countries and enemy nationals vested by the Government is, under existing law, the property of the United States.

We are not taking anybody's property.

The bill recognizes and states explicitly that the former owners of such property have no claim for its return.

That is the current situation today. The only claim they could have is what we might in our wisdom in the future give them.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman and thank him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, may I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that these claims which our citizens will have against the enemy countries will far exceed the conceivable amount which might be garnered from the private property of enemy nationals in this country.

The question therefore presents itself whether we should treat the enemy nationals in a way that we do not treat our own nationals and whether we should compensate enemy nationals first and our own nationals second, or, to put it in another way, whether we should put on the backs of the American taxpayers the burden for the compensation of our own nationals and relieve the enemy taxpayers from carrying that load.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I suggest to the gentleman that he remind the Members of the Congress that if perchance the United States had not won this war that the damages that would be paid by the United States in the form of reparations and things of that kind to the ones who might have been the victors, perhaps the Japanese, would be something out of this world. Practically all Americans would be indebted to the Japanese for the rest of their natural lives.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think the gentleman is entirely correct and thank him for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, one final aspect of this thing which I think is worth thinking about is that in recent months and years we have been called upon to assist some of our allies with loans and gifts. Some of us have said on the floor of the House that before we make any more gifts or loans we should require our Allies to liquidate the private holdings of their citizens in this country and apply that upon their needs. To my mind, there is considerable merit to such an argument.

But our failure to pass this kind of legislation and recognize the morality of this principle which is involved in this law would result in our compensating our enemies and penalizing our friends. We would require our Allies as a condition to our helping them that their citizens liquidate their holdings in the United States and at the same time return to our enemies' nationals their private holdings. We would give back to our enemies all the private property which we have taken and require our friends to liquidate all their private holdings in this country before they could get help from us.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does not the gentleman feel that the Government of the United States was very careful before it took over anybody's property at the beginning of this war?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course. We have to rely upon the administrative agencies and the executive department to see that that is done. Personally, I have the same confidence that the gentleman has expressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, most of the provisions of this bill have been pretty thoroughly discussed by other members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I voted to report the bill out of the committee and I believe it is good legislation, although I am frank to say that I do not think it deals adequately with the men and women who served in the armed forces and who were taken prisoners of war. I have no objection to the bill in its present form. It is perfectly all right with me to have this Commission study the problem, but I do not think the Congress should make payments dependent on certain assets that our Government has taken from enemy nationals or enemy countries for the funds with which to pay just com-

pensation to those who served in the armed forces. I think that servicemen who were prisoners of war are in a category separate and apart from the civilian internees. I hope that before this proposed Commission has a chance to complete its study of this problem and make its report to the Congress that the Congress itself, will approve other legislation that I believe should come out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Such legislation should make just and generous provision for those in the armed forces who were taken prisoners of war.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think the thought that is being expressed by the gentleman from Connecticut with respect to the rights of service men and women is one in which we all concur, so that if the language in the bill as now drawn does not sufficiently cover the subject to the gentleman's satisfaction, I am certain there will be no objection on the part of the committee in adding such language as would make it certain.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am glad the gentleman interrupted me. I did not intend to leave any impression of criticism of the committee or the bill. I said I voted for it, but I do not think this committee can deal with the problem thoroughly in the way it should be dealt with. It is perhaps a stop-gap. I certainly did not intend to be critical of the legislation. If I were, I would not have voted to report it out.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The veterans legislation which the gentleman has in mind, which would throw a presumption of disability in certain cases, a presumption which is not now granted by the Veterans' Administration, I think would be pretty much in order for the Veterans' Administration committee to bring out. I think I would be very happy to support such legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is exactly the thing that I wanted to express, that I think the Congress should write into law, so that the Veterans' Administration will have direct instructions, to grant a definite presumption of service connection for every man who was a prisoner of war for any length of time. Those men cannot prove that on a certain date they suffered from a certain illness. There were no records kept. They should not be called upon to offer any proof to the Veterans' Administration that the disability from which they are suffering today was in fact due to their term as a prisoner of war. They should be granted a very substantial rating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I welcome these last few minutes to make it clear that I am not finding fault with what this bill tries to do for men in the service, but rather to take advantage of

the opportunity to express the hope that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will before this commission completes its work, come in here with legislation that will put these men in a class separate and apart from either other service men or civilians.

It is rather difficult to write into a law adequate provisions that will take care of physical suffering. I listened to the testimony of men who appeared before our committee who described the indignities and suffering that prisoners of war were subjected to in the Japanese prison camps. It was beyond human comprehension; but still there is a degree of suffering that is just about 100 percent, and we must not forget that there are men who were not prisoners of war who came back from the battlefields, who suffered year after year in Veterans' Administration hospitals, who had gangrene, and who had to lie in their beds and watch their flesh decompose and drop off their bones. That is suffering about all any human being can stand. It is pretty difficult to supply a monetary compensation for suffering. It certainly cannot be done by any amendment offered on the floor of the House to legislation under consideration.

So I hope the bill will be passed in the form in which it was reported from this committee. This committee has gone as far as it can in this matter. I hope that other committees will take up where we have left off and see that these men have justice for the suffering they have undergone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I feel rather strongly that if there is any opposition to this bill it is opposition based on misunderstanding of what the bill accomplishes and of what it fails to accomplish. I merely wish to direct my attention to title II of the bill which very emphatically does not make any provision whatever for the adjudication of claims. It provides only for a War Claims Commission to determine and recommend as to the character of claims which should be allowed and as to their priority and so on.

I wish particularly to call attention to the third paragraph on page 15 of the report which contains a letter from Douglas W. McGregor, the Assistant to the Attorney General, in which he comments on title II and says:

This title recognizes that the problem of payment of war claims is a highly complex one. In view of the great number and variety as well as the aggregate amount of such claims, it would seem highly desirable that proposals for payment of them from public funds should be preceded by the careful study called for by the title. Aside from the problems of what claims should be paid and the equitable treatment of various types of claimants, with respect to priorities, ratable distribution, and the limitations on the interest and fees to be paid, there is involved the fundamental problem of the ultimate source and amount of the funds to be used for satisfaction. Moreover, the problem is intimately connected with the

reparations to be paid by the German and Japanese Governments and the burdens in general which the economies of those two countries may be expected to bear.

If an attempt is made to superimpose upon this legislation some provisions about the actual adjudication of claims, the attempt will, in my opinion, be subject to a point of order because that is not the subject matter of this bill. The War Claims Commission, when it gets around to reading its conclusions and reporting them, will, under a committee amendment to be offered, have until January 3, 1949, in place of the present date of March 31, 1948, found on line 7 of page 4. I repeat that when the War Claims Commission has done its work, then it must make recommendations to the Congress as to legislation which will fix the character of the claims to be allowed, the priorities in which they should be allowed, and the funds from which payment will be made. Then, and not until then, it seems to me, could Congress appropriately legislate machinery for the adjudication of those particular claims, whether in the district courts of the United States, as the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] desires, or in some special tribunal like that which adjudicated the so-called Alabama claims after the Civil War. All those questions require further legislation which cannot be enacted today and which should not be enacted today.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. In what time does the gentleman estimate we will be able to pay some of these claims after we go through all this machinery set up here and in further legislation and hearings on the merit of the claims?

Mr. HALE. If the War Claims Commission reports on January 3, then it ought to be possible in the next Congress to pass the necessary legislation regarding claims which will be recognized as valid and the machinery for the adjudication of those claims. Once that legislation is passed, adjudication and payment of the claims can be begun forthwith. I anticipate that some claims may be in shape to be proved immediately on the passage of appropriate legislation, while other claims, for one reason or another, not necessarily within the control of the claimant, may not be approved for many years. That has been the experience in all matters of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that the question of policy is eminently one that Congress will be called upon to pass on. Congress may in its wisdom elect to say that all claims against the United States or against the fund or whatever it may be shall be offered for proof and adjudicated before some specified date of limitation. That is a question of policy that we ought to consider at the appropriate time.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the question was raised, and it is a very important one and very timely. When will those claims be paid? Well, in the light of experience with claims commissions it can be safely said, that is, if this bill is adopted in its present form, they will, in all probability be paid to the grandchildren, the heirs of those who suffered the injuries and detriment upon which the claims are based. The claims of World War I, which were intrusted to another claims commission, have not been paid to this day. Claims arising out of World War I, to the extent of \$100,000,000, remain unsatisfied up to this very moment. Such is the work of claims commissions.

I raise the question here, Mr. Chairman, is it necessary for us to create another commission of three, each at \$12,000 a year, to perform a congressional function when there is already an available agency of the Government, one held in very high repute, the Federal judiciary system, which is right now ready and willing to accept the jurisdiction of the subject matter, to proceed to the adjudication of these enemy war-action claims? The purpose of my amendment is to accomplish a result within the lifetime of people now living. "Strangely radical," a bureaucrat would exclaim.

Mr. Chairman, let us do this through the Federal courts. I referred previously, and will incorporate in the RECORD at the proper time, a letter from a former Chief Justice of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, who has approved the procedure which I have incorporated in the amendment I shall offer to this bill. I have read to you, and there will be incorporated in this RECORD, a letter from the Chief Justice of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia in which approval of the court procedure method my amendment proposes is expressed. If the time available, and the patience of the committee would permit I could at this point list a most impressive group of eminent American jurists and publicists who likewise and with equal enthusiasm, endorse my proposal for court action rather than the slow and unsatisfactory claims commission method.

However, if you reject my amendment and go through with this claims commission procedure, it merely means, my friends, that you have set up one more commission whose members will draw \$12,000 a year, three men who will learn to like their jobs very, very much. They are required to report within 1 year. Well, that is fine, but I will tell you what they are more apt to do, if I know anything about commissioners and bureaucrats. At the end of the year they will come in and say that they have not been able to complete their work and therefore will ask Congress to extend their time, and they will keep on asking for extensions until the Congress grows restive. Then what will they recommend to the Congress of the United States? They will recommend the setting up of another claims commission to adjudicate the claims in accordance with the rec-

ommendations of the first commission. And then their friends will say that they should be appointed to the new claims commission because they are better qualified by experience and thorough-going knowledge of the subject they will go on when they are appointed to the new claims commission and they will be like Tennyson's babbling brook, as all claims commissions do, ad infinitum, on into eternity, and after a while the grandchildren of the claimants who, Lord knows, ought to have their claims satisfied right now, will probably get the money to spend on new, bright and shiny airplanes. No one will want jeeps in that distant day.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman will agree, will he not, that the life of the Commission is very definitely fixed at approximately 10 months, when a report must be made.

Mr. GEARHART. That I know, and I thank the gentleman for mentioning it, but if the gentleman had been listening, he would have known that I have already pointed that out very carefully. At the end of the year they will come in and recommend that they need a little more time and get themselves reappointed for another year, and then they will recommend that a new commission be set up and that they be appointed to it so that they can go on with the adjudications. You see, they will be experts by then.

That is the old, old gag, the thing which Members on this side of the aisle are supposed to be turning their backs upon; this forever setting up of commissions to do things that there is already an efficient and going arm of government ready to handle.

Do you not trust the Federal courts? I want to say to you that I trust the Federal courts, and I think every claimant who has a war action claim against the United States or any foreign power would be willing to submit his claim to the constituted judicial authorities of this great Republic of ours. Why not? Do you want this thing to go on forever and ever and ever?

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. Does the amendment that the gentleman proposes provide the standards that would govern the action of a court in determining the claim?

Mr. GEARHART. My amendment confers jurisdiction upon the courts and gives them the power to make such rules and regulations as they shall need to govern the procedure in these cases. It was approved as sufficient by Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Harlan Stone and by Chief Justice Laws of the District Court. It was approved in principle in a letter sent to me by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, when I incorporated the subject matter of this amendment in a bill which I introduced in a previous Congress. It was also approved

in principle by Secretary of State James Byrnes at a time when I had another bill up to the same effect, both saying, though, that they wanted the matter delayed, and we certainly have gotten 100 percent of the delay they requested. Years have rolled by, and the end is not yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. Is it not a fact that in most instances there is no legal authority to justify an award by the court for these claims, and Congress must adopt a standard by which the courts would be governed before they could render judgment? In most instances they automatically have to deny these claims because there is no legal authority for granting them.

Mr. GEARHART. With all due respect to the gentleman from California, whom I hold in very warm affection, I cite the expressions of the former Chief Justice of the United States and the present Chief Justice of the United States Court of the District of Columbia. They are ready to proceed under this legislation grant.

Let us do something now. Let us not set in motion a procedure which may never result in anything being achieved. Remember, the report of that Commission will not be made to this Congress. It will be made to another Congress, one which may be of an entirely different frame of mind than this. We know not what they may do, we know not how quickly they will act. We do not have the slightest idea whether they will act with expedition or whether it will allow this legislative subject matter to lie without action, as the three or four Congresses before this one has allowed this same question to lie in their dockets without any action at all. I plead with you, let us get action, and get action now, for these people who need it and need it so badly. My amendment would do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from California is a very distinguished member of the bar, and I am an engineer. I am not as cognizant of the procedures in the district court of the United States as he is, but as an engineer I can say to my lawyer friend that in any case standards must be applied. I do not know how many judges there are in the district court nor how many courtrooms there are where they meet, but it is a quite considerable number, from my observation. There are 8 or 10 of them in my own county, to my certain knowledge.

If these cases are to be brought before all of these judges, who is going to know, for example, how much money there will be available to pay off these claims? Suppose they allow claims in the total of \$1,000,000,000. We know that we are covering into the Treasury by this bill

\$250,000,000. If someone does not examine the number of cases and the kinds of cases, and set standards for the awarding of damages, and so forth, there may be money to pay only the first few who put in their claims, and there may be none for the remainder.

Those are some of the matters that require study. It is not as though the United States Government itself were paying these claims as such. If we want to pay what the Japanese Government should pay for the maltreatment of our prisoners and the sinking of our ships and all the other things they, as a defeated nation may be held to account for, then we should be mighty certain that we are going to be able to have the money from the proper sources to pay all the claims and not just merely the first few that are filed.

That is one of the reasons why we require a commission to study this subject. The quality of the claims, the standards by which they should be adjudicated, the amounts that may be paid for personal suffering and loss, under the Geneva convention, for example, all of those things must be taken into consideration, and the claims should be handled in accordance with priorities, priorities to be established for, we will say, the veterans of Bataan and others who have suffered similarly, as being No. 1 for consideration by these courts, and not merely in the order of filing the dockets.

There are many things to be discussed here which my friend from California knows are exceedingly important.

It was the hope of this committee that this bill could be passed last July, that it would then have become law, and that the Commission which was to be established would have reported by March 31 of this year, so that before the end of this Congress we could have had the necessary law and establishment to apply to this subject. That was not possible. We therefore must extend it to the nearest date of which we can conceive as a possible legislative date beyond the appointment of the Commission, namely, January 3, 1949. For myself, if I am a Member of that Congress, I could say here that if that Commission fails to report with the proper legislation I would be happy to see the matter taken completely out of its hands and turned over to the appropriate committee of the Congress for spending its time, and a very long time it takes, to examine these claims and set up standards and priorities.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I do not know how it happened that the word "standards" was injected into this discussion, because "standards" is not a proper description.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not a lawyer. A standard is an engineering practice. It may be something else in the legal practice.

Mr. GEARHART. We use the word "standard" when we direct certain commissions created by Congress to do certain things.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish the gentleman would apply the correct term quickly as my time is limited.

Mr. GEARHART. I would have done so a long time ago if I had not been interrupted three times, so I trust the gentleman will not chide me for taking up his time.

The way this is done by this act and this amendment which I would introduce is by conferring jurisdiction upon the courts in these cases, just as the Congress has in other cases conferred jurisdiction upon the courts to hear, determine, and render judgment. That is covered in my amendment, if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. In every case that the gentleman mentions, there are legal standards for the guidance of the court, a measure of damages that is established by law in accordance with long precedent. There are no precedents in this matter. There are no standards established, and it would be a hodge-podge job for the many district courts of the United States to try to resolve this question.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are no further requests for time, and unless the gentleman from Texas has any further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate having been concluded, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. The Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 39. No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the Government at any time after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, nor shall the United States pay compensation therefor. The net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of this act of any such property or interest therein shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 13, insert as follows:

"Sec. 2. No property or interest therein shall be applied to the payment of debts, under the provisions of section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, during the period beginning with the date of the enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the date on which the report of the War Claims Commission, made pursuant to title II of this act, is received by the Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this being a committee amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Texas, may I suggest that he now speak if he

desires to do so in support of the amendment, as I would like to speak in opposition to it.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. If there is not going to be any support for this amendment, I would like to rise in opposition to it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment and do expect to advocate its passage, but if the gentleman desires to speak, he certainly has the right to rise in opposition to it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEARHART. As a point of information, Mr. Chairman, I am offering a substitute amendment to the committee amendment. Do I not have the right to offer it at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must first recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. This amendment was agreed to by a very small majority of the committee. I believe it was largely because we are so very fond of our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas. I personally could not support the amendment because I believe it is not in the interest of proper legislation. Certain of the Members have come to me, who joined in supporting the amendment, and have indicated that they would have another viewpoint at this time, and I know particularly the chairman of my committee has so authorized me to state. In addition, there is opposition on the part of the Department of State and the Department of Justice to this amendment. The matter was taken up with them last July while the committee print was still under consideration. I have letters from them under date of July 7 and 8, in which they oppose this amendment and another amendment which may be presented by the gentleman from Texas. I might read from a letter from the State Department:

This is a matter primarily affecting the operations of the Department of Justice. It may be stated, however, that in view of the length of time already elapsed in which creditors have been denied payment of their claims, further delay of more than 1 year before consideration of payment of their claims may be taken would be undesirable.

Then, in the Department of Justice letter, similar words were used. Then they refer particularly to the words "inimical to the welfare of the United States." The Department says, "It will be very difficult to define, except in the most extreme cases, and which would operate in many cases to penalize conduct which at the time when it occurred was lawful under the laws of the United States." Then it refers to other matters.

Therefore, I would be personally in opposition to the amendment. I think the committee is about evenly divided.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, practically every person who has been on the floor today has said he believes these claims should be adjudicated. I made the statement originally that, in my opinion, this legislation should have been passed long ago. It should have been. The trouble is that today property is being returned, and the veterans of Bataan cannot even submit their claims. I repeat, today property is being returned and the veterans of Bataan cannot even submit their claims. There is nobody to whom they can submit them.

To whom is the property being returned? According to a table which I placed in the Record, January 20, 1948, it is being returned in the following manner:

Property returned to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested, under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany.

Of course, people are coming before the Alien Property Custodian today and saying, "I am a friend of America." Why? Because they want their property back. That is what they did after the First World War, and the Germans got 80 percent back and many Americans do not have their World War I claims satisfied today.

I say to you it is not consistent with the policy of the legislation we have before us today to continue to give back this property, as we are doing.

One of the firms, at the conclusion of World War I, that got property back, was the General Aniline & Film Co. At the beginning of this past war it had its property taken over again, if I understand correctly. Let us see who is getting some property back, according to the tables supplied me by the Alien Property Custodian. Some examples are: 1. First National Bank of Chicago, \$30,861.64; 2. Maurice Stern, 1,734 shares of common stock General Aniline & Film Co., \$109,000; 3. Leopold H. P. Klotz & North American Investment Co., \$457,000. We find one R. E. Stern got back 1,734 shares of that property, worth \$109,000. What kind of property is this, in most cases, anyway? Let me read to you a little bit of it. The Alien Property Custodian compiled this statement:

Continental Hendel Bank, \$5,000,000 claim already filed.

Here is another one for \$201,230, filed in behalf of a Swedish concern.

Here is another one for \$215,000, filed in the interest of a Swedish concern.

Just as companies and people did after World War I, they are getting it back again, while we are compelling our veterans of Bataan to wait; while we are compelling our citizens to wait. We should make everybody wait—including those who were dealing with the enemy in such a way that this country of ours had to take over their property at the beginning of the war. If you want to be fair to the veterans of this country, if you want to be fair to the civilians of this country who have not yet received a penny, you will certainly keep in this legislation the committee amendment. Many veterans suffered inhuman treatment in the Philippines and in Japan and in Germany and other European coun-

tries. I have letters in my files which describe that treatment. The prisoner or the civilian has to wait while these people are getting back sums of money as I have described. How this can happen I cannot understand. I certainly hope the Members of this Congress will see fit to retain this important amendment in the legislation before us.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART as a substitute for the committee amendment in the bill: Insert a new section to be known as section 2, as follows:

"SEC. 2. (A) No property or interest therein shall be applied to the payment of debts, under the provisions of section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411) as amended, nor shall any part or any portion of the proceeds from the sale or disposition of property or any interest therein of Germany or Japan or any national of either of such countries covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts be applied to the satisfaction or reduction of any claims of American nationals save and except pursuant to a judgment or judgments sought and obtained in the manner and in the form as in this title provided.

"(B) The United States district court for the district wherein the claimant is resident, including the United States district courts for the Territories and possessions of the United States, sitting without a jury, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on claims of American nationals, their heirs and legal representatives, in respect of damage or injury inflicted upon their persons, property, rights, or interests, by measures of enemy governments, including acts of force, violence, or duress, or legislative, administrative, judicial, and other measures, undertaken or enacted after January 1, 1931, including (but not limited to) all personal injury and death claims arising out of maltreatments of former prisoners of war by the Governments of Germany or Japan, their armed forces, or their nationals, in violation of the International Convention Relating to Treatment of Prisoners of War, signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on July 27, 1929, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States, Germany, Japan, and other nations therein represented: *Provided*, That such jurisdiction shall not extend to claims for loss, damage, personal injuries, or death, with respect to which compensation is authorized under other laws of the United States.

"(C) The clerk of United States district courts in each district shall certify to the Congress, at the beginning of each new session of the Congress, the judgments of the court with respect to such claims, for such action as the Congress may deem advisable.

"(D) (a) The United States district courts in the several districts are authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out their functions under this act.

"(E) The Attorney General is authorized and directed, upon the request of any district court, to appoint a law officer to aid the court in the performance of its functions under this act and to protect the interests of the United States.

"(F) Every claim cognizable under this act shall be forever barred, unless within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this act, it is presented in writing to the United States district court having jurisdiction of such claim pursuant to this act, in accordance with the rules and regulations of such court."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment and desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman from Maine is talking about the substitute, is he not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer by stating that he is.

The Chair will hear the gentleman from Maine on his point of order.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane to the subject matter of the bill. If it were germane either to the title of the bill or to any part of the bill it would presumably be with respect to title II with the provisions of which it is entirely inconsistent. Neither the title of the bill nor the language of title II purports to make any provision at all for the adjudication of claims. Title II purports simply to set up a commission to recommend to Congress what claims shall be received as valid in whatever tribunal shall be determined upon to pass upon them, the priority of the claim, the funds from which payments shall be made once the claims have been adjudicated valid, and so on.

The whole machinery suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is machinery which could be set in motion only after the Congress had laid down a basic law as to what claims should receive favorable consideration. That is a question of policy that this Congress must fix before any question of adjudication can arise. The amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], as I understand it, relates only to the question of adjudication.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] desire to be heard?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, the bill provides ultimately for the payment of claims against German and Japanese nationals in accordance with a formula not clearly defined in the bill, but the bill in general does deal with the subject of claims arising against alien enemies and their property.

Title I provides for the disposition of money derived from that source—alien property—and this addition to title I merely directs in detail an ultimate disposition of that same property. Title I creates the deposit, and my amendment merely provides a method of withdrawal.

Title II provides for an investigation, that is true, but title III contemplates an ultimate payment of claims. My amendment most certainly complements and completes that which title II leaves loose in space.

My amendment is most certainly germane to title III, as that title does provide for the adjudication and payment of a certain type of war-action claims

out of the former property of enemy aliens.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is germane to the bill the Committee now has under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

If the substance of the matter set forth in the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] were introduced as a separate bill in the House of Representatives, it would, of course, be immediately referred by the proper authority to the Judiciary Committee for consideration. There is, of course, a relation between everything contained in the gentleman's substitute and the matter contained in this bill; however, the gentleman seeks to set up a completely new agency which is recognized in the Constitution and is recognized in legislative procedure as an institution unto itself, with its own jurisdiction fixed by law. The gentleman seeks to place the material of this bill under the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, which would be a matter not within the jurisdiction of the committee having charge of this bill.

For that and other reasons, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the committee amendment which I and other Government departments oppose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment appearing on page 2.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Chair would state clearly what the vote is. I would like it fully understood that the committee amendment is in the bill and we would be voting to strike out the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is on the committee amendment as printed in the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 29, nays 5.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "War Claims Act of 1947."

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the War Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$12,000 a year. One of such members shall be designated by the President as chairman of the Commission. Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Any vacancy that may occur in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of an original appointment.

(b) The Commission may employ a secretary, and such legal, clerical, and technical assistants as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(c) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this title, including regulations covering the filing with it of war claims.

(d) The Commission shall cease to exist at the expiration of 1 year after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may by Executive order fix an earlier expiration date. Upon expiration of the Commission, all books, records, documents, and other papers in the possession of the Commission shall be deposited with such department or agency of the Government as the President may designate.

INQUIRY AND REPORT WITH RESPECT TO WAR CLAIMS

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall inquire into and report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress on or before March 31, 1948, with respect to war claims arising out of World War I or World War II, and shall present in such report its findings on—

(1) the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and

(2) the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

(b) The report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to—

(1) categories and types of claims, if any, which should be allowed and the legal and moral bases therefor;

(2) the administrative method by which such claims should be adjudicated and paid, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and

(3) any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of interest or fees in connection with such claims.

(c) The Commission shall include in such report recommendations as to the policies which, in its judgment, should be followed in the national interest with respect to the application of any property or interest vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian, or the proceeds thereof, to the payment of debts owed by the persons who owned such property or interest immediately prior to such vesting or transfer, and shall make such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out such recommendations.

(d) The Commission shall include in such report (1) such other recommendations as it deems appropriate, and (2) such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

(e) Such report, with accompanying evidence, shall be printed as a public document when received by the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW (interrupting the reading of the section). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the section be dispensed with and be printed in the RECORD, and that the Clerk read the amendment which has been offered on behalf of the committee to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW as a committee amendment: On page 4, line 7, strike out "March 31, 1948" and insert "January 3, 1949."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 4, line 8, after the comma at the end of

the line, insert the following: "including particularly, but not limited to, claims on account of abuse, starvation, and other forms of mistreatment of prisoners of war in violation of the provisions of international agreements or the laws and customs of war or principles of international law."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment concerns members of the armed forces who as prisoners of war were victims of atrocities during the period of World War II. In discussing this amendment I am reminded of my assignment by the commander in chief of the forces of the Southwest Pacific to proceed to Manila and report to a congressional committee headed by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Before the gentleman goes further, I would like to say to him that the committee has considered his amendment and believes that it is a very worthy one, and agrees entirely that it should be adopted as a part of this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman.

While in Manila with this congressional committee it was my privilege to visit personally with the members of the armed forces who had been prisoners of the Japanese, and who were at that time returning to their homes in the United States, many of them for hospitalization. Like many who served in World War II, I know what a broken body looks like, but to me the most ghastly sight that I witnessed during the war was the condition of these boys as they passed through Manila en route home. Never in the history of warfare have so many atrocities been committed, especially the type of atrocities that the Japs inflicted on our men. When talking to these liberated prisoners of war I solemnly vowed that if it was my privilege to return to the Congress of the United States I would see to it that legislation would be introduced and considered for their benefit.

It was my privilege to come back to this Congress after my service in World War II, and to introduce H. R. 1000 early in the Eightieth Congress. The committee was kind enough to consider H. R. 1000, but during the discussion of the bill it developed the matter was so highly complicated it was beyond the ability of the committee to perfect the bill. Realizing this, a resolution was then introduced, known as House Joint Resolution 173, incorporating practically the same language contained in title II of H. R. 4044 now under consideration. It is of title II that I wish to refer to at this moment.

First, I want to commend the committee for their action in adopting title II. As a matter of fact, they are to be commended for the entire bill. The provisions of title II will give to these former prisoners of war who were so brutally treated by the Japs an opportunity to file their claims, after a commission has been created and the necessary machinery perfected, to process such claims.

If the recommendations of this Commission are accepted by Congress these veterans will receive payment of their claims.

For your information let me read from the hearings on H. R. 4044 a statement attributed to William Horabin, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., a former prisoner of war in which he recites the horrible treatment he received at the hands of the Japanese. I read from page 359 of the committee hearings:

Our boat moved from Davao to Zamboanga Harbor. Then we lay in that harbor for 18 days without leaving the hold or receiving any explanation from the Japs. On the eighteenth day we left Zamboanga for Manila. Three days later at 4:30 p. m. an American submarine sent two torpedoes into our ship, which was in no way marked as a prisoner-of-war ship. The suffering and agony that followed is indescribable. The Japanese immediately turned their machine guns on the trapped men in the hold and dropped hand grenades on them. A few men, including myself, escaped through a crack in the ship's hull that had been caused by the concussion of the explosion and a few more forced their way out through the hold entrance. Many men reached the water only to be killed by rifle and machine-gun fire from the remaining ships in the convoy or were hunted down in motor launches and killed with the stroke of a saber.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I commend the gentleman on the work he has done to help the veterans. As I understood, this amendment also takes in the soldiers who suffered atrocities in Germany and other European countries?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Many of the atrocities these men suffered were just as violent as some of the ones the gentleman has described.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They were probably as violent, but there were not as many of them.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered provides that when the Commission established in title 2 reports to Congress through the President, such report shall definitely designate that claims arising from abuse, starvation, and other forms of mistreatment of prisoners of war shall have priority over all other claims. Let us remember that these boys who were prisoners of war and victims of cruel and barbarous treatment are still broken in mind and body from such a terrible experience. Knowing Congress as I do and since Chairman HINSHAW of the committee informed us there was no objection to my amendment I sincerely hope that it will receive unanimous approval.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is the gentleman's definite purpose by the amendment he offers, and which I wholeheartedly support, to include within the word "abuse" abuse amounting to death, such as where a man has been beheaded, and things of that character?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. His dependents would be involved then.

Mr. MACKINNON. You intend by your amendment that that class of case should be specifically covered.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right, and the dependents would take their place alongside of the veteran and be given priority in the report submitted by this Commission relative to claims that should be paid or recognized.

Mr. MACKINNON. I just wanted to make that clear, Mr. Chairman, that that group of cases was covered by the gentleman's amendment. I have such a case in my district.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the committee adopted a committee amendment to title I, section 2, the effect of which will be to prevent the payment of adjudicated claims to American nationals. It is indeed unfortunate that this amendment was adopted. It has the effect of repealing the law that the Committee on the Judiciary reported during the last session after very careful consideration and after unanimous action by the committee, which was passed by the Congress.

I call your attention to the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary last year in which it was stated that the purpose of the bill and the amendment to the First War Powers Act was to provide machinery for paying claims of creditors against the former owners of vested properties on an equitable basis to the extent that the assets vested from each debtor permit.

The adoption of this amendment prevents the payment of claims that have been long outstanding, claims of American nationals against the property vested by the Alien Property Custodian. Unless when we get back into the House, the action heretofore taken is rejected, it is going to mean that the Alien Property Custodian will never wind up his work. I distinctly remember in 1932 when I first came to Congress there were literally hundreds of cases in the office of the Alien Property Custodian that should have been terminated. It was with that experience in mind that the Committee on the Judiciary, after long and thorough hearings at which representatives of the Department of State and the Department of Justice testified, unanimously reported this measure. I trust that you will give consideration to the rights of American citizens in this property at the proper time and when we get back into the House reject this amendment when the opportunity is given you for such action.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENNER. I was necessarily momentarily absent from the floor when this amendment was considered. I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. I do hope that the House in its wisdom will take action different from that which was taken by the Committee a minute ago.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I am certain that the amendment was not considered as

thoroughly as it should have been because we must bear in mind that ever since the Alien Property Custodian started to function, he was looking to the day when the legitimate claims of American nationals could be paid, in part at least. If this amendment is permitted to stand, it is going to place a premium in the hands of those who have already acted. The disposition of claims will not be made equitably and it will be a case of first come, first served. Certainly, as the committee pointed out in its report, all of our people will not be fairly dealt with.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me would seem to indicate that only American citizens are denied the right of getting their property back under the amendment which has just been adopted. I do not think that is quite the fact. I think that foreign friendly nationals likewise can get property back today. The amendment does not repeal anything. It does not repeal a single law. It simply causes American citizens and foreign friendly nationals, who had property that was taken over by our enemy property custodian at the beginning of World War II, to wait like the boy who fought on Bataan must wait, and like the civilian must wait, until this whole thing is settled. It takes these classes out of a preferred position. It does not permit a foreign national, for example, to be in a preferred class compared to an American citizen.

The gentleman refers to what the Department says. Let us see what the Department says. I am referring to the Justice Department. In one place it says:

The Department is unreservedly in favor of the principle at this time—

Talking about title I—

that property of enemy countries and enemy nationals vested in the Government is, under existing law, the property of the United States. The bill recognizes and states conclusively that the former owners of such property have no claim for its return.

Not a bit in the world do they have any claim for its return. Now, let us find out how complicated this whole issue is, why the entire matter should be carefully studied. I further quote from the same letter that the Justice Department wrote our chairman June 18, 1947; the quoted part refers to title 2;

This title recognizes that the problem of payment of war claims is a highly complex one. In view of the great number and variety as well as the aggregate amount of such claims, it would seem highly desirable that proposals for payment of them from public funds should be preceded by the careful study called for by the title. Aside from the problems of what claims should be paid and the equitable treatment of various types of claimants, with respect to priorities, ratable distribution, and the limitations on the interest and fees to be paid, there is involved the fundamental problem of the ultimate source and amount of the funds to be used for satisfaction. Moreover, the problem is intimately connected with the reparations to be paid by the German and Japanese Governments and the burdens in general which the economies of those two countries may be expected to bear.

I said that this bill should have been passed long ago, and it should. The Judiciary Committee passed enemy property legislation in 1946. It was my contention at the time that one of their bills passed the House that not enough attention was given to the over-all subject. You will find that I was on the floor and said I was opposed to the legislation. That was in December 1945. There was not a treaty written at the time; but they brought in legislation and passed it through the House of Representatives in 1945, which was only a little after war had been concluded, and this is 1948, when American citizens are coming in here asking for a chance to be heard with reference to their claims; not to get any property back; and the interesting angle about this whole thing is that while a man is pleading for a chance to get his property back, to be reimbursed for inhuman treatment at the hands of the enemy, here come some people who day by day are getting their property back—some not even citizens of this country. So I say to you this provision should be kept in the bill. In fairness to whom? Not foreign nationals. What does this table say that I put in the RECORD on January 20, 1948?

Property returned to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman is talking about a bill that was reported in 1945. We are talking about two different things. I am talking about the bill approved August 8, 1946.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The bill I am talking about was approved in 1946. Were there not two of them?

Mr. WALTER. One in 1945 and one in 1946.

Mr. BECKWORTH. No. Both of them were in 1946; one in March and one in August. If I am not mistaken, the House passed the bill that became law in March, in December 1945.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. According to the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], a moment ago, that the committee amendment would repeal provisions of the law referred to, this does not repeal any law. Does it not merely suspend payment and operation of that law until 6 months after the Claims Commission has made its report?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right. Some of these claims are for as much as \$5,000,000. As I recall, one firm has already recovered nearly \$1,000,000 and one person \$100,000. What this does is to put all American citizens and friendly nationals on the same basis. Let us study this thing and see how much each who has a just claim can ultimately recover.

If that is unfair, I do not know what fairness means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request and again ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and the bill be considered as read.

Mr. HINSHAW. Just a moment. I think that is a prerogative of this side. To start with, we were giving a couple of Members the opportunity to offer amendments in due course.

The CHAIRMAN. There being objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 204. For the purpose of this title the Commission is authorized to hold hearings and to conduct investigations, and to make full use of pertinent information, including war claims or statements relating thereto, available in other departments or agencies of the Government. The President may designate an existing department or agency which shall furnish the Commission with such administrative services as may be required. Department and agency heads are authorized to assign for temporary duty with the Commission any of their officers or employees and may utilize their officers or employees to perform for the Commission any technical services which the Commission may request. The Commission is authorized to reimburse departments and agencies for the cost of services furnished and personnel assigned to or working on behalf of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 205. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$325,000 to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE III

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Internees' Relief Act of 1947."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(1) The term "civilian" means only a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this title, was a citizen of the United States.

(2) The term "detention" means any restraint of personal liberty (a) due to capture by the enemy, as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or otherwise; or (b) in hiding to avoid capture or internment by the enemy.

(3) The term "Administrator" means the Federal Security Administrator.

EXTENSION OF THE ACT OF DECEMBER 2, 1942

SEC. 303. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of titles I and II of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes", approved December 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 1028), as amended, are extended and shall apply in respect to the injury, disability, or death resulting from injury, or detention of a civilian, in the same manner and to the same extent as if such civilian were an employee within the purview of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

(b) For the purpose of determining the benefits extended and made applicable by subsection (a)—

(1) the average weekly wage of such civilian, whether employed, self-employed, or not

employed, shall be deemed to have been \$37.50;

(2) no compensation shall be paid for detention of any person with respect to any period during which such person was under the age of 16 years;

(3) any disability incurred or aggravated during, or caused by, detention shall be regarded as having resulted from injury from a war-risk hazard as defined by such act;

(4) the benefits for detention shall be payable for the period of detention, beginning with first day thereof and ending with the date upon which the civilian was returned to the jurisdiction of the United States, or the date upon which the particular area in which such person was situated was liberated by the military or naval forces of the United States or its allies, whichever is the earlier;

(5) the provisions of such act shall be applicable whether or not the civilian was employed;

(6) notice of injury or death shall not be required; and limitation provisions with respect to the filing of claims for detention, injury, disability, or death shall not begin to run until the date of the enactment of this title.

(c) For the purpose of determining the right to benefits under this title of a person claiming as widow, status as widow may be accepted upon a showing, satisfactory to the Administrator, sufficient to establish a common-law marriage, whether or not such marriage is recognized by the law of the place of residence of the parties, unless acceptance of such status should operate to deprive a lawful widow of her right to benefits. The acceptance of such status shall not operate to increase the maximum aggregate amount of benefits payable in any case should a lawful widow be found entitled to benefits, after acceptance of status as herein authorized.

(d) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, shall not apply in the cases of such civilians: So much of section 101 (b) (1) as provides for payments of detention benefits to dependents of the detained person; section 101 (d); section 104; and section 105.

(e) Any unpaid promissory notes or other evidences of indebtedness executed by or on behalf of such civilians to the Government of the United States in consideration of their transportation or repatriation may be canceled whenever the head of the department or agency of the Government to which such notes or other evidences of indebtedness are payable finds that recovery in respect thereof would be impracticable or would cause hardship to the maker thereof.

(f) Rights or benefits which, under this title, are to be determined with reference to other provisions of law shall be determined with reference to such provisions of law as in force on January 3, 1947.

(g) Except as may be modified by this title, the terms used in this title shall have the same meaning as such terms have under such act of December 2, 1942, and for purposes of taxation benefits payable under this title shall be regarded in the same category as benefits under such act of December 2, 1942.

EXCLUSIONS

SEC. 304. (a) This title shall not apply to a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this act, was—

(1) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or

(2) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or

(3) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

(b) This title shall not apply to a person who at any time voluntarily gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served the enemy or the purposes of the enemy.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 305. (a) The provisions of this title shall apply with respect to injury, disability or death from injury, or detention, only if the event giving rise to the right to benefits occurred at Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or at any other Territory or possession of the United States, attacked or invaded by the Imperial Japanese Government, or while in transit to or from any such place.

(b) The money benefit for disability or death shall be paid only to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall not upon death of the person so entitled survive for the benefit of his estate or any other person.

(c) The benefit for detention shall be paid to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall in case of death of the person so entitled be payable only to or for the benefit of the following persons:

(1) widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

(2) widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares; and

(3) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

(d) The benefit of a minor or an incompetent person who has no natural or legal guardian may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be paid, in whole or in such part as he may determine, for and on behalf of such minor or incompetent, directly to the person or institution caring for, supporting, or having custody of such minor or incompetent.

(e) No person, except a widow or child, shall be entitled to benefits for disability or detention in respect to himself, and to death benefits on account of the death of another. No person shall be entitled to money benefits in excess of \$7,500 on account of the death of another person or persons. A person, other than a widow or child, whose right to money benefits is derived from his own detention or disability and from the death of another, or on account of the death of more than one person, shall elect which benefit he shall receive, and any payment accepted prior to such election shall be charged against the benefits so elected.

(f) Benefits for injury or disability shall not be payable for any period covered by the benefit for detention; but the right to benefits on account of disability continuing after detention ceased, including benefits on account of the loss, or loss of use, of a member or function of the body, shall not be affected.

REDUCTION OF BENEFITS

SEC. 306. (a) If a civilian or his dependent receives or has received from the United States any payments on account of the same injury, death, or detention, or from his employer, in the form of wages, or payments in lieu of wages, or in any form of support or compensation (including workmen's compensation) in respect to the same objects, the benefits under this title shall be diminished by the amount of such payments in the following manner:

(1) Detention benefits shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the detained person or to his dependents on account of the same detention;

(2) Benefits on account of injury or disability shall be reduced by the amount of

payments to the injured person on account of the same injury or disability;

(3) Benefits on account of death shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the dependents of the deceased civilian on account of the same death.

(b) Should the civilian or dependent receive any payment under this title, made under mistake of fact or law, the recovery of which is not waived under the applicable provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, any other benefit payment in the same case to which the same civilian or dependent is entitled shall be reduced so as to recoup any overpayment of benefits. The reduction of any benefit under this section shall be accomplished in such manner as the Administrator shall determine to be equitable.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 307. The provisions of this title shall be administered by the Federal Security Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of titles I and II of such act of December 2, 1942. All provisions in such titles, relating to matters other than benefits or administration, unless made inapplicable by other provisions of this title, shall be applicable with respect to this title as though embodied therein.

PAYMENTS UNDER THIS TITLE NOT TO AFFECT WAR CLAIMS

SEC. 308. The payment of benefits to any person under this title shall not affect the right of such person (1) to file any war claim with any domestic or international tribunal or agency having jurisdiction to consider or adjudicate such claims, or (2) to receive any payment or award made by any such tribunal or agency.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 309. This title shall take effect as of December 7, 1941, and the right of individuals to benefits shall be held to have begun to accrue as though this title had been in effect as of such date.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 310. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. HINSHAW (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill be open to amendment at any section, the sections to be handled in sequence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ (when section 304 was called). Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 10, line 18, after the word "amended", strike out the semicolon, insert a period, and strike out the word "or" in line 18, and all of lines 19 and 20, and insert at the end of line 23 the following:

"(c) In this title wherever the words 'civilian' or 'civilians' are used those words shall be construed to include members of the military or naval forces who were citizens of the United States."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, section 304 of the bill, on page 10, contains this language:

This title shall not apply to a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this act, was * * *

(3) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

My amendment merely strikes that language out of the bill, that is, the words "a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force."

It then adds another clause making it definite that wherever the words "civilian" or "civilians" are used they shall be construed to include members of the armed forces who were citizens at the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to repeat the argument I made in favor of this amendment a while ago, but I do want to point out that the heroes of Bataan appeared before the committee because they want action now. They do not want a kick and a promise such as that contained in title II. They want to be included in any legislation which may pass this House and they want the same treatment that civilians who were prisoners of war of the Japanese are given by this bill.

I hope that the committee will approve my amendment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I congratulate the gentleman on offering such an amendment. I realize this is a very difficult problem to get at, but this amendment does undertake to do what I wanted to do with my original legislation, that is, to include servicemen in the awarding of anything that went to those who suffered cruel and inhuman treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to speak for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, it is obvious that the gentleman has in mind extending the benefits contained in this title to members of the armed forces who were captured. Actually, the bill provides elsewhere that where benefits have been paid from any other fund, either by contractors or by any employer, they shall be deducted from the benefits to be received under this bill. Consequently, I am very much afraid that it would not benefit the people the gentleman has in mind one iota. From that standpoint, it really does not matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I repeat that I am not at all satisfied with the bill, but it is the best we have. For what it is worth, I want the men of Bataan to have at least whatever benefit would accrue

under this bill to others, meager though it is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as I have read it seeks to include for the purpose of this title military personnel and no one is more concerned with those men than I am. I am a member of both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as are other Members of this distinguished body. To say that the term "a person within the purview of this title" and so forth, shall include the regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted members of any military or naval force, which I believe is the sense of the amendment, would really change the entire title, which is intended to be an internees' relief bill of 1947 as stated in the title and applies only to internees. I do not see how you can include prisoners of war among internees, as they have no relationship to each other except that they were both incarcerated, but they were incarcerated under different international law.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the term includes prisoners of war, and if the gentleman's contention is correct, then the so-called Van Zandt amendment was also subject to a point of order. If my amendment is subject to a point of order, so was his amendment subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Referring to the remarks of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] relative to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] the Chair may say that no point of order was lodged against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Referring to the point of order made by the gentleman from California, even if the language which the gentleman from New Mexico seeks to strike out were not in the bill the Chair doubts very much if the gentleman's amendment would be germane because the title of section 3 definitely refers to one class and only one class. This legislation affects the rights of that class known and designated as internees, and then they have strengthened the bill, evidently intending to strengthen their position, by adopting the language used on page 10, which the gentleman seeks to strike out. Consequently, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are no further amendments to be offered to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, pursuant

to House Resolution 431, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called committee amendment, being section 2, as published in the bill on page 2, lines 13 to 20, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. No property or interest therein shall be applied to the payment of debts, under the provisions of section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, during the period beginning with the date of the enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the date on which the report of the War Claims Commission, made pursuant to title II of this act, is received by the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HINSHAW) there were—ayes 37, noes 17.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BROPHY (at the request of Mr. ARENDs), for the day, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator from Connecticut.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Fleet Reserve Association.

Mr. HESELTION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. J. C. Penney.

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon some newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today and tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore granted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] for Wednesday next be vacated and that he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the message which President Truman delivered on the state of the Union on January 7 caused a number of Members of the House, on the Republican side of the aisle, to make severe criticisms of nearly all—if not all—of his message.

I listened to the President very intently, and it brought back to my mind another document which was issued some 2½ years ago.

I also remembered that shortly after the campaign of 1946 that letters were issued by the treasurer of the Republican National Committee over his signature to a number of citizens of the United States. This letter read as follows:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Chicago, November 29, 1946.

DEAR MR. ____: I hope you are as happy about the election results as I am. In my

opinion we have made a tremendous start toward turning the American Government back to the American people and bringing order out of the present chaos at home and abroad.

I assume you have contributed to some of the local Republican finance committees but thus far we have not had the pleasure of including you as a contributing member of the Republican National Committee.

We need \$500,000:

1. To take care of campaign and other expenses payable before December 31.

2. To expand our publicity services; including our monthly and semimonthly publications, to tell the Republican story to the American people.

3. To provide research facilities to help the new Republican House and Senate to do the job the voters clearly have indicated they should do with respect to putting the ship of state back on an even keel.

Will you be one of 1,000 persons to contribute \$500 to the Republican National Committee for these purposes? Or, if you prefer, would you be willing to raise that sum among your friends and associates?

Now that we have won the election we should not fail in our obligation to carry on with respect to the important work which lies ahead.

Your sympathetic and favorable consideration will be deeply appreciated and I shall await your reply with much interest.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. KEMPER,
Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I wondered when I saw this letter in December of 1946 why it was necessary for the Republican National Committee to provide research facilities to help the new Republican House and Senate do the job the voters clearly have indicated they should do with respect to putting the ship of state back on an even keel. As this was one of the major purposes for collecting \$500,000, it was clearly to instruct the new Republicans in the House as to what they should do. Evidently, they were not instructed properly and the money was wasted, or on the other hand, the money was collected and never used for the purpose stated in the letter.

As I stated, when I sat listening to the President's message, it brought another document to my mind. That document was the Republican platform of 1944—the platform that you new Members who needed instruction on were elected on. In some 29 or more particulars, there is a similarity between these two documents. For the purpose, therefore, of instructing the Members which the Republican National Committee failed to do, I will read these sections from both documents to you:

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7,
1948

HUMAN RIGHTS

The United States has always had a deep concern for human rights. Religious freedom, free speech, and freedom of thought are cherished realities in our land.

Any denial of human rights is a denial of the basic beliefs of democracy and of our regard for the worth of each individual.

Today, however, some of our citizens are still denied equal opportunity for educa-

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

In times like these, when whole peoples have found themselves shackled by governments which denied the truth, or worse, dealt in half-truths or withheld the facts from the public, it is imperative to the maintenance of a free America that the press and radio be free and that full and complete information be available to Americans.

We pledge the establishment of Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7,
1948

HUMAN RIGHTS

tion, for jobs and economic advancement, and for the expression of their views at the polls. Most serious of all, some are denied equal protection under our laws. Whether discrimination is based on race, or creed, or color, or land of origin, it is utterly contrary to American ideals of democracy.

ALASKA AND HAWAII

I believe that the time has come for Alaska and Hawaii to be admitted to the Union as States.

SOCIAL SECURITY

We should now extend unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, and survivors' benefits to millions who are not now protected. We should also raise the level of benefits.

HEALTH

The greatest gap in our social-security structure is the lack of adequate provision for the Nation's health. We are rightly proud of the high standard of medical care we know how to provide in the United States. The fact is, however, that most of our people cannot afford to pay for the care they need.

I have often and strongly urged that this condition demands a national health program. The heart of the program must be a national system of payment for medical care based on well-tried insurance principles. This great Nation cannot afford to allow its citizens to suffer needlessly for the lack of proper medical care.

Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health.

HOUSING

Within the next decade, we must see that every American family has a decent home. As an immediate step we need the long-range housing program which I have recommended on many occasions. This should include financial aid designed to yield more housing at lower prices. It should provide public housing for low-income families, and vigorous development of new techniques to lower the cost of building.

VETERANS

We have had, and shall continue to have, a special interest in the welfare of our veterans. Over 14,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces in World War II have now returned to civilian life. Over 2,000,000 veterans are being helped through school. Millions have been aided while finding jobs, and have been helped in buying homes, in obtaining medical care, and in adjusting themselves to physical handicaps.

All but a very few veterans have successfully made the transition from military life to their home communities. The success of our veterans' program is proved by this fact. This Nation is proud of the eagerness shown by our veterans to become self-reliant and self-supporting citizens.

NATURAL RESOURCES

We need to protect and restore our land—public and private—through combating erosion and rebuilding the fertility of the soil.

We must expand our reclamation program to bring millions of acres of arid land into production, and to improve water supplies for additional millions of acres.

We must protect and restore our forests by sustained-yield forestry and by planting new trees in areas now slashed and barren.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

HUMAN RIGHTS

we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

ALASKA AND HAWAII

Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood; and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of all our national laws.

Alaska is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered.

HEALTH

A careful study of Federal-State programs for maternal and child health, dependent children, and assistance to the blind, with a view to strengthening these programs.

The continuation of these and other programs relating to health, and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital service available to those in need without disturbing doctor-patient relationships or socializing medicine.

HOUSING

The stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration, or otherwise, when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private sources.

VETERANS

The Republican Party has always supported suitable measures to reflect the Nation's gratitude and to discharge its duty toward the veterans of all wars.

We approve, have supported, and have aided in the enactment of laws which provide for reemployment of veterans of this war in their old positions, for mustering-out pay, for pensions for widows and orphans of such veterans killed or disabled, for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, for temporary unemployment benefits, for educational and vocational training, and for assisting veterans in acquiring homes and farms and in establishing themselves in business.

NATURAL RESOURCES

A comprehensive program of soil, forest, water, and wildlife conservation and development, and sound irrigation projects, administered as far as possible at State and regional levels.

We favor a comprehensive program of reclamation projects for our arid and semi-arid States, with recognition and full protection of the rights and interests of those States in the reclamation and control of water for present and future irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses.

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7,
1948

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

NATURAL RESOURCES

We favor full development of our forests on the basis of cropping and sustained yields; cooperation with private owners for conservation and fire protection.

STOCK PILING

We need accurate and comprehensive knowledge of our mineral resources and must intensify our efforts to develop new supplies and to acquire stock piles of scarce materials.

PUBLIC WORKS

We must continue to erect multiple-purpose dams on our great rivers—not only to reclaim land, but also to prevent floods, to extend our inland waterways, and to provide hydroelectric power. This public power must not be monopolized for private gain. Only through well-established policies of transmitting power directly to its market and thus encouraging widespread use at low rates can the Federal Government assure the people of their full share of its benefits. Additional power, public and private, is needed to raise the ceilings now imposed by power shortages on industrial and agricultural development.

We should achieve the wise use of resources through the integrated development of our great river basins. We can learn much from our Tennessee Valley experience. We should no longer delay in applying the lessons of that vast undertaking to our great river basins.

AGRICULTURE

Price supports

We need to continue price supports for major farm commodities on a basis which will afford reasonable protection against fluctuations in the levels of production and demand. The present price-support program must be reexamined and modernized.

An American market price to the American farmer and the protection of such price by means of support prices, commodity loans, or a combination thereof, together with such other economic means as will assure an income to agriculture that is fair and equitable in comparison with labor, business, and industry. We oppose subsidies as a substitute for fair markets.

CROP INSURANCE

Crop insurance should be strengthened and its benefits extended in order to protect the farmer against the special hazards to which he is subject.

Serious study of and search for a sound program of crop insurance with emphasis upon establishing a self-supporting program.

FARM COOPERATIVES

We also need to improve the means for getting farm products into the markets and into the hands of consumers. Cooperatives which directly or indirectly serve this purpose must be encouraged—not discouraged.

Support of the principle of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

We need to go forward with the rural electrification program to bring the benefits of electricity to all our farm population.

To make life more attractive on the family type farm through extension of rural electrification services to the farm * * *.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We can, and must, aid and encourage farmers to conserve their soil resources and restore the fertility of land that has suffered from neglect and unwise use.

A comprehensive program of soil, * * * conservation and development.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Growth and vitality of our economy depend on vigorous private enterprise. Free competition is the key to industrial development, full production and employment, fair prices, and an ever improving standard of living.

We shall promote the fullest stable employment through private employment.

MONOPOLY

Competition is seriously limited today in many industries by the concentration of economic power and other elements of monopoly. The appropriation of sufficient funds to permit proper enforcement of the present antitrust laws is essential. Beyond that we should go on to strengthen our legislation to protect competition.

Small business must be preserved by the enforcement of laws against monopoly and unfair competition.

WAGE EARNERS

The Government has wisely chosen to set a floor under wages. But our 40-cent minimum wage is inadequate and obsolete. I

The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Social Security Act,

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7,
1948

recommend lifting the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

In general, however, we must continue to rely on our sound system of collective bargaining to set wage scales. Workers' incomes should increase at a rate consistent with the maintenance of sound price, profit, and wage relationships and with increasing productivity.

WAGE EARNERS

and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women, and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws.

ARMED FORCES

We believe that the United States can be an effective force for world peace only if it is strong. We look forward to the day when nations will decrease their armaments. Yet, so long as there remains serious opposition to the ideals of a peaceful world, we must maintain strong armed forces.

UNITED NATIONS

We have learned that a healthy world economy is essential to world peace—that economic distress is a disease whose evil effects spread far beyond the boundaries of the afflicted nation.

For these reasons the United States is vigorously following policies designed to achieve a peaceful and prosperous world.

We are giving, and will continue to give, our full support to the United Nations. While that organization has encountered unforeseen and unwelcome difficulties, I am confident of its ultimate success.

WORLD TRADE

We are seeking to restore the world trading system which was shattered by the war and to remedy the economic paralysis which grips many countries.

To restore world trade we have recently taken the lead in bringing about the greatest reduction of world tariffs that has ever occurred. The extension of the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which made this achievement possible, is of extreme importance. We must also go on to support the International Trade Organization, through which we hope to obtain world-wide agreement on a code of fair conduct in international trade.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Our present major effort toward economic reconstruction is to support the program for recovery developed by the countries of Europe. In my recent message to the Congress I outlined the reasons why it is wise and necessary for the United States to extend this support. I want to reaffirm my belief in the soundness and promise of this proposal. When the European economy is strengthened, the products of its industry will be of benefit to many other areas of economic distress. The ability of free men to

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

overcome hunger and despair will be a moral stimulus to the entire world.

INFLATION

Already inflation in this country is undermining the living standards of millions of families. Food costs too much. Housing has reached fantastic price levels. Schools and hospitals are in financial distress. Inflation threatens to bring on disagreement and strife between labor and management.

ECONOMY

Government expenditures have been, and must continue to be, held at the lowest safe level. Since VJ-day Federal expenditures have been sharply reduced. They have been cut from more than \$63,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1946 to less than \$38,000,000,000 in the present fiscal year. The number of civilian employees has been cut nearly in half—from 3,750,000 down to 2,000,000.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7,
1948

TAXATION

On the other hand, Government revenues must not be reduced. Until inflation has been stopped there should be no cut in taxes that is not offset by additions at another point in our tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that my speech today giving in detail a number of portions of the Republican platform will be extremely beneficial to you gentlemen on the left because it will refresh your recollection—if you have forgotten—or it will inform you what the platform was if you do not know.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan—who knows exactly what it is? Nobody. It seems to be something one day and something else the next day. Its origin, apparently, was accidental and it now seems to have no definite purpose or direction.

One day they say it is economic in its principal purpose and the next day they say it is military.

One day they say it is a fixed 5-year program and the next day someone high in the administration says 1 year or 15 months at a time is better.

One day they say about \$25,000,000,000 is necessary to carry on the program and the next day they say \$17,000,000,000 will do. Then someone says \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 will be enough.

One day Marshall said "take it as it is or leave it." The next day other men high in the administration said in effect, "We must have it to prevent war and we are willing to modify it."

Mr. Speaker, all this simply means that the Marshall plan is no definite plan at all but is a designation of another movement to have the United States give away a large amount of money and supplies without any satisfactory system of distribution and without any lasting benefits to our country.

There is little wonder that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is having difficulty in disposing of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the American people are willing to do whatever is reasonably necessary to relieve hunger and suffering in Europe and in Asia, but they demand a different system of distribution than that which has heretofore been followed. The situation is entirely different now than it was during the war. Then it was principally a matter of food and clothing and temporary relief. Now it is a matter of strengthening weak and discordant governments so that they can unify their people—stabilizing the unstable and depreciated currencies of these countries so that they can trade among themselves—rehabilitating the industrial, commercial, and agricultural activities of these countries so that they can provide employment for their people and

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We favor the prompt extension of relief and emergency assistance to the peoples of the liberated countries without duplication and conflict between Government agencies.

We favor immediate feeding of the starving

children of our allies and friends in the

Nazi-dominated countries and we condemn

the New Deal administration for its failure,

in the face of humanitarian demands, to

make any effort to do this.

We favor assistance by direct credits in

reasonable amounts to liberated countries

to enable them to buy from this country the goods necessary to revive their economic systems.

We shall maintain the value of the American dollar and regard the payment of Government debt as an obligation of honor which prohibits any policy leading to the depreciation of the currency.

We shall eliminate from the budget all wasteful and unnecessary expenditures and exercise the most rigid economy.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

TAXATION

As soon as the war ends, the present rate of taxation on individual incomes, on corporations, and on consumption should be reduced as far as is consistent with the payment of the normal expenditures of Government in the postwar period.

thereby increase their national wealth and security.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is a difficult one and the task before us requires our best efforts. It is a matter for Congress and not a departmental matter that can be handled by the State Department or any of the other departments of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should realize the importance of this matter and proceed immediately toward giving it affirmative and courageous consideration. Too much time has been wasted in an attempt to satisfy departments of the Government that do not want to yield power and prestige.

To this task Congress should call to its assistance the best financial and business experts of the Nation—men who know finance and the importance of a stable currency to the welfare of a country. Men who know foreign transportation and its complications. Men who know construction here and abroad and men who know how to set up business on a world-wide scale.

This task can only be done well by congressional action putting foreign aid under a separate authority. This authority should be in the form of a separate corporate agency with a bipartisan board of directors of the caliber and qualifications that I have already mentioned. The Board should be empowered to select a chairman or administrator to carry out its wishes.

This Board should immediately make a survey of the needs and facilities of the several countries with the purpose of assisting them to strengthen their currencies and to rehabilitate their industries and production agencies. When a preliminary survey is made, which should not take more than a month, this Board should immediately make recommendations to the Congress or to the President or both. The Congress should supply this Board with a few millions which it can use for emergency relief while it is making these surveys.

When more thorough surveys and recommendations are made the Congress and the President will then better know what to do and how to do it. Congress will then be better able to know how much money and how much national aid will be necessary. Congress will also then know how much these countries are willing to do for themselves.

Moneys and credits of these countries and their citizens on deposit or hidden in the United States or elsewhere should be applied to this relief program. Since no other countries are collaborating with the United States in this program, it is not only our privilege but it is our duty to make our own plans and to carry them out as we think best, always keeping in

mind our obligation to protect our own economy.

Unless serious political or military contingencies arise this task should be completed in 3 years at a total outlay of not more than three or four billion dollars.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHERE DOES OUR FOREIGN RELIEF MONEY GO?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures of the Congress of the United States, Senate Document No. 112, Eightieth Congress, first session, is truly an amazing report. It shows that the total estimate of post-war assistance for foreign relief, rehabilitation, and so forth, has reached the staggering sum of nineteen to twenty billions of dollars, exclusive of what may be contemplated under the Marshall plan proposals. This report covers the period from July 1945 to September 1947.

What is especially interesting to note is that Germany and Italy, two of the enemy nations, received \$1,674,000,000, while Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and the U. S. S. R., together with Ukraine and White Russia, received a total of \$1,644,000,000. Germany and Italy, the enemy nations, received \$30,000,000 more than these much devastated nations of eastern Europe.

I ask you, gentlemen, is this the way to make friends?

England, France, and Greece received \$7,288,000,000.

Maybe this policy makes sense to some people, but I am sure that it will not be understood by the vast majority of our citizens, and that it does not have their approval. I am sure that our citizens expected a humane policy which would give fair and equal assistance to the nations devastated by war. Must we continue to follow a relief or rehabilitation program based on politics?

Our original purpose was to work out a relief, rehabilitation, and recovery program for European nations in conjunction and in cooperation with the United Nations. This was the honest and proper way to pursue a world-recovery program, but the selfish and greedy bankers and international cartels, under the guise of a bipartisan program, wrecked the plan that the honest and decent American citizens were supporting. A world-recovery program under the United Nations would have cost our taxpayers less than one-half of what this selfish and inequitable program is costing us, and it would have brought us the respect, gratitude, and love of the whole world, instead of envy, fear, suspicion, and hatred.

I believe that our support of the rightists, or of the prewar status quo, can only bring us the enmity and hatred of the European people. That is why our position is so bad in Greece today, and that is also why we have made a mess of it in China. The people of Europe do not want communism, but likewise,

and even more strongly, they do not want a return to their old governments, and to the misery, intrigue, war, and starvation that those governments have brought upon them.

I am not in sympathy with a program which will shower billions of dollars on some nations and some people, and ignore the plight of other people who suffered so much at the hands of the Nazis. How do you feel when you read that 2,500,000 German children could eat American ice cream for Christmas, and 1,000,000 Polish orphan children, who went through all kinds of hell for six long years, are ignored and forgotten?

It seems like our bipartisan, big business, and international cartel program will only bring us the hatred and enmity of all the people of the world. We appropriated \$600,000,000 for German civilian relief on July 23, and then 2 weeks later canceled a miserable \$15,000,000 relief fund for Poland. This is something that my constituents cannot understand.

We had originally embarked on a sound American program which would give aid and credits to all people and all nations. This was the right policy to pursue, as it was in the old American tradition that has made America strong and respected. The present policy has resulted in a lot of confusion and misunderstanding. For example, we have now three groups of people in America: Those who are sincerely supporting a program of genuine relief and assistance out of the charity of their big Christian American hearts. Then there is the second group that has always opposed old-age pensions, school-lunch programs, aid to veterans, Federal aid to school teachers, aid to the incapacitated, the blind, and crippled. Yes; those who wouldn't give a bone to a starving dog we find strongly supporting the Truman plan and the Marshall plan, because it is a policy of anticommunism and a restoration of the rightists and reactionaries in Europe. Thirdly, there is the group of big bankers and international cartels, and all of those speculators in petroleum products, grain, and commodities who see for themselves an opportunity to make big profits quickly out of these free dollars that are being given to certain countries. Their motives for supporting the program are not based on patriotism, on a sound foreign policy that would work for peace, or because of sympathy for the destitute and hungry, but they have only one purpose in mind, and that is high prices, greed, and big profits that they can realize quickly out of this program.

I would like to see a genuine relief program, where the gifts from America would be distributed directly to the needy people by established charitable organizations, such as the Red Cross, the various religious relief organizations, and the many other societies that for years have been doing this kind of work, so that our gifts would not fall into the hands of the profiteers and black marketeers, or into the hands of political cliques, where the people must sell their souls to get bread or are bled white by the profiteers. This method of distribution has brought us

the hatred and enmity of the destitute and hungry.

This program should be supplemented further by the bill which I introduced, and the amendment that I offered to the recent relief bill, which provides for free postage on gift packages being sent from the citizens of the United States to the people of Europe. In the first 9 months of last year Americans spent \$44,000,000 for postage alone to send these gift packages. They are sending old clothes, shoes, food, and those things that the people in Europe desperately need. These packages go directly to the needy and the recipients know that they come from the United States. These gift packages have brought us more goodwill than any other thing that we have done, and it is my firm conviction that this program should be encouraged, as it would bring the greatest benefits in goods to the needy and genuine appreciation to the American people who send these packages.

Then, further, I believe that we should junk the present Marshall and Truman program, and instead, we should give loans and credits, without interest, to all nations and their people who have suffered from the ravages of war. We should not play favorites and try to rebuild one country as against another, and particularly, as we have been doing recently, where we ignore nations and people who have been our loyal friends for centuries, and who have been on our side in every struggle. It is said "but they have a government that we do not like." And I say in reply, "So what? The people of that nation also may not like their government, but governments come and governments go, but nations and people remain forever."

We cannot drop the American iron curtain that Churchill created for us on these unfortunate people and say "you must go to Russia for bread and sustenance." These people have fought for freedom and liberty for centuries. Both Germany and Russia have tried at various times to swallow and devour them, but each time they were unsuccessful and had to yield them up.

These people stand in ghastly fear of our policy of rebuilding Germany. They know that Germany has sprung at their throats at every opportunity, and in some nations, such as Poland, there is hardly a family who has not suffered the loss of fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters. Here is a nation that had 30,000 orphans in prewar days. Today it has 1,000,000 orphans as a result of German barbarism and bestiality. Twenty thousand tons of human ashes were found at one crematorium just outside of Warsaw. These people and these nations have a right to be alarmed about our present policy. They also have a right to ask, "Why do not you give us an equal opportunity to rehabilitate and reestablish ourselves?"

Now, let us turn to the recent London Conference at which Russia asked for \$10,000,000,000 in reparations from Germany, and which we opposed so strongly. From my viewpoint, this is not an unreasonable request. It is estimated that Poland suffered over \$100,000,000,000 in property damage by the Nazis. Rus-

sia's damages in all probability are two or three times as great as that of Poland. Now, why should not the Germans work and pay for their sins? Certainly \$10,000,000,000 is not a great amount of compensation for the damages they inflicted upon the Russian people. Since the war the United States has already contributed twice that much for the relief of European nations, and the funny part of it is that we won the war. It will serve America no good to be identified as supporting the Fascists and anti-democratic forces anywhere in the world. Certainly, that is not the desire nor the program of the rank and file of the American people. We love our liberty, and we have advanced steadily in our fight for better economic and living conditions. I am sure that the sympathies of the average American are with the downtrodden, and not with the kings, queens, dukes, and the big-landed aristocracy of Europe, or with the European cartelists and monopolists. The people of Europe desire liberty, freedom, democracy, and better living conditions just as much as we do. I believe that they shall get them. I believe that neither the left nor right shall win in Europe. I only hope that when the clouds over Europe roll away that we shall not be hated and despised by everyone. I am sure that the United States will be respected, loved, and admired if we follow the program on relief that I suggested, and also the program on credits and loans to all nations, without interest, and so as to give all of them an equal opportunity to rehabilitate themselves without playing favorites one way or another.

After the last World War our country was whipped into a frenzy and hysteria over Bolsheviks and Reds, and many thousands of people were rounded up and lodged in jail. In recent months we have witnessed a rebirth of this program. Unless the citizens awaken they will find themselves stripped of their civil liberties, as I find that already, even in Congress, many liberals and progressives fear to speak out their thoughts and feelings, because today it takes courage to speak out frankly and buck the press, radio, and the big international cartelists.

It will be different 4 or 5 years from now when these cartelists will be flooding the world markets with goods made in Germany and other European countries by 35 cents an hour labor. When our industries in Detroit will have to shut down and our labor will be unemployed because they will be unable to meet the competition of these international Americans.

It would be revealing to find out just what American firms have made European business connections in the last 2 years—and to what extent have they invested in European industry, banking, and business.

This, I am sure, would explain, "Where does our foreign relief and rehabilitation money go?"

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1842. An act to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain

for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564).

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1246. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, National Military Establishment, transmitting a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling between July 1 and December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1247. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1248. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947, which is to be substituted for the report submitted on January 6, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1249. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1250. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting certain information required by House Resolution 365 regarding the removal of industrial plants from Germany by way of reparation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1251. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1252. A letter from the Chairman, the National Archives, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1253. A letter from the Chairman, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, covering reports of all its constituent units, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 508); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1254. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the transactions of the government of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1255. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on operations under the Synthetic Fuels Act for the period January 1 to December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1256. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project (H. Doc. No. 509); to the Committee on Public Works.

1257. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Preliminary report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; relating to fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4478. A bill to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1411. A bill for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 380. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of

Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3425. A bill for the relief of Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; with amendments (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Jacob Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 5116. A bill to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 5117. A bill to transfer to the Territorial government of Alaska the administration within such Territory of laws relating to Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5118. A bill to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 5119. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5120. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as amended to provide homes for veterans by assistance to the various States, including the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 5121. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5122. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5123. A bill to increase World War I and II disability and death compensation and pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 5124. A bill to provide automobiles for disabled veterans of World War I under the same terms and conditions as are now applicable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5125. A bill to grant increased subsistence allowances to veterans undergoing courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5126. A bill to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5127. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 with reference to condemnation powers of the Administrator; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5128. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5129. A bill relating to the taxation of certain property owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5130. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of public-school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5131. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 5132. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5133. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to concerts conducted by civic and community membership associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 5134. A bill to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational rehabilitation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5135. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$80,000 for improvements to the harbor in St. Andrews Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5136. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5137. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5138. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death while on 2 weeks' active duty, and for their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 5139. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of \$60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 5140. A bill to amend the act approved August 5, 1947, entitled "An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5141. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 5142. A bill to encourage enterprise capital investment in production facilities, private research laboratories, rental homes, and other long-term assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5143. A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide an alternative tax, at the election of the taxpayer, on income derived from an unincorporated business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 5144. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution designating the 25th day of April 1948 as the fiftieth anniversary of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to permit the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution designating Horace C. Carlisle as poet laureate of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Concurrent Resolution 134; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 447. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to continue its investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortoloni; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5147. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5149. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renata Cuff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5150. A bill for the relief of George E. Finnegan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 5151. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1201. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 26 residents of Salem, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by Charles H. Carey Post, No. 56, American Legion Auxiliary, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1202. Also, petition of 74 residents of East Liverpool, Ohio, circulated by the American Legion Auxiliary of East Liverpool Post, No. 4, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1203. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by Lodge No. 2018, International Workers Order, Racine, Wis., repudiating Attorney General Clark's statement with reference to the loyalty of that organization; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1204. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of Local No. 464, International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, Dixfield, Maine, signed by Raymond Hanson, president, and Mrs. Jennie C. Haines, secretary, urging Congress to enact the Stratton displaced-persons bill into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1205. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Racine, Wis., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1206. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Detroit Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 295, NFPOC, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 4710; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1207. Also, petition of the State Water Resources Board of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to make adequate 1949 appropriations for flood control in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1208. Also, petition of Cassius M. McDonald, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1209. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress for judicial wrongs or grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for Thy blessed promise: Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee. Amid the blinding flashes of a world convulsed in the throes of misery, be Thou the holy benediction

of strength and encouragement, blessing us with zest of soul and those rugged virtues which make nations live. We pray that our passion to serve may match our privileges, linking us to a might that shall forever surmount a tyrant's ambition. O keep America in a crusade that makes secure the freedoms of the individual and that blasts the corrosive evils of human slavery. O Lord, cause Thy face to shine forth, and we shall be saved, to help generations to come. In Thy holy name. 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 a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3645. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 774. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments;

H. R. 1366. An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 400. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top;

S. 401. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott;

S. 773. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes;

S. 1407. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Robert E. Doyle;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Train-