

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12, 1945:

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

William A. Brophy, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice John Collier, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral William B. Young, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1945:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Courtney Whitney
Hammond Davies Birks
Charles Booth Spruit
James Francis Collins
John Carroll Kennedy
Charles Royal Lehner
Charles Sabin Ferrin
William Lemuel Mitchell
Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt
George Windie Read, Jr.
Donald Fowler Fritch
Selby Harney Frank
Harold Haney
Rex McKinley McDowell
John French Conklin
Einar Bernard Gjelsteen
Edwin William Rawlings
David Hazen Blakelock
Thomas Sarsfield Power
Thomas Merritt Lowe
William Archer Hagins
Francis Hudson Oxx
John Brandon Franks
Cornelius Edward Ryan
Lotha August Smith
Clarence Charles Fenn
Bernard Linn Robinson
George Francis Wooley, Jr.
Thomas Benton Catron 2d
Benjamin Grant Weir
Robert Merrill Lee
Ralph Townsend Heard
Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck
Cyrus Higginson Searcy
William Fulton McKee
Gustav Joseph Braun
Pearson Menoher
John Hubert Davies
Walter King Wilson, Jr.
Garland Cuzorte Black
James Roy Andersen
Frank Denis Hackett
George Arthur Lincoln
LeGrande Albert Diller
Charles Day Palmer
John Koehler Gerhart
John Keliher
Harold Albert Nisley
Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr.
Eugene Lynch Harrison
James Harve Johnson
Marion Van Voorst
John Archer Elmore
Edward Ward Smith
Augustus Milton Gurney
Emons Bert Whisner
Roy Victor Rickard
James Frederick Phillips
Charles Kenon Galley, Jr.
Harold Quiskie Huglin

Lawrence Edward Schick
Calvert Hinton Arnold
Henry Irving Hodes
Robert Clarence McDonald
Ralph Parker Eaton
Max Frank Schneider
Eugene Ware Riddings
Charles Eskridge Saltzman
Edward Clark Rose
Georges Frederic Doriot
William Henry Draper, Jr.
Elliott Roosevelt
Bernhard Alfred Johnson
Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr.
John Joseph O'Brien
Gene William Hall
George Hamden Olmsted
William Herbert Eaton

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

W. H. Knight, Shreveport, La., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who from everlasting to everlasting changeth not, we humble ourselves this noontide in Thy holy presence, and offer unto Thee this, the sincere prayer of our hearts. Lend Thou Thy gracious ear unto our petition, and grant us Thy divine favor.

We give thanks for our beloved Nation, her people, her ideals, her honorable history. We thank Thee for the officials of our Nation, for those chosen by the free suffrage of the people, to make our laws and to execute them. We beseech Thee to bless, through the abundance of Thy grace, this body of Thy legislative servants. Bless their homes and families and all the interests of their hearts consistent with Thy divine will and plan. Guide them as they seek to thus make their contribution toward the solution of the problems of a distraught world.

We remember today our sons and daughters, husbands, sweethearts, and friends who have answered the call of duty "where e'er the sun doth his successive journeys run." Be Thou graciously near every one of them. Comfort those who are called upon to make the supreme sacrifice. Heal the hurt of the wounded and cheer the hearts of those in prison, or who for any reason long for the loving fellowships back at home. Bless and strengthen loved ones who wait and labor in the homeland and who pray. Hear our prayers, O gracious God, in these momentous days. Give victory to our armed forces on land and sea and in the air. Confuse, we pray, the brutal plans and nefarious purposes of our enemies. Hasten the day when the forces of right shall be regnant on earth, even as it is in heaven. In the name of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 9, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

COMMUNICATION FROM GENERAL MACARTHUR

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FEBRUARY 10, 1945.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: General MacArthur has asked that the following message from him be delivered to you:

"On behalf of all ranks of this command, I express respectful thanks and appreciation for the magnificent tribute expressed through you by the House of Representatives. Such a message from this great body, representative of the spirit and conscience of the citizenry of the United States, will serve as an unfailing inspiration to our completion of the task which lies ahead of us, the complete defeat of Japan."

It is a great privilege and pleasure for me, as an agent of the War Department, to transmit this message to you.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, G. S. C.,
Deputy Chief,
Legislative and Liaison Division.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE

Mr. COCHRAN. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of giving the insurance companies of the country an opportunity to adjust themselves to the decision of the Supreme Court, but I am not in favor of the House bill as it was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. If you look at section 3 of the bill you will find that it exempts all the business of insurance companies and agents from the original Federal Trade Commission Act, and all amendments thereto, as well as the Robinson-Patman Act; in my opinion no honorable insurance company or honorable agent would want to be exempted from these acts. It will give an opportunity to fly-by-night insurance agents and companies to indulge in all the false advertising they desire, and they will be exempt from prosecution if that provision in the bill stands.

Section 3 of the House bill reads as follows:

Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

This certainly sets a precedent. The Congress has never so far as I know ever exempted any business from the original Federal Trade Commission Act as amended or the Robinson-Patman Act. You will note the language "or to acts in the conduct of that business." That plainly means that advertising would be construed as an act in the conduct of the insurance business.

I sincerely hope that this matter will be thoroughly considered by the Judiciary Committee and before this bill is called

up that the committee will agree to eliminate section 3.

I will not vote for the bill as it was reported by the committee unless section 3 is stricken from the measure.

THE LATE HARRY CLIFFORD CANFIELD

Mr. LUDLOW. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former distinguished Member of this body from the State of Indiana.

Harry Clifford Canfield, a Representative in Congress for 10 years from the old Fourth Indiana District, died Saturday, February 10, at his home in Batesville, Ind., after a protracted illness. Mr. Canfield was a shining example of a self-made man in this land of opportunities. Born on a farm in Dearborn County, Ind., his finances were so meager that he was thrown upon his own resources to obtain an education. He worked his way through Moores Hill College, Moores Hill, Ind.; Central Normal College, Danville, Ind.; and Vories Business College, Indianapolis. After teaching school for a time in Dearborn County he moved to Batesville and entered upon a business career as a manufacturer and retailer of furniture, with banking and farming interests. In the business world he achieved a high degree of success.

His service as a Representative in Congress covered 10 years, from 1923 to 1933, an eventful period in our country's history, and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Ways and Means Committee he was active and influential in shaping some of the most important legislation of that decade. His relations with John N. Garner, then the Democratic leader, were very close. While he was in Congress his apartment at the old Congress Hall Hotel, the site of the present New House Office Building, where he lived with his wife and their son and daughter, was a center of radiant Hoosier hospitality. He was a wise counselor and a faithful friend and his public service brought distinction and credit to the district he so ably represented and to the State that gave him birth.

NATURAL GAS SITUATION IN DETROIT AREA SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED—CHAOS MAY RESULT AGAIN

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include several short excerpts from Detroit newspapers in the RECORD at this point relative to the confusion and near hysteria created last week end at Detroit over the local gas company's bungling of Government orders affecting natural-gas service. This is a further report to the House, following my address of last Monday, February 5.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar here with the dire emergencies that may grow out of a prolonged spell of bad weather in the wintertime. We accepted without alarm the embargo placed on freight shipments from Chicago eastward when snow impeded the movement of vital war materials, and with the same degree of calmness and order the War Production Board 10 days ago considered the steps to be taken to rescue the vast Appalachian region from a dangerous natural-gas shortage then impending. Thus, on Thursday, February 1, the W. P. B. Director of War Utilities dispatched orders throughout the threatened area from Louisville north to Saginaw, and eastward to the seaboard. His directives went out primarily to the pipe-line executives controlling gas-well output and pipe-line gas flow, and thence to the officials of local gas distributing companies, including the gas utility, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., at Detroit.

Now what was the nature of the emergency? We certainly cannot obtain those facts from the panicky headlines of Detroit newspapers, but investigation will reveal that local gas-utility officials at Detroit and elsewhere understood clearly exactly what the Government sought to accomplish. Investigation will show, too, that everywhere except at Detroit the orders were carried out with competence and due appreciation of the complex situation confronting W. P. B. officials. Now if Detroit were the exception—if at Detroit our war production was thrown into a tailspin, if our war workers lost half a million dollars in wages, if the national taxpayers footing the war bill at Detroit were burdened with extraordinary expenses, if the morale of management and labor alike was threatened—is it not important for the Congress to understand why Detroit was the exception? Since the W. P. B., having no control over the weather, has warned that a similar emergency may recur in the Appalachian region and at Detroit, should not an investigation be undertaken now to prevent another costly disruption of the war production at Detroit? I believe we all know where our duty lies, and as Representative of the most heavily industrialized district of the United States, and for that matter, of the entire world, I intend that all the facts instead of fiction shall be brought forth.

I have asked, "What was the nature of the emergency?" It consisted simply of the fact that cold weather had produced such an unusual demand for natural gas by families—not by war industries—in the region eastward from Indiana that gas pressures in the intricate pipe-line systems were dropping to a dangerous low. This was recognized by the gas utilities throughout the area and by the Government. This must have been known also to the gas-utility executives at Detroit, but please keep in mind that gas pressures were not dropping at Detroit. Our area was not faced with a shortage of supply, for two reasons: First, the pipe line to Detroit does not draw its natural gas supplies from the waning gas reserves in the Appalachian area, but from the vast reserves of southwest Kan-

sas, western Oklahoma, and the Texas Panhandle; second, Detroit's natural gas supplies were augmented by so-called standby equipment of the local gas utility, available for the manufacture of a gas having the same heating quality of natural gas, and for intermixture with the natural gas brought in from the Southwest.

Now for the second question: "How was the emergency to be met?" Mr. Edward Falck, W. P. B. Director of War Utilities, has informed us as follows, and I quote from Mr. Falck's public statement of Saturday, February 3:

When the possibility of collapse in the Appalachian area became imminent it was imperative to put into immediate effect measures previously prepared and authorized by telephone.

I ask my colleagues to keep in mind his phrase, "Measures previously prepared and authorized by telephone." Meantime, let me present the situation as it appeared to the executives of war plants, to war workers, and to the population generally in the Detroit area, nearly 24 hours after W. P. B. officials had taken their precautions and ordered necessary safeguards; that is, the precautionary safeguards "previously prepared and authorized by telephone."

The near-hysteria at Detroit is evidenced by the newspaper headlines, some of which I hold up for your inspection. Here is the Detroit News' "blue streak" edition of Friday, February 2, with a headline 3 inches high, and I quote it: "W. P. B. cuts off gas flow to 100 war plants here—Ban made to relieve Ohio crisis—Detroit workers face lay-off." As war plant managers and workers turned from this comparatively modest presentation, their apprehension and indignation mounted as they encountered the "red line" edition of the Detroit Times. To the simple directives issued from Washington 24 hours previously, the news of which had been withheld deliberately from the Detroit public, the Detroit Times added a special headline in red ink, with an exclamation point, and the headlines were nearly 6 inches high, reading as follows:

In red ink: "War plants closing!"

In black ink: "Bars, movies stay open in 3-day gas holiday—Factories hit by U. S. order curtailing gas."

Several hours later, on Thursday evening, the first edition of the Detroit Free Press for Friday, February 2, reached the streets with this 8-column headline: "Detroit escapes cut in gas," followed by "W. P. B. ban is lifted at last minute; 30,000 made idle in dozen war plants."

My colleagues in the House are fully aware of the highly complicated and interdependent nature of war production at Detroit. Not only is each plant an intricate mechanism in itself, geared to strict schedules with all departments functioning at set tempos, but many plants are also interlinked with the output of other related plants. Experience has demonstrated time and again that any obstructive incident, such as a delay in the execution of a Government directive and a failure to publicize its nature properly to plants and personnel, can create in a few hours a degree of chaos which can be resolved only by days

of corrective effort. Thus, I have presented the Detroit Free Press headline in its first Friday edition, appearing Thursday night: During the night, it appears, Detroit industrialists poured their woes in an unending torrent upon the Mead committee of the Senate, with Detroit's own Senator HOMER FERGUSON, a member of that committee, as their intermediary. So now we come, a few hours later, to a final Free Press edition of Friday, February 2, with another screaming headline, as follows: "Bungling shuts Detroit war plants—United States asked to probe gas order—FERGUSON calls chaos inexcusable—W. P. B. admits error; 50,000 made idle," and here I quote directly from the Free Press article:

A congressional investigation to determine the responsibility for the bungling which sent 50,000 Detroit war workers into idleness and jeopardized the city's entire week-end war production will be demanded. The request will be made by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan, Republican.

The Senator acted Friday night on protest from Detroit's industrialists. They were aroused at being thrown into confusion and shut-downs following a series of contradictory War Production Board orders to 100 of the largest plants drastically curtailing their use of natural gas.

FERGUSON said that the investigation would fall under the jurisdiction of the Mead committee, formerly the Truman committee, of which he is a member.

While a critical gas shortage has developed in the Appalachian area because of the prolonged cold weather, Senator FERGUSON said the forced shut-downs in Detroit were inexcusable.

High-priority products from Detroit are sorely needed on the western front and, W. P. B. officials admitted Friday night, the Detroit gas cut-down would have brought no improvement to the shortage area.

"While this needless damage to the war effort cannot be undone," Senator FERGUSON said, "an investigation should prevent repetition of such costly bunglers."

Meanwhile, following a day of wild confusion which saw vital plants sending thousands of workers home for the week end, production experts were working late in the night trying to restore production of the needed war materials.

An ambiguously worded order curtailing the use of industrial gas and a drastic interpretation of it by the W. P. B. in Washington resulted in closing the heavy-armor-producing factories.

The day of bewilderment for industry rounded into a complete fiasco at 5:35 p. m. Friday when the earlier orders suddenly were rescinded.

As matters stood late Friday the plants are to continue production if the shifts sent home for the week end can be reassembled.

At the root of Detroit's chaotic day was the prolonged cold wave. It had stripped Ohio and eastern communities of their normal coal supply and placed a heavy drain on gas pipe lines.

Before the curtailment orders were recalled for Michigan, Chrysler Corporation, General Motors Corporation, Continental Motors Corporation, Bohn Aluminum & Brass Co., and Aluminum Co. of America plants had closed.

So had numerous smaller but highly vital war industries.

I have presented here merely the high lights of the first accounts of this deplorable situation as presented by Detroit's three daily newspapers. Through Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday the newspapers continued to blaze away,

both in their news columns and with thundering editorials. The Free Press on Monday declared:

War plants must not be placed so senselessly in jeopardy again. The Mead committee should probe deeply and thoroughly. Thereafter strong safeguards should be erected against repetition.

The Detroit Times on the same day asserted:

Michigan's Senator FERGUSON indicated he might start an investigation. If he still is of the same mind, he should start one and finish it. We cannot afford the luxury of such dangerous mistakes at this stage of the war.

On Tuesday the Detroit News chorused in the same vein:

Senator FERGUSON should pursue his inquiry so that it may be determined how the blunder was made and who is responsible for it.

The admission that just a mistake accounted for shutting off gas supplies to industrial customers here was made by Alexander Macomber, Director of the Gas Division of the Office of War Utilities. Although the correction was quickly attempted by the local War Production Board office, the confusion was such, after the plants were closed, that in a number of cases full production could not be resumed until Monday.

Mr. Speaker, in my address to the House on last Monday I pointed out that much, if not all, of the confusion at Detroit, with its disruption of war plant morale, can be traced directly to the management of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., the local gas utility, and that much of the near hysteria appearing in the newspapers may likewise be attributed to those utility officials, due either to their failure to publicize and implement Government orders promptly or to their giving to the newspapers an incorrect and unfair interpretation of the real problems confronting W. P. B. and the steps initiated by W. P. B. to avert virtual disaster throughout the Appalachian region. I wish now to return to that grave charge.

As a result of the chaos prevailing last week end at Detroit, these four measures have been taken toward the facts, rather than the fictions of the situation:

First. Senator FERGUSON has conferred with W. P. B. officials and is quoted by last Sunday's Free Press in part as follows:

"It does appear, however, there was real necessity for the order Friday morning," FERGUSON asserted. "It seems to me it was a matter of judgment based on facts." He said a further investigation would be made particularly to determine what action could be taken to avert a repetition of the confusion caused to Detroit's war-producing machinery.

Second. Further conversations with W. P. B. officials have been undertaken by myself, with results to be presented to the House.

Third. An investigation has been launched by the U. A. W. (C. I. O.) with a possible view to seeking "some sort of recompense from the Government for the estimated \$500,000 in wages that was lost." The quotation is from the Free Press of Monday, February 5.

Fourth. Two principal Government officials have gone to Detroit to restate their official position in the controversy.

From the manifold inquiries in progress, these facts are emerging, in contrast to confusing interpretations appearing in Detroit newspapers:

First. The natural-gas reserves and pipe-line facilities connected to Detroit are adequate to supply that area.

Second. Any need which may arise in the future for the borrowing of a part of the natural gas intended for Detroit, and its temporary diversion to homes in Ohio, cannot properly be seized upon by the Detroit gas utility management as a justification for spending \$70,000,000 to duplicate existing pipe-line facilities, as a further burden on rate payers.

Third. The gas curtailment, which for a few hours, threatened Detroit, is a restriction which has been calmly and frequently accepted by hundreds of industrial communities in the Appalachian area, large and small, during periods of prolonged cold weather.

Fourth. No bungling by the War Production Board officials occurred in connection with curtailment orders affecting Detroit's supply. An admission by Alexander Macomber, Director of the W. P. B.'s Gas Division, that "we made a mistake" has been misinterpreted in the newspapers as indicating that W. P. B. had ordered the Detroit curtailment through error. Mr. Macomber has informed the Detroit public on this subject, according to the Detroit Times of Wednesday, February 7, as follows:

"The only mistake, if there was a mistake, was to include Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois among the States in which amusement places were affected by a similar curtailment order," he continued.

He explained that inclusion of those three States in the later separate order affecting amusement places had been contemplated. They were included in a preliminary draft of the order, but were dropped out before the order was issued because secret military weather information by that time had indicated the Detroit area crisis was ended.

Fifth. The confusion and near-hysteria which occurred at Detroit, and the losses sustained by taxpayers and war workers, were the result of bungling by the management of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. and not by the Government, and it is this bungling which needs to be investigated by Congress, if recurrence is to be avoided, for W. P. B. officials are warning that a similar emergency may develop before the winter passes.

Now, let us fill in the background of this costly blundering by Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., in which a few slick operators, seeking to utilize a Government directive to promote their private or corporate ambitions overplayed their hands.

For approximately 15 years the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. at Detroit, and its predecessor, Detroit City Gas Co., has been conducting a ruthless form of guerrilla war against every threat of competition for the great gas market which it dominates, a deliberate campaign in which it has had the assistance of the powerful Columbia Gas & Electric Corporation, and, more recently, of others whose activities merit attention.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is a subsidiary of American Light & Traction, which is a subsidiary of United

Light & Railways, which is a subsidiary of the vast and sprawling United Light & Power Co. Controlling this top company is a small group of voting stockholders, headed by Mr. Harrison Williams, husband of the ex-"best-dressed woman in America." The value of the holdings of all of the voting shares of United Light & Power have been estimated by the Securities and Exchange Commission to be less than 2 percent of the total assets of this top holding company. I should state here that American Light & Traction controls not only Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., at Detroit, but also the Detroit Edison Co., thanks to a quirk in administrative problems of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The conduct of this guerrilla war against competitors has been a principal responsibility of one William G. Woolfolk, a former lieutenant of Samuel Insull, who has been maintained by the Harrison Williams group as president of the three holding companies and currently as chairman of the board of directors of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. A study of the present affairs of the United Light & Power set-up will quickly reveal the precarious situation of the Harrison Williams shareholders and the Woolfolk management, arising from requirements of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

This vital legislation has been on America's statute books for nearly 10 years, but only now is the Securities and Exchange Commission coming to grips with the problems of disentangling the United Light & Power combine. In that process the Commission has ordered, thus far, the dissolution of the top company, and has, significantly, ordered United Light & Railways, second from the top, to dispose of its interest in and control over the third holding company, namely, American Light & Traction Co. A third important demand of the Commission is that American Light & Traction dispose of its interest in shares of Detroit Edison Co.

Mr. Speaker, it requires no wise man from the east to recognize the perilous status of Harrison Williams, William G. Woolfolk, et al., arising from the Commission's application of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended. Their first personal concern, in the grand toss-up of these properties, is to come down on their feet. For example, with the dissolution of United Light & Power Co., of which the Williams-Woolfolk group now control less than 2 percent of assets, how can they perpetuate their present control of the second holding company, United Light & Railways, which is not faced with dissolution?

Again, in the Commission's order for separation of American Light & Traction, third holding company, from United Light & Railways, how can the present control of American's subsidiaries by the Williams-Woolfolk management be preserved? Out of their months of mental travail, Mr. Woolfolk has given recent birth to a unique proposal, on which the Commission has been asked by Mr. Woolfolk to decide favorably.

The proposal, briefly, calls for the following steps:

First. American Light & Traction Co. would be dissolved. By this process the Williams-Woolfolk clique would be rid of a minority group of stockholders owning almost one-half of the voting power.

Second. After this minority has been eliminated as an effective check, the subsidiaries of American Light & Traction Co., now under the Williams-Woolfolk control, would be so maneuvered as to become the owners of a natural-gas pipe line, to be constructed under supervision of the Woolfolk group, and presumably to be operated by Mr. Woolfolk and associates.

Third. Initial funds for construction of such a pipe line would be obtained by Woolfolk and others through the sale of Detroit Edison Co. shares now held by American Light & Traction Co.

Fourth. As a necessary requirement for obtaining a pipe-line certificate to construct such a pipe line, Mr. Woolfolk and others must obtain from the Securities and Exchange Commission a permit to organize a pipe-line company, and this permission is now being sought.

The pipe line, as proposed, would supply gas to present American Light & Traction subsidiaries in Wisconsin, at Madison and Milwaukee, and to Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., at Detroit. Unfortunately for Mr. Woolfolk, however, bitter opposition to the above objectives has arisen among both preferred and common stockowners of the holding companies, as expressed to the Commission. Further, public officials representing gas users at Milwaukee and Detroit are eyeing the Woolfolk pipe-line proposal with extreme caution, and hearings are pending before common councils in both cities. Aside from a natural desire by the Williams-Woolfolk clique to come down on their feet in the Commission's reshuffling, Mr. Woolfolk and some of his corporate associates are the controlling owners of a tidy investment in natural-gas-producing properties in southwest Kansas, in the very field where the proposed Woolfolk pipe line would originate. And the public officials of Wisconsin and Michigan are not unmindful of that investment, nor of the history of its acquisition.

And so we come down to Thursday afternoon, February 1, in the year of our Lord 1945. Throughout the vast Appalachian area, which, with Detroit, is the mind and sinew of the mightiest production for war in the history of the world, pipe-line officials and gas-utility executives are nervously watching the constant drop in gas pressures. They are aware of what must be done and what can be done, and they know that the War Production Board officials at Washington are prepared. Preliminary instructions have already gone out. Curtailments have been necessary before, and the operation itself has become an expected occurrence when the icy hand of winter keeps its grip too long.

Therefore, in the late afternoon of Thursday, about 5 or 6 o'clock, the orders for curtailment go out from Washington for the institution of such measures as will maintain necessary gas pressures,

particularly in Ohio, where the companies supplying millions of homes have no stand-by or emergency service to supplement natural-gas pipe-line supplies. One of the steps necessary to maintain the pressures is the diversion, for a limited time, of a part of the natural gas being pumped from the Southwest into Michigan by the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. The Government officials also recognize that, for the first time, Detroit industries may be required to surrender, temporarily, a part of their accustomed deliveries of gas.

And so a directive from Washington went forward also to W. P. B.'s representative at Kansas City, who controls there the allocation of Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co.'s available gas supplies, directing him to pump into the depleted pipe-line system of Ohio, reaching almost to Pittsburgh, every cubic foot of natural gas that could be obtained from the Panhandle Eastern system. The directive meant, if disaster to millions of people was to be averted, no more than temporary curtailment of natural gas delivered to Detroit where no shortage of supply otherwise would occur. Within a few hours, the necessary instructions had been forwarded to Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. at Detroit, where the utility management received them about 9 p. m. According to such accounts as may be gathered from the press, the instructions ordered, and I quote: "a total curtailment to the maximum extent possible without damage to service and production facilities to all plants using over 30,000 cubic feet of gas per day."

Here, evidence would indicate, is where the proverbial fat was thrown into the fire. With Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. in receipt of the curtailment order at 9 p. m. Thursday, or thereabouts, a fatal pause ensued. But the clock ticked busily away, as before, and the emergency grew—9, 10, 11, midnight, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and noon, Thursday. And as Ohio gas pressures dropped, the headlines on Detroit newspapers, more than 12 hours after the curtailment order had been received there, leaped higher and higher.

And what had transpired, meantime, at the gas company? Had the management foreseen such an eventuality during all the previous weeks when neighboring utility officials to the south had been wrestling with an identical situation in Ohio? Why were not the orders immediately publicized, and the public's cooperation enlisted in conserving gas supplies? In a patriotic community like Detroit, under these circumstances, every facility of press and radio is available for such enlistment. Who will deny that such immediate conservation might have resulted as to tide the war plants over the emergency period, assuring adequate gas both for their needs and for gas-starved systems in Ohio? Who can challenge the conclusion that such conservation by domestic and commercial users might have immediately resulted in such manner as to permit war plants to curtail gas use in an orderly manner, should that extreme measure have become finally necessary?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the charge to the House made by me on Monday, February 5. Detroit's confusion and near-hysteria, upturned war production, losses to workers and disruption of morale in industrial management may be traced directly to the fact that the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. slept on the order all night, instead of instituting the measures one might ordinarily expect of an alert and competent public-utility official in such an emergency.

It is significant that when the curtailment order finally was disclosed, the gas company accompanied it with a public statement that included the following:

The condition in which Detroit finds itself today emphasizes the importance of the consummation of the plan for the building of an independent \$70,000,000 pipe line from the Hugoton fields at Kansas to Detroit in which Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. would own a major interest and which plan is being currently actively advocated before interested governmental agencies.

Thus, it appears that the gas company, during precious hours when it could find no time to tell the public the facts and enlist its cooperation, could nevertheless find time for the preparation of publicity purporting falsely to show that favorable action by the Government on the Woolfolk pipe-line proposition might avert a recurrence of Government curtailment orders. The gas company's delay, in view of the timing of such publicity, was without a shred of logic or justification. From John W. Batten, president of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., and local hatchet man in the long war Mr. Woolfolk conducts on competition, has come the alibi that the W. P. B. orders received by him from Kansas City on Thursday night were ambiguous, and he could not place them in effect without further consultation directly with W. P. B. at Washington.

Direct light on Mr. Batten's claims is thrown by the visit of W. P. B. officials to Detroit last week. The Detroit Free Press of Wednesday, February 7, contains this statement:

He—

Edward Falck, Director of the Office of War Utilities, W. P. B.—

said the original order had gone out late Thursday to the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. At noon Friday, Michigan Gas notified this area's prime users of industrial gas of the shut-down.

He said he understood that some confusion was caused because certain companies refused to take telephone orders from the gas company and demanded a written directive from Washington.

In this same connection, I refer to the Detroit Times of Wednesday, February 7, and the following:

Both Macomber and Falck challenged an assertion of John W. Batten, president of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., blaming ambiguity of the order received here for a part of the delay in notifying the public of the crisis. Batten insisted, however, it included new phraseology.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of all America and so that this inexcusable blundering may never recur at Detroit or anywhere else, I trust that the demands by Senator FERGUSON, by the Detroit news-

papers, and by labor and management at Detroit for a thorough investigation may result in an immediate, penetrating, and conclusive investigation either by the Mead committee of the Senate, as Senator FERGUSON has proposed, or by a responsible committee of the House. I refer again to the fact that House Resolution No. 18, now pending before the Rules Committee, which I introduced in the last Congress and have again sponsored here, is adequate for the purpose of conducting such an inquiry under authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my intention to speak again on this subject.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an essay by the late Pvt. Robert Kenneth Osterberg, 19 years of age, of Chicago, who died in action in Germany last November 27, and who understood what he died for.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times on lend-lease.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. 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, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on the subject of world peace by that distinguished lawyer and former Ambassador to Great Britain, Hon. John W. Davis, of New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by me before the graduating class of the officers candidate school at Camp Lee, Va.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 15, 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.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article. I am advised that this article will cost \$138.67 over and above the amount allowed under the rule, but I ask that it be printed nevertheless.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one entitled "The Rural Mail Carrier—A Faithful Public Servant," which was taken from the Austin Daily Herald of Austin, Minn., and the other entitled "Remember the Loyal Mailman," which was taken from the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Gazette Telegram.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the statement of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur in presenting the Snow medal on behalf of the American Social Hygiene Association to Maj. Gen. Merritte W. Ireland; also an extract from the report of the award committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on the manpower problem.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a

senate concurrent resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the soldier vote bill from the Creston (Iowa) News Advertiser, and further to extend my remarks and include an address delivered on February 9 before the Mu-So-Lit Club of Washington, D. C., by our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two separate matters and include newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print two extensions in the Appendix of the RECORD, one to include a letter from a County Farm War Board, and second, to include a tax speech I made in New York City.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I made on the Blue Network on February 9 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. L. R. Durkee, Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] may have permission to extend his remarks and include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by John W. Scoville, economist for the Chrysler Corporation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD on the subject of treaty ratification and include two short editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we would like to have the matter in such shape that all points of order are reserved on the bill. May I state a parliamentary inquiry, How may we do that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TABER. At this time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so at this time.

Mr. TABER. May that be done now or after unanimous consent is granted?

The SPEAKER. It makes little difference whether it is done before or after.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the completion of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LEASING OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order

to inquire of the majority leader if arrangements can be made to bring up tomorrow a joint resolution making provision for the leasing of hospital facilities in New York City. The Public Health Service reports that the Staten Island Marine Hospital is wholly unable to take care of emergency cases and recommends leasing supplementary quarters. The Committee on Appropriations has unanimously reported the joint resolution and would like to bring it up tomorrow immediately after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand this is noncontroversial.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is noncontroversial. There is, so far as I know, no difference of opinion on any provision of the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have talked to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and I also spoke to the chairman of the Committee on Rules about it. It is agreeable to them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. That will be conditioned, of course, upon the limitations stated by the majority leader the other day, that if any roll call came up the matter would go over.

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely. That is the reason why I asked if it was noncontroversial. If I make a statement to the House, of course, I shall keep it. I want to keep any promise I make to the House. I understand this is noncontroversial and that there will be no roll call. I understand that other than a colloquy under a reservation of objection explaining the bill there will be no controversy or discussion on the bill, and no amendments offered to it. The understanding is if any debate is undertaken or an amendment offered, it would be withdrawn. Is that the understanding?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, the situation is something like this: The marine hospital, under control of the Public Health Service, is completely filled. They only have four or five beds available, and it is overcrowded now. More and more are coming in all the time, and they must have some place to put them. They felt they should proceed immediately with equipping this hospital, which it is proposed to take over from the City of New York, it having been closed because the City of New York was unable to get the personnel to operate it. That is the situation, and it really is a situation that should be taken care of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With that understanding, I hope to call up the bill tomorrow. If there is objection, of course, at any stage of its consideration, I will withdraw the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. From what committee did this legislation come?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is an appropriation reported from the Committee on Appropriations, under authorization of law.

Mr. RANKIN. This is for a marine hospital?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is for the lease of a hospital belonging to the city of New York, the Neponsit Beach Hospital, which is to be used to supplement Staten Island Marine Hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. It is to be a part of the Staten Island Marine Hospital?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; under the same jurisdiction, providing for the same class of cases.

Mr. RANKIN. How much is involved?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. \$184,000 for alterations, fuel, and equipment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the war record of the General Motors Corporation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and certain excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 127) providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered, as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage, without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent, Mr. G. W. Selvidge, of Henryetta, Okla.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my Budget message of January 9 I called attention to the need for immediate action on the Bretton Woods proposals for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It is my purpose in this message to indicate the importance of these international organizations in our plans for a peaceful and prosperous world.

As we dedicate our total efforts to the task of winning this war we must never lose sight of the fact that victory is not only an end in itself, but, in a large sense, victory offers us the means of achieving the goal of lasting peace and a better way of life. Victory does not insure the achievement of these larger goals—it merely offers us the opportunity—the chance—to seek their attainment. Whether we will have the courage and vision to avail ourselves of this tremendous opportunity—purchased at so great a cost—is yet to be determined. On our shoulders rests the heavy responsibility for making this momentous decision. I have said before, and I repeat again: This generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

If we are to measure up to the task of peace with the same stature as we have measured up to the task of war, we must see that the institutions of peace rest firmly on the solid foundations of international political and economic cooperation. The cornerstone for international political cooperation is the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a permanent United Nations. International political relations will be friendly and constructive however, only if solutions are found to the difficult economic problems we face today. The cornerstone for international economic cooperation is the Bretton Woods proposal for an International Monetary Fund and an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These proposals for an international fund and international bank are concrete evidence that the economic objectives of the United States agree with those of the United Nations. They illustrate our unity of purpose and interest in the economic field. What we need and what they need correspond—expanded production, employment, exchange, and consumption—in other words, more goods produced, more jobs, more trade, and a higher standard of living for us all. To the people of the United States this means real peacetime employment for those who will be returning from the war and for those at home whose wartime

work has ended. It also means orders and profits to our industries and fair prices to our farmers. We shall need prosperous markets in the world to insure our own prosperity, and we shall need the goods the world can sell us. For all these purposes, as well as for a peace that will endure, we need the partnership of the United Nations.

The first problem in time which we must cope with is that of saving life and getting resources and people back into production. In many of the liberated countries economic life has all but stopped. Transportation systems are in ruins and therefore coal and raw materials cannot be brought to factories. Many factories themselves are shattered, power plants smashed, transmission systems broken, bridges blown up or bombed, ports clogged with sunken wrecks, and great rich areas of farm land inundated by the sea. People are tired and sick and hungry. But they are eager to go to work again, and to create again with their own hands and under their own leaders the necessary physical basis of their lives.

Emergency relief is under way behind the armies under the authority of local governments, backed up first by the Allied military command and after that by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Our participation in the U. N. R. R. A. has been approved by Congress. But neither U. N. R. R. A. nor the armies are designed for the construction or reconstruction of large-scale public works or factories or power plants or transportation systems. That job must be done otherwise, and it must be started soon.

The main job of restoration is not one of relief. It is one of reconstruction which must largely be done by local people and their governments. They will provide the labor, the local money, and most of the materials. The same is true for all the many plans for the improvement of transportation, agriculture, industry, and housing, that are essential to the development of the economically backward areas of the world. But some of the things required for all these projects, both of reconstruction and development, will have to come from overseas. It is at this point that our highly developed economy can play a role important to the rest of the world and very profitable to the United States. Inquiries for numerous materials, and for all kinds of equipment and machinery in connection with such projects are already being directed to our industries, and many more will come. This business will be welcome just as soon as the more urgent production for the war itself ends.

The main problem will be for these countries to obtain the means of payment. In the long run we can be paid for what we sell abroad chiefly in goods and services. But at the moment many of the countries who want to be our customers are prostrate. Other countries have devoted their economies so completely to the war that they do not have the resources for reconstruction and development. Unless a means of financing is found, such countries will be unable

to restore their economies and, in desperation, will be forced to carry forward and intensify existing systems of discriminatory trade practices, restrictive exchange controls, competitive depreciation of currencies, and other forms of economic warfare. That would destroy all our good hopes. We must move promptly to prevent its happening, and we must move on several fronts, including finance and trade.

The United States should act promptly upon the plan for the International Bank, which will make or guarantee sound loans for the foreign currency requirements of important reconstruction and development projects in member countries. One of its most important functions will be to facilitate and make secure wide private participation in such loans. The Articles of Agreement constituting the charter of the Bank have been worked out with great care by an international conference of experts and give adequate protection to all interests. I recommend to the Congress that we accept the plan, subscribe the capital allotted to us, and participate wholeheartedly in the Bank's work.

This measure, with others I shall later suggest, should go far to take care of our part of the lending requirements of the post-war years. They should help the countries concerned to get production started, to get over the first crisis of disorganization and fear, to begin the work of reconstruction and development; and they should help our farmers and our industries to get over the crisis of reconversion by making a large volume of export business possible in the post-war years. As confidence returns, private investors will participate more and more in foreign lending and investment without any Government assistance. But to get over the first crisis, in the situation that confronts us, loans and guaranties by agencies of Government will be essential.

We all know, however, that a prosperous world economy must be built on more than foreign investment. Exchange rates must be stabilized, and the channels of trade opened up throughout the world. A large foreign trade after victory will generate production and therefore wealth. It will also make possible the servicing of foreign investments.

Almost no one in the modern world produces what he eats and wears and lives in. It is only by the division of labor among people and among geographic areas with all their varied resources, and by the increased all-around production which specialization makes possible, that any modern country can sustain its present population. It is through exchange and trade that efficient production in large units becomes possible. To expand the trading circle, to make it richer, more competitive, more varied, is a fundamental contribution to everybody's wealth and welfare.

It is time for the United States to take the lead in establishing the principle of economic cooperation as the foundation for expanded world trade. We propose to do this, not by setting up a super-government, but by international negotiation and agreement, directed to the

improvement of the monetary institutions of the world and of the laws that govern trade. We have done a good deal in those directions in the last 10 years under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and through the stabilization fund operated by our Treasury. But our present enemies were powerful in those years, too, and they devoted all their efforts not to international collaboration but to autarchy and economic warfare. When victory is won we must be ready to go forward rapidly on a wide front. We all know very well that this will be a long and complicated business.

A good start has been made. The United Nations Monetary Conference at Bretton Woods has taken a long step forward on a matter of great practical importance to us all. The Conference submitted a plan to create an International Monetary Fund which will put an end to monetary chaos. The Fund is a financial institution to preserve stability and order in the exchange rates between different moneys. It does not create a single money for the world; neither we nor anyone else is ready to do that. There will still be a different money in each country, but with the Fund in operation the value of each currency in international trade will remain comparatively stable. Changes in the value of foreign currencies will be made only after careful consideration by the Fund of the factors involved. Furthermore, and equally important, the Fund Agreement establishes a code of agreed principles for the conduct of exchange and currency affairs. In a nutshell, the Fund Agreement spells the difference between a world caught again in the maelstrom of panic and economic warfare culminating in war—as in the 1930's—or a world in which the members strive for a better life through mutual trust, cooperation, and assistance. The choice is ours.

I therefore recommend prompt action by the Congress to provide the subscription of the United States to the International Monetary Fund, and the legislation necessary for our membership in the Fund.

The International Fund and Bank together represent one of the most sound and useful proposals for international collaboration now before us. On the other hand, I do not want to leave with you the impression that these proposals for the Fund and Bank are perfect in every detail. It may well be that the experience of future years will show us how they can be improved. I do wish to make it clear, however, that these Articles of Agreement are the product of the best minds that 44 nations could muster. These men, who represented nations from all parts of the globe, nations in all stages of economic development, nations with different political and economic philosophies, have reached an accord which is presented to you for your consideration and approval. It would be a tragedy if differences of opinion on minor details should lead us to sacrifice the basic agreement achieved on the major problems.

Nor do I want to leave with you the impression that the Fund and the Bank

are all that we will need to solve the economic problems which will face the United Nations when the war is over. There are other problems which we will be called upon to solve. It is my expectation that other proposals will shortly be ready to submit to you for your consideration. These will include the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, broadening and strengthening of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, international agreement for the reduction of trade barriers, the control of cartels and the orderly marketing of world surpluses of certain commodities, a revision of the Export-Import Bank, and an international oil agreement, as well as proposals in the field of civil aviation, shipping, and radio and wire communications. It will also be necessary, of course, to repeal the Johnson Act.

In this message I have recommended for your consideration the immediate adoption of the Bretton Woods Agreements and suggested other measures which will have to be dealt with in the near future. They are all parts of a consistent whole. That whole is our hope for a secure and fruitful world, a world in which plain people in all countries can work at tasks which they do well, exchange in peace the products of their labor, and work out their several destinies in security and peace; a world in which governments, as their major contribution to the common welfare, are highly and effectively resolved to work together in practical affairs, and to guide all their actions by the knowledge that any policy or act that has effects abroad must be considered in the light of those effects.

The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 1945.

FORM OF ADDRESS OF A MEMBER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the long-established rules of the House you must refer to a Member as "the gentleman from such and such a State." About 30 years ago the first woman came to the House of Representatives, and today we have several in the House. I notice that the usage has grown up of referring to those ladies as "the gentlewoman from such and such a State." I find no rule to that effect, but it seems to be a custom. When I address one, I address her as "the lady from such and such State." yet

when the RECORD comes back it is changed to "gentlewoman."

I think that one of them should be addressed as "the lady from Massachusetts" or "the lady from New Jersey" or "the lady from Illinois."

Let us see what a gentlewoman is.

Webster's Dictionary defines gentlewoman as—

A woman of good family or breeding.

Also:

A woman who attends a lady of rank.

So, it seems to me that not only are you encumbering the RECORD with unnecessary verbiage and compelling Members to use a word that is unhandy but you are placing them one step below the male Members of the House from the standpoint of social designation.

Mr. O'NEAL. Read the definition of "lady."

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that I read the definition of "lady" and see what the word "lady" means. A lady is defined as—

A woman who looks after the domestic affairs of a family; the female head of a household; a woman having proprietary rights—

Do not laugh too soon.

A woman having proprietary rights, rule, or authority; a woman to whom obedience or homage is owed as a ruler or feudal superior—

And so forth.

A feminine correlative of lord. Lord or lady of high degree.

So far as I am concerned Members' wives are designated as "congressional ladies." We use the word "lady" when referring to a woman in the same sense we refer to a man as a gentleman and I think we should address one of the lady Members of the House as a lady and not as a gentlewoman. And when a Member addresses one of them as a lady the RECORD ought not to be changed to make it appear that he referred to her as a gentlewoman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] raises a very interesting question, one to which I believe every Member of the House should give serious consideration, and which I think should arouse the interest of the entire country. In these serious days of war, giving consideration to this important question will, I am sure, constitute a normal, healthy, and wholesome relaxation for all Members of the House and for the people throughout the country. However, there is something basic in what the gentleman says.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I merely took this moment at a time when there is no business before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have discussed this matter with some of the people involved. They feel, as I do, that this policy should be changed.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me the Committee on Rules, which is laboring hard on many other matters at this time, might labor a little harder and consider this important question. I suggest that in their consideration of it they invite all of the lady Members of the House to appear before the committee and give their viewpoint. About a year ago one of the distinguished Members of the House of the feminine sex, whom I had referred to as "gentlewoman," in a very dignified way, called my attention to the fact that under the rules of the House all Members must be referred to as "gentleman." On one or two occasions I have in a most friendly way referred to what she said and admitted that there was at least some color of justification for the remarks she made to me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I gladly yield to the distinguished parliamentarian from Michigan, whose knowledge of parliamentary law is recognized by all in the House to be unsurpassed. I know my friend will approach the question with the seriousness it deserves.

Mr. MICHENER. This matter came up and, if I recall correctly, received some consideration when Mr. Longworth was Speaker. I recall in particular that Ruth Hanna McCormick was a Member from Illinois at that time, and there was some question as to whether we should say "the lady" or "the Member" or "the gentlewoman." Mr. Longworth always said "the gentlewoman." I have always said "the lady," but when my minutes came back from the reporters it is always changed to "the gentlewoman."

I spoke to one of the reporters on one occasion some years ago about it, and he said that he had been instructed by the Speaker to use the word "gentlewoman" because that was the proper designation according to one of the Speakers. But some of our most fluent orators on the floor always say "the gentle lady." Now, that is certainly not correct; there is hardly such a thing as a "gentle lady."

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to protect my friend from Michigan, does he want to let that remark stand? I want to correct him.

Mr. MICHENER. That is an awkward way of putting it. I thank the gentleman and know he knows what I mean.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The Official Reporters will correct it probably and make it read "gentlewoman."

Mr. MICHENER. The ladies are assumed at least to be gentle.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask my friend from Michigan, does the gentleman realize the difficulty of a member of the male sex referring to a member of the opposite sex as gentle?

Mr. MICHENER. I realize that the rules provide a Member of the House shall be addressed as, for instance, "the gentleman from Massachusetts." However, we have ladies or women or females who are not provided for by the rules of the House insofar as their designation is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under those circumstances, cannot we meet that situation by custom or practice which will be accepted by the House and refer to them as gentlewoman or lady, whichever you want?

Mr. MICHENER. By an off-the-record decree of a former Speaker of the House the Official Reporters of Debate were instructed to use the word "gentlewoman" as I am advised. I have always used the term "lady" and my remarks come back as "gentlewoman."

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman advise the House why he uses the term "lady" in preference to the term "gentlewoman"?

Mr. MICHENER. The word "lady" expresses to me everything that is intended. It is not quite so awkward and is not so much of a mouthful as the other word.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman feel in the absence of consideration of this question by the Committee on Rules and a recommendation from that committee to the House and in view of the impropriety of referring to them as "gentlemen," might we not agree to establish a custom for the time being and refer to them as either "ladies" or "gentlewomen"?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he has not heard a parliamentary inquiry with reference to the rules of the House as yet.

Mr. RANKIN. As I pointed out in the beginning, this proposition is not covered by any rule of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. But the reason I refer to one of them as the "lady" is that I think it is a little more dignified. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that it is not quite so cumbersome. I should like to see the custom established of referring to them as ladies from now on.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman recognizes the fact that some reference other than "gentleman" should be made when referring to them?

Mr. RANKIN. I expect to call the men gentlemen as I always have done. I think that the ladies of the House should

be addressed as "the lady from such and such a State." We refer to other women as ladies when introducing them, or address them, and I see no reason why we should not treat our colleagues of the opposite sex with the same respect.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Mississippi who brought this question to the attention of the House if this is an indication of his endorsement of the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to have my remarks cluttered up with extraneous matter no matter how important it is. The gentleman from Mississippi, if he will permit me to suggest, may answer it "Yes" or "No" and then let it go.

Mr. RANKIN. This proposition does not have anything to do with the Constitution. It is merely a question of the manner in which we address lady colleagues—whether we address one of them as a "lady" or as a "gentlewoman."

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but we are discussing a very serious matter which confronts the House.

Mr. RANKIN. It is simply ridiculous to address one of our lady Members as a "gentlewoman," when you refer to her as a "lady" every time you address her or introduce her, outside the House. You use the term "lady" when referring to your wife, your mother, or your sister, and I submit that the lady Members of this House should be treated with the same courtesy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in calling to the attention of the House this serious matter was that not only the Members of the House but the people of the entire country who are interested in the orderly procedure of the House in wartime might receive a lot of relaxation if they also considered it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the present occupant of the chair made any ruling on this matter or given any directions to the official reporters of debates?

The SPEAKER. Not that the Chair remembers.

Mr. SABATH. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the seriousness of this question and perhaps will take the advice of the majority leader and confer with the ladies to see whether they can agree between themselves, which they generally

always do, especially those who are Members of this House, as to how they feel about this matter.

Unfortunately we have a few minor matters before the Rules Committee, such as the George bill, the Commodity credit bill, the rivers and harbors bill; about 50 other applications for rules on bills, resolutions and joint resolutions and between 40 and 50 investigating resolutions upon which hearings have been requested. If, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has stated, it is of great importance that we accord a proper salutation to the ladies of the House—whether it be "gentlewoman," "gentlelady," or "lady," I may postpone the hearings on the mentioned rules, bills, and resolutions and call a meeting of the ladies to obtain their feelings and views in the matter, after which I may call a formal meeting of the Committee on Rules to consider the changing of the rules of the House to make clear how the ladies should be addressed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Arkansas.

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

There was no objection.

NANCY HANKS, MOTHER OF LINCOLN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1936, the late Arthur Brisbane, writing in his column on the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln, said:

Without Nancy Hanks there would have been no Abraham Lincoln. This, his birthday, is a good day to honor him and his mother.

This is Lincoln's birthday, and it is an appropriate time to pay honor to him and to his mother. I arose to tell the membership present that the birthplace of Nancy Hanks, the mother of Abraham Lincoln, is in the congressional district that I have the responsibility to represent. She was born in a little hut near Antioch, Mineral County, W. Va. Mothers have ever been the molders of men. So often they go unappreciated. We can remember now the modest hillside marker for this woman who nurtured a great and good President.

When we recall Nancy Hanks and the son she bore I would also like to say to my colleagues that there is a poet, Karl Myers, an invalid, living at Parsons, in my congressional district. Several years ago he wrote a touching tribute to the Emancipator, which I feel is particularly timely during this dark period. It follows:

IF ABRAHAM LINCOLN COULD TALK TO YOU

If Abraham Lincoln could talk to you
Over the radiophone tonight,
Could for a moment the veil step through,
Out of the silence and far skies bright.

Gentle and great as of old—what then,
Think you, the theme of his speech would be?

Preachings, perchance, to the sons of man,
Muddled and restless, beyond the sea?

Haply a word on affairs of state,
Out of his storehouse of wisdom rare?
Maybe a fling at the low birth rate?
Pleas for the virtues of days that were?

Making orations inspired and grave,
Think you the seconds he'd speed away,
Casting his pearls on the wireless wave
Unto all people and nations? Nay.

Somehow I fancy him standing here,
Knowing the heart of the world is sad,
Spinning a yarn of the yesteryear,
Telling a story to make us glad.

I think we pay tribute to Lincoln not so much because of his brilliance of mind but because of his depth of understanding, his capacity for service, and his humility of heart.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial entitled "War Forest Production."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and quote some brief excerpts from letters.

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

There was no objection.

FORM OF ADDRESS OF A MEMBER

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered about this "gentlewoman" recognition. We are always entitled to be addressed as gentlemen, whether deservedly or otherwise. Let us protect the lady Members and allow them to be "gentlewomen," whether or not their attitude or remarks belie the title. I might be tempted to prefer "lady," thinking that perhaps at some time someone might be entitled to be called "the shrewist lady" from a certain-named State.

You can put an adjective before the word "lady" but when you say "gentlewoman" you in fact remind her to be

gentle. We are protected by calling ourselves "gentlemen," even if we are not.

SPECIAL ORDER

The **SPEAKER**. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. **MERROW**] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **MERROW**. Mr. Speaker, on January 31 the New Hampshire Legislature passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law an amendment relative to treaty-making powers of the President of the United States. The resolution is as follows:

That whereas a bill (H. Res. 16, 79th Cong.) has been introduced in the Congress of the United States proposing that the Constitution of the United States shall be amended so that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members in each House concur; and

Whereas the enactment of such a resolution and its submission to the several States for ratification would provide for and promote the chances of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace and to insure our successful participation in building a peaceful society: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately enact the before-mentioned resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the legislative branches of the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to United States Senator **STYLES BRIDGES**, United States Senator **CHARLES W. TOBEY**, Congressman **CHESTER MERROW**, and Congressman **SHERMAN ADAMS** requesting them to do all in their power to secure the passage of the said resolution.

NORRIS COTTON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DONALD G. MATSON,

President of the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 16 referred to in the concurrent resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature was introduced by me on January 3, the day the Seventy-ninth Congress convened. The resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution to read as follows:

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur.

Last week the Committee on the Judiciary of the House ordered reported favorably House Joint Resolution 60, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. **SUMNERS**] on the 8th of January. This resolution contains an amendment to the Constitution to read thus:

Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress.

The Committee on the Judiciary is to be highly complimented upon its prompt action. I shall be most happy to give my wholehearted support to House Joint Resolution 60.

It is gratifying that in my own State of New Hampshire the legislature has so strongly expressed itself in favor of amending the Constitution so that a majority of the Congress will be empowered

to ratify treaties. New Hampshire, if given the chance, will be one of the first to ratify the proposed amendment. It is the duty of Congress to act at once and present to the State legislatures, over 40 of which are in session this year, an opportunity to express themselves on this most fundamental of all issues affecting the future peace.

The proposed amendment could easily be placed before the State legislatures within a period of 2 weeks if the Congress would but assume the leadership in this matter which the Nation is constantly demanding. Now is the time for action. Now is the time to begin to forge the machinery for making a just and lasting peace. For the future safety and security of this Republic we should act at once to effect a much needed reform of the constitutional mechanism for the validation of treaties.

Mr. **BREHM**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MERROW**. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. **BREHM**. This may be extraneous, perhaps not, but has the gentleman heard the advocates of this proposal state whether or not they would be willing to have a bare majority of the Congress override a Presidential veto?

Mr. **MERROW**. I have not.

Mr. **BREHM**. It seems to me if we adopt one perhaps the other should also be adopted.

Mr. **MERROW**. I may say to the gentleman it seems to me the proposition he advances is not analogous to this matter; therefore it does not have any bearing on the question under discussion.

Mr. **MICHENER**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MERROW**. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. **MICHENER**. The gentleman is taking a very active part in promoting this resolution and he has succeeded in getting a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee. The matter will now come before the House. May I suggest to the gentleman that, in my judgment, the hard going for his resolution will be found at the other end of the Capitol. May I suggest that the gentleman exert every effort at that end of the Capitol.

Mr. **MERROW**. I thank the gentleman for his excellent contribution to the discussion of this subject but I feel that in reference to this matter the House must take the lead just as the House took the lead in passing the Fulbright resolution in the Seventy-eighth Congress. That resolution was adopted by such a large majority the Connally resolution followed within a short time at the other end of the Capitol. If we can act upon this immediately and pass it by far more than the two-thirds vote required, it will in all probability be the greatest spur to action as far as the other side of the Capitol is concerned.

Mr. **MCCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MERROW**. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. **MCCORMACK**. I am very glad to hear the gentleman's remarks because I

am in complete agreement with the position he has taken in supporting such an amendment to the Constitution. In light of our Nation's history up to this time, I feel that it is a change that is not only justified but necessary for the best interests of our country today and in the future. What the gentleman from Michigan stated is correct. Of course, practically everything the gentleman says is correct, and I say that not by way of flattery but with a feeling of great respect for his judgment throughout the years I have been associated with him.

The gentleman from Michigan will agree, I am sure, with the position taken by the gentleman from New Hampshire, who has the floor, that it is our responsibility to act without regard to what the other body might ultimately do and that the passage by the House will be an act on the part of the House which would create and mold public opinion. That in a democracy, after all, and properly so, is the controlling influence in the passage of legislation or in the prevention of the passage of legislation.

Mr. **MERROW**. I am very grateful for the remarks of the distinguished majority leader and for his expression of approval of the proposed amendment. May I ask him if he thinks it will be possible for us to act on this in the near future as far as the House is concerned?

Mr. **MCCORMACK**. That is a question which I welcome from the gentleman. As soon as the Rules Committee reports a rule making this matter in order, it will be the pleasure of the gentleman from Massachusetts now speaking to put it on the program of the House just as soon as possible thereafter. There is no uncertainty about that. That will mean within a week or 10 days at the most.

Mr. **MERROW**. I appreciate that statement from the gentleman very much.

Mr. **GEARHART**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MERROW**. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. **GEARHART**. The proposition that the gentleman advances is a very, very interesting one to me and one in the consideration of which I cannot ignore the provisions of the Constitution, which provide that the Constitution and the laws of Congress passed pursuant thereto and the treaties adopted under the authority of the United States are the supreme law of the land.

If the gentleman's amendment to the Constitution is adopted by a simple majority vote of both Houses of the Congress, you would be able to adopt laws and treaties which would be the supreme law of the land of equal dignity with the Constitution itself, which now can only be amended by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of each House and the further concurrence of three-fourths of the States. The Constitution does not say anything about which shall be supreme, the treaties of the United States adopted with the approval of the Congress of the United States or the Constitution or the laws adopted pursuant thereto. The change in the Constitution

in respect to treaties reduces their ratification to the level or to the standard of a law for establishing and regulating barbers in the District of Columbia, for example, a bill which we would adopt by a simple majority vote in each House.

May I ask the gentleman to express himself on the question whether or not we want to set up a law in the form of a treaty which is the supreme law of the United States by a simple majority vote of the Members of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MERROW. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof become the supreme law of the land. The laws we pass here by a simple majority are the supreme law of the land. It might be stated that both Houses of Congress by majority vote can abrogate, by failing to pass implementing legislation or subsidiary legislation, treaties that are ratified, and it would seem as though the same agencies which can abrogate treaties ought to have a part in the formulation of treaties.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman is not answering my question at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman's statement is in accord with my understanding of what is correct, that if we pass a law after a treaty has been confirmed, or if we pass a law amending or abrogating it, the latter law supersedes the law passed following the ratification of a treaty. Furthermore, the distinguishing feature is that the amendment to the Constitution, its proposal, passage, and ratification, is entirely different than a law passed by the Congress. It has to be approved by two-thirds vote of both branches and then ratified by three-quarters of the States in the method provided by the Constitution, and there is the difference in fundamental law and statutory law.

Mr. MERROW. That is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman will yield further, that is just the point, that we have a Constitution per se as the supreme law of the land; that is, the act itself, the act of Congress passed by both Houses and signed by the President, becomes the supreme law of the land only when it is made pursuant to the Constitution, and then when an act of the Congress is enacted which is pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, it is just as much the supreme law of the land as the Constitution itself. That is one part of it. There is nothing in the Constitution which says that a treaty duly ratified must conform to the Constitution. It stands on its own feet and it must be authorized merely by the Government of the United States, whatever that means.

MONEY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the birthday of America's greatest inventor, Thomas A. Edison. Today is the birthday of one of the two or three very greatest Americans who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln. All I have asked for this time is to read two quotations, the first one from Edison, the second one from Lincoln. My quotation from Edison is as follows:

The only dynamite that works in this country is the dynamite of a sound idea. I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong and that the wrong somehow centers in money.

The danger of paper money is precisely the danger of gold—if you get too much it is no good. There is just one rule for money and that is to have enough to carry all the legitimate trade that is waiting to move. Too little and too much are both bad.

If our Nation can issue a dollar bond it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent interest, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who contribute directly in some useful way.

Then a letter from Abraham Lincoln written to Col. E. D. Taylor:

CHICAGO, ILL., December 1864.

Col. E. D. TAYLOR:

I have long determined to make public the origin of the greenback, and tell the world that it is one of Dick Taylor's creations. You have always been friendly to me, and when troublous times fell upon us, and my shoulders, though broad and willing, were weak and myself surrounded by such circumstances and such people that I knew not whom to trust, then I said in my extremity, "I will send for Colonel Taylor; he will know what to do." I think it was in January 1862, on or about the 16th, that I did so. You came and I said to you, "What shall we do?" Said you, "Why, issue Treasury notes bearing no interest, printed on the best banking paper. Issue enough to pay off the Army expenses and declare it a legal tender." Chase thought it a hazardous thing but we finally accomplished it, and gave to the people of this Republic the greatest blessing they ever had—their own paper to pay off their own debts. It is due to you, the father of the present greenback, that the people should know it, and I take great pleasure in making it known. How many times I have laughed at you telling me plainly that I was too lazy to be anything but a lawyer.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by pointing out that in view of the fact that there was \$450,000,000 of United States money issued to help finance the Civil War, there has been a saving even at a simple interest computation at 4 percent, let alone compound interest, to the people of this Nation since that time of \$1,476,000,000.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. He did say there was danger of having too much.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and I agree. I agree heartily.

But the basic question is whether the Nation shall continue to be forced to pay interest on its own credit. Both Thomas Edison and Abraham Lincoln have told us "No."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a most unusual letter which I received this morning and which I believe should be read by all the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OUR DEBT TO POLAND

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is Lincoln's birthday. February 12 is the birthday of another lover of freedom, Thaddeus Kosciusko. Providence works in strange and devious ways. It is more than coincidence that these two outstanding lovers of freedom should be born on the same date, February 12. Hence, while we honor and remember Lincoln on this day—let us also honor and remember Kosciusko, for he, too, was a model of a freedom-loving person.

When America was desperately in need of help in the summer of 1776, Kosciusko arrived here to give his fortune and life in the fight for freedom. Pending the decision of the Board of War upon his application, he found employment at Philadelphia, in the construction of fortifications against the expected attack by the Delaware. This gained him his commission from Congress, October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service with pay of \$60 a month, and the rank of colonel. In the spring of 1777, he joined the northern army, where his ability as an engineer was of invaluable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His fortification at Van Schaick and elsewhere, his able judgment in the choice of battle-grounds, contributed much to the skillful retreats and the firm stands of the Continental Army before Burgoyne's rash advance. He was ordered by General Gates to erect the fortification in the defense of Saratoga, and his task was accomplished with great brilliancy and speed.

With justified pride Poles regard the role played by their national hero in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a campaign but France's recognition of her independence.

For long the question of the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance; the brief respite gained by the defeat of Burgoyne rendered this a favorable moment to render it impregnable. West Point was chosen for its commanding position, and its fortification was

finally conferred, over the head of the French engineer, Radiere, upon the Pole.

Mr. Kosciusko—

Wrote McDougall, now in command of the northern army, to Washington—

is esteemed to have more practice than Colonel Radiere, and his manner of treating the people is more acceptable than that of the latter.

Little is now left of the fortifications, but the monument erected to his memory by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciusko, who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

In the summer of 1780, General Gates requested Washington to transfer Kosciusko to the south, where the Army was now under his command. But before the Pole was able to reach him, his old friend had been defeated at Camden—deprived of his command, and General Nathanael Greene—after Washington, the finest general in the Continental service—had been appointed his successor. While awaiting Greene's arrival, Kosciusko spent some time in Virginia among the planters. He saw there the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negroes in slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which, 17 years later, was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciusko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. True to his ideals, at the Battle of Eutaw Springs, he restrained a carnage which outraged his feelings, and he is said personally to have saved the lives of 50 Englishmen. When the campaign changed to one of guerrilla warfare, he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell. And on December 14, 1782, the American Army entered the town in a triumphal procession, in which Kosciusko rode with his fellow officers, greeted by the populace with flowers and cries of "Welcome."

Kosciusko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. Nathanael Greene best sums up what the Pole had done for America and what he had been to his brother soldiers.

Colonel Kosciusko belonged—

Wrote Greene—

to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems, nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others. Congress, in 1783, belatedly conferred upon Kosciusko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service.

In the fall of 1784 Kosciusko reached his native country. A great wave of ef-

fort—a nation's magnificent effort to save herself by internal reform, which culminated in the Constitution of the 3d of May 1791—was sweeping at that time over Poland.

For the next 12 years he remained in Europe—through the infamous partitions of Poland and the many battles fought in connection therewith. It was in 1794 that Kosciusko was seriously wounded in the battle of Maciejowice and was taken prisoner by Russia, not to be released until 2 years later.

On the 19th of December 1796, Kosciusko left St. Petersburg with his friend and fellow prisoner, Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, and a young officer, Libiszewski, who eagerly offered to serve the maimed Kosciusko till he again reached America. He carried Kosciusko from carriage to church, distracting his sadness by his admirable playing of the horn and by his sweet singing. In good time the party arrived in Stockholm, where Kosciusko was greeted with enthusiasm. From there he passed on to Gothenburg to await a ship for England. On May 16, 1797, the Poles embarked and after a 3 weeks' passage landed at Gravesend and thence to London, staying at the Sablonniere Hotel, Leicester Square.

The Gentleman's Magazine announced:

Kosciusko, the hero of freedom, is here.

The whole of London made haste to visit him. Politicians, men of letters, the beauties of the day, and the rulers of fashion, all alike thronged to his rooms. To Walter Savage Landor, then a mere youth, the sight of Kosciusko awakened a sympathy for Poland that he never lost, and to which English literature owes one of his Imaginary Conversations. More than half a century later he looked back to the moment in which he spoke to Kosciusko as the happiest of his life. The Whig Club presented Kosciusko with a sword of honor; the Duchess of Devonshire pressed upon him a costly ring, which went the way of most of the gifts that Kosciusko received—he passed them on to his friends; tokens of admiration counted for naught in Kosciusko's life; now they were the merest baubles to him who had seen his country fall. In the portrait that without his knowledge Cosway painted, said by Niemcewicz to resemble him as none other, we see him lie with bandaged head in an attitude of deep and sorrowful musing.

Bristol was at that time the English port of sailing for America, and it was there that, after a fortnight's stay in London, Kosciusko betook himself, passing a night in Bath on the way. He found in Bristol old friends of American days, and now was the guest of one of them, and that time United States consul. A guard of honor received him, processions of the townfolk flocked to catch a glimpse of the hero, a military band played every evening before the consulate, and he received as the gift of the city a handsome silver service. One who visited him here records his impression of a soul unbroken by misfortune, by wounds, poverty, and exile; of

an eagle glance, of talk full of wit and wisdom.

The journey down the Avon to where Kosciusko's ship lay at anchor was a triumphal progress. He was accompanied by English officers in full dress, by the American consul, and hosts of well-wishers. All heads were bared as he was carried on board. The whole length of the river handkerchiefs were waved from the banks. Farewell resounded from every rock and promontory, where spectators had crowded to see the last of the Polish hero. Boats shot out from the private dwellings on the waterside, laden with flowers and fruits for the departing guest. Not a few men and women boarded the ship and accompanied Kosciusko for some distance before they could bring themselves to part with him.

The ship had sailed on June 18, 1797. For 2 months Kosciusko and his Polish companions tossed on the Atlantic, on one occasion near shipwreck. Philadelphia, their destination, they reached on August 18, 1797, Claypole's Advertiser, for August 19, 1797, reported:

In the ship *Adriana*, Captain Lee, arrived here last evening from Bristol, came passenger that illustrious defender of the rights of mankind, the brave but unfortunate Kosciusko, the Polish general, accompanied by two Polish gentlemen. On the arrival of the vessel at the fort the commander of the garrison, being informed that the veteran general was on board, welcomed him by a Federal salute, and when the vessel came to anchor in our harbor the sailing master of the frigate had its barge manned with eight masters of vessel and waited upon the general to take him on shore. On his landing he was received with three cheers. And, as a further mark of popular respect for this great character, the citizens insisted upon drawing him to his lodgings. The general appears to be in good spirits but has suffered very materially from his wounds and inhuman imprisonment. We trust, however, he will long live to enjoy in these peaceful shores that liberty and happiness which he assisted in fighting for, but which he fought in vain to obtain for his native land. We understand the general is personally known to most of the characters in our Revolution.

On August 23, 1797, Kosciusko wrote to General Washington at Mount Vernon:

By sending packet delivered to me by Lord St. Clair for you, I have the honor to pay my respects not only to my chief commander, but to a great man whose eminent virtues to his country rendered him dear to every feeling breast.

And 8 days later Washington from Mount Vernon replied, congratulating Kosciusko on his safe arrival and welcoming him to the land "whose liberties you had been instrumental in establishing."

No one—

He continues—

has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have and no one more sincerely wished, during your arduous struggle in the cause of liberty and your country, that it might be crowned with success. But the ways of Providence are inscrutable, and mortals must submit. I pray you to believe that at all times, and under all circumstances, it would make me happy to see you at my last

retreat, from which I never expect to be more than 20 miles again.

Kosciusko was, however, never able to visit his commander at Mount Vernon.

Yellow fever prevailed at Philadelphia at this time, so Kosciusko, with his poet friend Niemcewicz, journeyed on to New Brunswick, the home of Gen. Anthony Walton White. Later he proceeded to New York, where he was the guest of General Gates at Rose Hill, where he remained until September 29, 1797. Before leaving New York, he received from Congress a grant of 500 acres in recognition of his military services. This property was located on the extreme western border of the United States military lands, on the east side of the Scioto River, in Perry Township, Franklin County, Ohio, the site of the present city of Columbus. After a short visit in Elizabethtown, he returned to the home of General White in New Brunswick, where he remained until November 28. Kosciusko, whose convalescence was slow, spent nearly all his time reclining on a sofa, sketching and painting in water color and India ink. From General White's home Kosciusko repaired to Philadelphia and took residence on Second Street. Bevy of visitors and admirers again surrounded him, and Kosciusko drew into great intimacy with Thomas Jefferson, at this time Secretary of State. Jefferson wrote to Gates:

I see Kosciusko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all, not only to the rich.

On January 23, 1798, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to Kosciusko a certificate of indebtedness of \$12,260.54 with interest at 6 percent from January 7, 1793, to December 31, 1797. The final settlement of the account was made by a payment amounting to \$15,227.87.

Sometime in March 1798 a packet of letters from Europe was handed to Kosciusko. His emotion on reading the contents was so strong that, despite his crippled condition, he sprang from his couch and stepped without a helping hand to the middle of the room. "I must return at once to Europe," he said with no explanation. Jefferson procured his passport to France under the name of Thomas Kanberg and, with only Jefferson's knowledge, with no word either to Niemcewicz or to his servant, Stanislaus, for both of whom he left a roll of money in his cupboard, he sailed for France. Before embarking at Baltimore he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which more than half a century before the Civil War, the Polish patriot advanced the cause of emancipation:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, hus-

bands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

T. KOSCIUSKO.

FIFTH DAY OF MAY 1798.

There was difficulty in putting this testament into effect as Jefferson was of advanced age at the time of Kosciusko's death. It was never carried out; but in 1826 the legacy went to found the colored school at Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in the United States, and which bore Kosciusko's name.

By the end of June or early in July 1798 Kosciusko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy with himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed upon all sides. At the news of his return the Polish legions awakened to renewed life. He negotiated at length with the Government of France for France's help in the restoration of Polish independence. This was promised him many times, but his cautious request for guaranties was never complied with. When Napoleon was proclaimed First Consul, Kosciusko, mistrusting him, commenced to withdraw from relations with him or his officials. After the disastrous expedition of the Polish legions to San Domingo, Kosciusko severed all relations with him.

But Kosciusko's intercourse with his American friends did not slacken. In 1800, at Paris, at the request of Gen. William R. Davie, then envoy from the United States to France, Kosciusko prepared in French his *Maneuvers of Horse Artillery* and published them. General Davie requested the United States Military Philosophical Society of West Point to have the manual translated and published. This was done, and Colonel Williams, the translator, presented President Jefferson with a copy of this work, the first upon its subject to be published in America.

At this period Kosciusko became acquainted with a Swiss family by the name of Zeltner and moved to their home at Berville, near Fontainebleau. The name of Zeltner will ever arouse gratitude in the Polish heart; beneath the roof of these friends Kosciusko found the hospitality and domestic charm which gladdened his declining years that only death ended.

Napoleon, in 1806, from Berlin, now summoned Kosciusko to assume the leadership of the revolting Poles. But the former Polish commander in chief had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call and remained in Paris.

In May 1815 Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland. An autonomous kingdom of Poland was, it is true, to be formed with the czar as king, but it would be but a small part of the true Poland. Provinces that remained under Russian rule were severed from the kingdom and incorporated wholly with Russia. Kosciusko heard these things. In dismay he wrote to the czar. In vain he waited for an answer. Then, openly,

as to the czar he could no longer write, he appealed to Czartoryski, in denunciation of the czar's betrayal, but in vain. Kosciusko refused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland. He felt that his very presence, even, would lend sanction to the new partition. He chose therefore a voluntary exile. Not desiring to live in a Bourbon France, he settled in Switzerland with the devoted Zeltners in Soleure.

Here, in serene communion with nature, among eternal mountains, in unceasing meditation upon the future of Poland, he spent the 2 last years of his life. And here on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his fatherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciusko died. Even in his loneliness he was faithful to Poland—her purest soul and the greatest of Poles. And his greatness was greatest in that it was not his own personal greatness merely; it was the greatness of Poland.

Kosciusko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Cracow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead; but his heart is in the Polish conquerors. To his memory, 3 years after his death, the nation raised a monument perhaps unique of its kind. Outside of Cracow towers the Kosciusko Hill, fashioned by the hands of Polish men, women, and children, bringing earth in the battlefields where Kosciusko had fought. The act is typical. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their dearest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BY CONGRESS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire has brought up a very interesting point, and I learned then as we all did from the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, that we may have a measure before the House within 10 days or so on the question of treaties and their ratification by a majority vote in both the House and Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed, I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I said as soon as possible after the rule is reported out, and probably not more than a week or 10 days thereafter.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has pointed out a

provision of the Constitution which reads:

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land—

The punctuation in that important sentence is very interesting and might indicate that the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto are one thing, and treaties are another thing. If we fail to give due consideration to that fact we may find ourselves with two bodies of supreme law; first, the Constitution and law which is enacted pursuant to the Constitution; and second, that which is made by treaty. I do not believe that question, as a question, has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not know just why, unless perhaps it has not been brought up before the Supreme Court in a test case. But at all events it is something which should be decided either by the Congress and the States through a proper rewording of that particular sentence and paragraph or through an interpretation by the Supreme Court. It might even be decided that the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction over the question of constitutionality of a treaty.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that if he goes into this proposition he will find it has been held, you might say, from the beginning of the Government that wherever there is a conflict between a treaty and a law passed by Congress, the law prevails.

Mr. HINSHAW. Perhaps, but it has not been decided when there is conflict between a treaty and the Constitution itself, which prevails.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the Constitution, of course.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is presumed.

Mr. RANKIN. The Constitution prevails over a law passed by the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is presumed because the Constitution itself says that this Constitution and treaties shall be the supreme law of the land.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but the Constitution takes precedence over any law or any treaty. You cannot amend the Constitution by treaty, or by an edict of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HINSHAW. I take it then, if a treaty were ratified by the United States Senate which violated the Constitution, that the treaty itself would be null and void; is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly it would be null and void.

Mr. HINSHAW. That would be my position exactly; but, on the other hand, there has been no positive decision on that point as yet to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me go a step further, if the gentleman will pardon me. I will try to get him some more time if he needs it.

If the Supreme Court of the United States should go so far astray as to attempt to set aside any part of the Constitution, or hold that a treaty prevails over the Constitution, the members of the Court would be subject to impeachment. This question has not been brought to the floor of the House probably in the history of this country, but it was tried out by British Government.

The British House of Lords is the supreme court, and when certain courts there undertook to override the constitution or the supreme law as laid down by the House of Commons and the House of Lords, those judges, if I remember correctly, were tried for treason and hanged.

It is about time this subject was impressed upon the American people, and probably upon some of the judges themselves, that when they set aside a law without rhyme or reason or excuse, they subject themselves to the penalty of impeachment.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate what the gentleman has to say, but there have been cases in which treaties were enacted, ratification having been given by the United States Senate, which were in violation of the Constitution. Likewise, there have been other treaties, merely negotiated but not ratified, that are in violation of the Constitution itself. I have in mind a treaty negotiated by the State Department, I believe, in 1880 or 1881, which provided for free trade between the United States and the then Kingdom of Hawaii. That treaty was transmitted from the State Department after signature by the President to the Senate of the United States for its ratification. At that time the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives held meetings and determined that this treaty, if enacted into law by ratification by the Senate, would be unconstitutional, because it violated the privilege of the House, under the Constitution, in its power to initiate revenue legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Extensive hearings were held recently before the Committee on the Judiciary on this matter. The hearings are printed and are available. If all Members interested will read those hearings I think they will get a very good idea of the various arguments. For instance, I call attention to the argument made by a former member of this House, Mr. David Lewis, of Maryland, along the line suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. I believe that a treaty violating the Constitution of the United States is now pending before the United States Senate for ratification.

Last year at about this time I called that matter to the attention of the House of Representatives by raising a question of the privilege of the House in connection with the treaty, citing article IV, section 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, which provides that—

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States.

I believe that this treaty, by obligating the Congress to make appropriations and by disposing of certain property of the United States violates the Constitution. It is my belief that the House of Representatives should take cognizance of the various facts connected therewith and make its position known in relation thereto. I believe that should be done in relation to all treaties. The House of Representatives is not impotent in regard to treaties if the Constitution is of itself the absolute and supreme law of the land, because the Constitution does provide certain functions that must be performed by the House of Representatives in its proper order. In some cases the House must take prior action, as for example, in taxation and revenue matters and in appropriation matters.

It likewise must take prior action in reference to such matters as authorizing the disposing of property of the United States; and there are other paragraphs, sentences, and phrases in the Constitution giving the House of Representatives certain powers that, in my humble opinion, cannot be circumvented except through inaction on the part of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman object to Members of the House passing upon the very treaty that he refers to that is now pending in the other body?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly my point. I think the House of Representatives should carry out its power through its legislative function prior to the treaty's being approved by the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my question. My question is: does the gentleman object to the Members of the House passing upon the pending treaty in the other body.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to change the Constitution with reference to the ratification of treaties by the House, I believe the House should be given the power to pass or the confirmation of Presidential appointees.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not interject that material into this particular discussion. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that it undoubtedly will be raised when this matter comes before the House; we might as well discuss it now.

Mr. HINSHAW. Not in my time, if the gentleman please. I appreciate the gentleman's ideas.

Mr. RANKIN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman is interested in the case connected with the water treaty.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am interested in treaties of all kinds, but, of course, especially in the treaty which is pending before the Senate now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have 5 additional minutes; I took up a part of his time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire 5 additional minutes?

Mr. HINSHAW. I would appreciate 5 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that I have an open mind on the question of that water treaty to which he refers. I am intensely interested in it, because it involves the question of water power in the Western States.

Mr. HINSHAW. It involves more than that.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not trying to sidetrack the gentleman from a discussion of that important issue.

Mr. HINSHAW. It involves rights to a great deal more than water power; it involves, of course, the question of the lifeblood of the West, which is water itself.

But, speaking generally on the subject of treaties, the House has on numerous occasions in the past taken cognizance of the fact that a treaty was pending before the United States Senate, and by resolution, the House on occasion has called the Senate's attention to the privileges and prerogatives of the House in connection therewith. For example, in 1852 when the Gadsden Purchase Treaty was before the United States Senate, the House of Representatives through a resolution by its Appropriations Committee, I believe, called upon the Senate not to complete its act of ratification until the necessary appropriations legislation providing for the \$10,000,000 that was to be expended pursuant to the treaty in the purchase of the land, had been passed. A considerable debate ensued in the House of Representatives. I believe it lasted 2 or 3 days under the then rules of the House which I presume are the same today, namely, that a question of constitutional privilege of the House called for unlimited debate unless a unanimous consent arrangement had been made in advance of entering upon the debate. I believe it lasted 3 or 4 days. In the meantime, of course, the Senate decided they should give ear to the House, and the House did ultimately appropriate \$10,000,000 for this purpose.

It may interest the Members of the House present to know that history shows there was also a question of whether they should spend an additional \$5,000,000 and buy a large piece of the Mexican State of Sonora and all of Lower California known as Baja California. It would have been a very cheap purchase, but

the legislative body of that time did not have the foresight apparently that can come only with living longer and looking back on history. So Lower California and a piece of Sonora large enough to give us entry from the Gulf of California was not acquired at that time, 1852. The Congress was feeling parsimonious after the War of 1848.

Prior to 1852 there were numerous other occasions on which the question of the privilege of the House in connection with the treaty-making power was brought out on the floor of the House through questions of the privilege of the House.

I believe that the first instance was at the time of George Washington in connection with the Jay Treaty in 1793. That is a long time back. The House itself has not since 1881 chosen to exercise any positive right or privilege or prerogative in connection with treaties that have been ratified by the Senate. No doubt that was because the House was satisfied with the terms of the treaties and no one raised the question; nevertheless, it is quite possible that in connection with this Mexican water treaty, this gentleman from California now addressing the House, or some other person may want to represent to the House again the privileges of the House in connection with that treaty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. RYTER. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my slight contribution to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin on Thaddeus Kosciusko. "For your freedom and ours," was his credo. He was the first true internationalist of his day who realized that the threat to freedom anywhere is a threat to the freedom of the world.

I hope that we will repay the debt of gratitude we owe Kosciusko by being eternally vigilant of the dangers to democracy and by seeing to it that his beloved country shall once more rise a free, sovereign, and independent nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 5 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, Feb-

ruary 13, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will hold a meeting on Tuesday, February 13, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 59.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1945, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. The hearing will be held in room 362 (caucus room), Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing beginning at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, February 14, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 97) to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes" (with respect to certain patent matters). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, February 14, 1945.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Pensions at 11 a. m., Tuesday, February 13, 1945, for organization purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS

The hearings on H. R. 1425, the post-war ship disposal bill, scheduled to begin on Thursday, February 15, 1945, have been postponed until Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

201. A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on the Library.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former-Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

203. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service for the period December 1, 1944, to January 31, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

204. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to

amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to receiving of stolen public property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to permit eviction proceedings brought thereunder to be instituted in the Federal courts; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

206. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 129. A bill to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants; with amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 127. Resolution for the consideration of S. 35, authorizing the consideration, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1705. A bill providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2109. A bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the lands belonging to the United States within the exterior boundaries of said monument to the same status held immediately prior to the issuance of said proclamation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2110. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2111. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2112. A bill to permit the naturalization of native-born Filipinos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2114. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2115. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2116. A bill providing for termination of the family allowance under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, with respect to a wife adjudged by a competent court to have committed adultery or fornication; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2117. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2118. A bill to restore one of the "four freedoms," the freedom of expression; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2119 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2120. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States by adding the following new section, to be known as section 5219A; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2121. A bill to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2122. A bill to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2124. A bill to amend sections 11 (c) and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2125. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 128. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate

the condition of the American Indian in the United States and the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. Res. 129. Resolution to investigate erroneous statements concerning the Battle of Saipan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. Res. 130. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate the condition of the American Indian in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law an amendment relative to treaty-making powers of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Morton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2128. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen, review, and readjudicate the case of John W. Parish, trustee (John H. Bexten, substituted), against the United States, No. 34450; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 2129. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Bagley, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Bagley, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

63. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution of the Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies endorsing the principles of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. By Mr. HOPE: Petition from residents of Ford County, Kans., relative to peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

65. By Mr. LECOMPTÉ: Petition of Mrs. C. A. Bowers, Newton, Iowa, and other members of the Zoar Reformed Church Women's Guild in opposition to peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

66. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the California Legislature, relating to exchange of United States and Japanese nationals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, memorializing the Senate of the United States not to advise nor consent to a proposed treaty with Mexico, signed February 3, 1944, relating to

the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

68. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California Legislature, relating to the San Joaquin Experimental Range; to the Committee on Appropriations.

69. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, relating to removal of temporary war housing facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

70. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 of the California Legislature, relating to reconversion to peacetime operation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

71. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 of the California Legislature, relating to the bear flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

72. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 of the California Legislature, relating to wartime employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

73. Also, Resolution No. 3 of the California Legislature, relating to opium; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Racine, Wis., protesting prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Officers' Association of the State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of House bill 693 and recommending to the Congress of the United States its prompt enactment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

76. Also, petition of the president of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to international business agreements adopted by the board of directors of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless. God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Farris Island, S. C., on August 11 and 12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943;

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina;

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation, in the State of New York; and

S. 374. An act to amend the act of October 29, 1919, entitled "An act to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton and wheat.

CRIMEAN CONFERENCE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, no conference of the Allies in this war previous to that historic meeting just completed on the Crimea has had a greater significance. It was a conference destined to lay the foundation of the world of tomorrow. The results of the conference are better than the most optimistic expectations. They are bet-

ter because they are based on a truly growing confidence among the Allied Governments. They breathe sincerity and strength.

Each great power made concessions. They were based on the American concept of conciliation of different points of view and not the triumph of a single opinion.

The five most important points are:

First. The unconditional surrender clause has been explained in such a way as to encourage the German people to revolt against Hitler.

Second. The Crimean Conference provides for democratic self-government everywhere in Europe.

Third. On the question of Poland, Roosevelt has won a very definite concession. The Lublin Government will be modified into a new provisional national unity government composed of representatives of all democratic factions with a definite guaranty for free and secret elections.

Fourth. The great principles of the Atlantic Charter have been reaffirmed. They have become the basic philosophy of the new world organization.

Fifth. The fact that the United Nations conference in San Francisco is being called by the five major powers will speed victory in the Atlantic and the Pacific. The inclusion of France and China as equals among the sponsoring nations of this all-important conference is a further guaranty that the nations which met on the Crimea do not intend to engage in power politics but are instead determined that all nations, regardless of size or economic condition, shall have equal opportunity in the post-war family of nations.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my congratulations to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], who has just addressed us, and to express also my hearty agreement with her interpretation of the results of the conference of the Big Three which has just terminated. The Allied Nations have been hearing very many things to encourage us in recent weeks from all theaters of action, but I feel there is nothing more heartening and that will give the American people a greater thrill than the unity and the concord and the splendid manner in which these three leaders of the three great nations of the earth have reached an agreement which will mean much toward shortening this war and winning the peace. I trust and I know the American people hope that our own great President may shortly be returned home to us safe and well after this great achievement.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report.