

act by changing a reference from "carrier" to "freight forwarder."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on August 3, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6818. An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6963. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7140. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," so as to increase the additional pay of officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7364. An act to repeal certain laws and to amend other laws relating to naval aviation cadets, to provide for aviation cadets in the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7419. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the War Shipping Administration to sell or charter two merchant vessels to the Government of Ireland.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, August 10, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1837. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, transmitting in accordance with section 20 of Public Law 607. Seventy-seventh Congress, there is herewith report of the Navy, Marine Corps, from June 1 to July 25, 1942, and in the Coast Guard from June 1 to July 31, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1838. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 21, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Coden Bayou, Ala., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 29, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 824); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1839. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting complete Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1941; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1840. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Colum-

bia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1841. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make transportation and storage facilities available for military use where military necessity exists, by authorizing the removal to other points of merchandise in customs custody; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1842. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Charles E. Naghel; to the Committee on Claims.

1843. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Victoria Jessie Lodge Skin, now Standing Bear; to the Committee on Claims.

1844. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 7470. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Perry County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7471. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near Mount Vernon, Posey County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 7472. A bill to revise the Alaska game law; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 7473. A bill to amend section 72 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a central district of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7474. A bill to establish, for the duration and prosecution of the war, adequate United States guards for the protection of lines of communication and supply, and installations and positions deemed by the military authorities vital to national security anywhere within the requirements of military necessity of the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7475. A bill to permit members of the Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve to serve in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 7476. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCGEEHEE:

H. R. 7477. A bill to authorize the purchase, on behalf of the United States, of certain bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Natchez, Miss., and Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7478. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the President to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist the governments of the Latin American republics in military and naval matters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 7479. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal to Father Peter B. Duffee; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 7480. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck and Darrell Claud Tuck, a minor; 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:

3285. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the American Legion in Kings County, Department of New York, that suitable recognition of the valiant services rendered by Father Peter B. Duffee, O. F. M., associated with the Church of St. Francis d'Assissi, New York City, be given by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3286. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of Rev. T. L. Cashwell and congregation of the East Baptist Church of Gastonia, N. C., petitioning passage of Senate bill 860, and House bills 4000 and 6785; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3287. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 115 citizens of Butler and vicinity, Butler County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 1942

The Reverend Thoma: Small, rector, Christ Church, Oil City, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Heavenly Father, Ruler of the Universe, regard, we beseech Thee, our prayers on the behalf of a war-torn world; turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; inspire in the cruel and brutal a sense of mercy and love; and help us all to study and learn those things which will make us live in fellowship and peace with one another.

Send Thy blessing, O gracious Father, upon all those who give themselves in the service of their fellow men. Endue them with wisdom, patience, and courage to strengthen the weak and raise up those who fall, that, inspired by Thy love, they may worthily minister in Thy name to all who are in need in this our good land and throughout the world.

And teach us, good Lord, to put away all bitterness and misunderstanding, both in church and state, that we, with all the brethren of the Son of Man, may draw together as one comity of peoples and dwell evermore in the fellowship of the Prince of Peace who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, now and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 6, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on August 7, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2456. An act to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; and

S. 2642. An act to amend section 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by inserting "of part 1" after "(12)," and to amend subsection (b) of section 417 of such act by changing a reference from "carrier" to "freight forwarder."

VISIT TO VENEZUELA OF DR. MANUEL PRADO, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PERU

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter addressed to him by Hon. Pedro Blanco-Gásperi, President of the National Congress of Venezuela, together with copy of a letter addressed by the Vice President to Dr. Blanco-Gásperi, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Translation]

UNITED STATES OF VENEZUELA,
NATIONAL CONGRESS,
Caracas, June 16, 1942.

His Excellency the President of the Congress,
Washington, D. C.,

United States of America:

Pedro Blanco-Gásperi, president of the National Congress, has the honor to present his compliments to His Excellency the President of the Congress of the United States of America and takes pleasure in transmitting to him, enclosed, several copies of the pamphlet recording the formal session held by the National Congress on May 25 of this year in honor of His Excellency Dr. Manuel Prado, President of the Republic of Peru, on the occasion of his visit to Venezuela.

Blanco-Gásperi avails himself of the opportunity to express to His Excellency the President of the Congress of the United States of America the assurances of his distinguished consideration and deep appreciation.

AUGUST 7, 1942.

Hon. PEDRO BLANCO-GÁSPERI,
President of the National Congress,
United States of Venezuela,
Caracas, Venezuela.

DEAR DR. BLANCO-GÁSPERI: It gave me a great deal of pleasure to read your letter and the copies of the pamphlets recording the proceedings in the National Congress of Venezuela on the occasion of the visit of His Excellency Dr. Manuel Prado, President of the Republic of Peru. Your communication will be placed before the Senate of the United States, and may I, on behalf of the Senate, express deep appreciation for your kindness.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

VICTORIA JESSIE LODGE SKIN NOW STANDING BEAR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

for the relief of Victoria Jessie Lodge Skin now Standing Bear (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

A letter from the president of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, transmitting, pursuant to law, the proceedings of the thirty-second meeting of the convention of the American Instructors of the Deaf, held at Fulton, Mo., June 23 to 27, inclusive, 1941 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Printing.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, the Interior, and Agriculture (8), National Housing Administration (3), Veterans' Administration, United States Civil Service Commission, Board of Economic Warfare, and Administrative Office of the United States Courts, not needed in the conduct of business and having no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Passaic County, N. J., protesting against the imposition of Federal taxes on State, county, or municipal bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the waste of sugar and grains in the manufacture of beer, wines, and distilled liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Illinois and New York praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROSPECTING FOR AND DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC METALS—RESOLUTION OF OREGON MINING ASSOCIATION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Oregon Mining Association on August 3, 1942.

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

At a special meeting of the board of directors of the Oregon Mining Association held on the 3d day of August 1942, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and the Secretary was instructed to forward copies to Senator Charles L. McNary, Senator Rufus C. Holman, Representative Homer D. Angell, Representative James W. Mott, Representative Walter M. Pierce, and to Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon:

"Whereas the whole success of the war effort is dependent upon the maintained and increased production of metals both strategic and critical; and

"Whereas the 1942 revenue bill makes it impossible for new and short-lived mines and plants for production of strategic metals to recover their investment, much less make a profit; and

"Whereas the 1942 revenue bill makes it impossible to interest private capital to open, develop, or equip new mines and plants

for the development of such metals, since there is little possibility of recovering invested capital and no possibility of making a profit; and

"Whereas the Treasury Department by arbitrary rules and regulations has, in effect, already amended the law and refuses to allow the full 15-percent depletion in the mining and processing of strategic metals; and

"Whereas the Treasury Department is endeavoring to still further reduce depletion allowances both by amendment to the law and by regulation; and

"Whereas if the total income from the production of strategic metals were taken by the Government it would not pay for the war effort for more than a fraction of an hour; and

"Whereas unless the 1942 revenue bill gives some consideration to the mining of short-lived deposits of strategic and critical metals the whole war effort is threatened with curtailment and possible collapse: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That our Oregon Senators and Representatives be urged to make every effort to amend the 1942 revenue bill to make it possible for private capital to explore, develop, and produce the short-lived deposits of strategic and critical minerals and metals by:

"1. Removing the excess-profits tax from strategic metals production or guaranteeing the return of capital invested in strategic metal production.

"2. Maintain present depletion allowances and make the bill more definite so that the Treasury Department may not by arbitrary regulation reduce depletion allowances as it already has with quicksilver, and may with other strategic metals.

"3. Adopt the unit of production credit so that an operator increasing production will not be penalized."

I, F. Whalley Watson, secretary of the Oregon Mining Association, certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Oregon Mining Association held at Portland, Ore., August 3, 1942.

F. WHALLEY WATSON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF PROSPECT POMONA GRANGE, NO. 25, ORLEANS COUNTY, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. I present and ask to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by Prospect Pomona Grange, No. 25, of Orleans County, Vt., one of them requesting the Congress to put a stop immediately to irresponsible liquor traffic that undermines the effectiveness of our Government, in the District of Columbia. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The other one protests converting sugar into liquor and wines and beer. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

To the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Whereas our Nation has been summoned to the greatest test of its strength in its entire history; and

Whereas this effort demands the utmost loyalty on the part of governors and governed alike; and

Whereas the District of Columbia leads all other units of our national Commonwealth, not in sobriety but in the consumption of alcoholic liquors, outdistancing her nearest rival by nearly two to one: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, members of Prospect Pomona Grange, No. 25, hereby call upon

the Congress of the United States to immediately put an end to the irresponsible traffic that thus seeks to undermine the effectiveness of our Government at its headquarters; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, together with the vote on the same, be sent to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives for this district of Vermont.

PROSPECT POMONA GRANGE, No. 25,
PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY OF VERMONT,
S. FRANCES GOODALE, *Secretary*.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the war effort of the United States has laid heavy burdens upon the citizens of the Nation, asking sacrifice of necessary foods and equipment to support the sacrifice of sons, brothers, and fathers; and

Whereas the manufacture of certain explosives requires large amounts of sugar; and Whereas the manufacture of beer, wines, and liquors competes directly with this aforesaid necessary supply of explosives by using and storing for future use vast quantities of sugar in various forms; and

Whereas the housewives of America have gladly submitted their important processes of preparing food for a healthy Nation to the restrictions of the munitions requirements: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, members of Prospect Pomona Grange, No. 25, hereby demand of the proper authorities that they place drastic restrictions upon the use of sugar in the preparation of beer, wines, and liquors to bring this industry into the total war effort to which all other sections of the population have been subjected.

PROSPECT POMONA GRANGE, No. 25,
PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY OF VERMONT,
S. FRANCES GOODALE, *Secretary*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Pensions:

S. 1882. A bill granting pensions to persons who suffered injury or disease prior to final induction in the Regular Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1573); and

S. 1947. A bill to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1574).

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

S. 2682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain lands of the United States located within the Fort De Russy Military Reservation, Oahu, T. H., for certain land at Barbers Point, Oahu, owned by the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1576).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2524. A bill to allow an additional period of 6 months in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, or their beneficiaries, may make claim for benefits under the act of July 18, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1575); and

S. 2686. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the President to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist the governments of the Latin-American republics in military and naval matters"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1578).

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

S. 2685. A bill to provide that promotions to higher grades of officers of the Army of the

United States, or any components thereof, shall be deemed to have been accepted upon the dates of the orders announcing such promotions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1577).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation five lists of records transmitted by the Archivist of the United States which appeared to have no permanent value of historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY) from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that on August 6, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2642) to amend section 219 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by inserting "of part I" after "(12)", and to amend subsection (b) of section 417 of such act by changing a reference from "carrier" to "freight forwarder."

ATTORNEYS' FEES IN THE LANGER CASE

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report an original resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 283), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, authorized by Senate Resolution 81, agreed to March 10, 1941, to consider the question of whether WILLIAM LANGER was entitled to retain his seat in the Senate to which he was certified as having been elected on November 5, 1940, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-seventh Congress to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized, not to exceed \$16,500 for the payment of attorneys' fees incurred by Senator LANGER and others in connection with the said proceeding, on vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was absent from my seat when the resolution was read by the clerk. Does the Senator from Illinois desire immediate action on the resolution, which has to do with attorneys' fees in the Langer case?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have immediate consideration, if I can obtain it. I will say to the minority leader I am being pressed on every side in connection with the effort to have the attorneys' fees in this case settled. I should like very much to have the Senate settle the question once and for all. It is immaterial to me whether the attorneys are paid \$16,000 or \$10,000, but, in order that attorneys and others who are apparently interested in the payment of the attorneys' fees may not constantly be calling me on the telephone and writing me and having other people discuss it with me, I am more than anxious to make disposition of the matter.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thoroughly sympathize with the unhappy position of the able Senator from Illinois. Mr. LUCAS. But sympathy does not get me very far.

Mr. McNARY. Probably not. I placed in the RECORD a few days ago a telegram from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] who desires to be present when the question involved in the resolution is considered. I think I should object this morning. However, I do not want the Senator to take too much punishment over too long a period. I am willing to advise the Senator from North Dakota that he must be here a week from today if the Senator desires to dispose of the matter then.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall say to the Senator from Oregon that I am going to press consideration of this matter on Thursday next, and I hope the Senator from Oregon will telegraph the Senator from North Dakota that if he has objection to the attorneys' fees as proposed he should be present on that occasion, because it does seem to me that we have delayed this matter long enough and that the Senate ought to settle it one way or the other.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the request is reasonable, and I shall telegraph the Senator from North Dakota that the Senator from Illinois proposes to press for action next Thursday. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I agree with him that this matter ought to have been disposed of long ago. It has not been delayed on my account. The first time the resolution was under consideration I offered an amendment. I was willing to have it disposed of then. The Senator knows that there is probably not a quorum of the Senate in the city now. I realize that the Senator is not to blame for that situation. Neither am I. However, I feel that the matter ought to have the consideration of a larger attendance of Senators than I feel we shall be able to have even next Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot keep the Senator from making the point of no quorum if he wishes to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not wish to resort to any technicalities. I shall press my amendment to reduce the amount to \$10,000, and shall make some remarks about it. My remarks will not be lengthy. I think the Senate ought to pass on the question on its merits; but I do not like to have such a question disposed of with so few Senators present.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been in no way to blame for delaying action on the resolution. The Senator has acted in good faith. Apparently we cannot reach a determination of the issue, due primarily to the fact that the Senator from North Dakota is not present. At one time he telegraphed that he was satisfied with the attorneys' fees, and requested that the resolution be adopted. I have the telegram on my desk.

Mr. NORRIS. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault with that.

Mr. LUCAS. Later, when the Senator offered his amendment, we had a telegram from the Senator from North Dakota asking for delay; and we have delayed the matter for 10 days or 2 weeks.

As I previously stated, it is absolutely immaterial to me what the Senate does. I shall make no address upon the question one way or the other. I should like to dispose of the resolution at the earliest possible time, because of the continued annoyance the Senator from Illinois is having because of the question of attorneys' fees in the Langer case.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe that the question involved is extremely important. The attorneys' fees ought to have been paid before this time. However, I do not believe that the attorneys will suffer because the fees are not paid, even if the resolution should go over. I do not wish to make an agreement that I will not make the point of no quorum. I feel justified in obtaining a ye-and-nay vote on this question. I have no personal interest in it. However, I think there is a principle involved in it. I may have been unwise in offering my amendment. Perhaps it is not of sufficient importance to justify a ye-and-nay vote; but I should like to have a ye-and-nay vote on my amendment. I do not care very much which way the question is decided. If the Senate wishes to pay \$16,000, let it do so. If it feels that \$10,000 is enough—and my amendment would reduce the fees to that amount—let the question be decided in that way.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to yield if I have the floor. However, I think perhaps the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. We will both yield to the Senator from Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEE. Let me inquire of the majority leader if there is not a sort of gentleman's agreement that no controversial question shall be brought up while so many Senators are absent?

Mr. NORRIS. Even so, I should not feel like insisting upon postponing consideration of the resolution. I suppose it may be said that the so-called gentleman's agreement has no application, because perhaps it will not be admitted that those of us who are opposed to the resolution in its present form are gentlemen. [Laughter.] I do not wish to insist upon that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Oklahoma, let me say that I do not know that I can say that technically there is any gentleman's agreement. However, I stated that, so far as I could see, no important controversial matter would be taken up for the next 2 or 3 weeks, or until the tax bill is brought before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not violating that understanding by bringing this matter up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. I am in some doubt as to whether that understanding or statement would foreclose us from taking up what might be regarded as a routine matter.

Mr. LEE. There is no doubt that this is a controversial issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should regret it if in the midst of the quasi recess in which we are indulging a matter should be brought forward which would require a quorum. I doubt whether Senators who are legitimately absent under the circumstances would wish to be brought back to vote on this particular question.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF SENATE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1941, TO JUNE 30, 1942

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a report on the activities of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

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

From July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942, 126 bills or resolutions were referred to the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs for consideration. One hundred and four of these bills were public bills or resolutions and 22 were private bills. Sixty-nine of these bills were introduced at the request of the Navy Department; 26 were House bills which were referred to the committee, and the remaining 31 were introduced by individual Senators. Of the total of 126, 87, after hearings by the committee, either became law or were reported favorably to the Senate. Sixty-four bills related to naval personnel, 8 related to the acquirement of land for naval purposes, 8 related to the construction of Navy public-works projects, 3 to shipbuilding and ordnance manufacturing facilities, 2 to increase of salvage facilities, 9 to increases in naval vessels of various categories, and 1 to increases in lighter-than-air craft. The remaining 31 covered miscellaneous subjects.

In addition to the above, the committee also held hearings and took favorable action on 28 bills which were introduced and referred to the committee prior to the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1941. Fifteen of these bills related to personnel matters, 3 to the acquirement of land for naval purposes, 2 to the construction of public-works projects for the Navy, and the remaining 8 related to miscellaneous naval matters.

The major personnel bills are as follows:

S. 2568 establishes in the Navy additional commissioned warrant officer grades, as follows: Chief ship's clerk, chief aerographer, chief photographer, chief torpedoman, and the warrant grades of ship's clerk, aerographer, photographer, and torpedoman.

S. 2455 relates to the additional pay authorized for submarine duty and provides additional pay for officers and men who perform diving duties under certain conditions.

S. 2454 grants nurses in the Navy the relative rank of officers, and provides that the superintendent of the Nurse Corps shall have the rank of lieutenant commander, assistant superintendents the rank of lieutenant, and the other nurses the ranks of either lieutenant (jr. gr.) or ensign.

H. R. 6446 provides for continuing the payment of pay and allowances to per-

sonnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof and the civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments who were reported as missing in action, interned in a neutral country, or captured by an enemy as a result of war activities.

H. R. 6496 authorizes additional appointments of warrant officers and commissioned warrant officers to the ranks of commissioned officers in the line and staff corps of the Navy and of the Marine Corps.

S. 2196 establishes a limited-service Marine Corps Reserve. The duties of the members of this limited-service Marine Corps Reserve are to act as guards at naval shore establishments in the United States to relieve more active personnel for military duties.

S. 2149 approved January 12, 1942, increases the authorized strength of the Navy from 300,000 to 500,000 and provides that hereafter the authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps shall be 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. It also authorizes the President to increase the number of Marines to 104,000.

S. 2093 provides that in time of war all enlistments in the Regular Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Reserve components thereof, may be extended by the Secretary of the Navy for such additional time as deemed necessary in the interests of national defense, and that men so detained need not be discharged until 6 months after the termination of the war.

Public Law No. 188, Seventy-seventh Congress. The act, approved July 24, 1941, authorizes the temporary appointment of warrant officers and enlisted men to commissioned rank, and the temporary promotion of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and the Reserve components thereof, to higher ranks in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

S. 2592 suspends for the duration of the war, and for a period of approximately 6 months thereafter, the regular promotion of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and provides that all promotions shall be for temporary service only.

H. R. 6807 establishes a Women's Reserve in the Navy and provides that under certain conditions women between the ages of 20 and 50 may be enrolled in the Naval Reserve and assigned to duty with the Navy. This bill is on the calendar of the Senate and will be considered in the near future.

The major public-works bills enacted, are as follows:

Public Law No. 174, approved July 14, 1941, authorizes an expenditure of \$31,115,000 for the expansion of naval shore establishments.

Public Law No. 210, approved August 16, 1941, authorizes an expenditure of \$22,600,000 for the construction of facilities for lighter-than-air craft.

Public Law No. 241, approved August 21, 1941, authorizes an expenditure of \$244,929,800 for additional naval shore facilities.

Public Law No. 378, approved December 26, 1941, authorizes an expenditure

of \$310,000,000 for naval public-works construction.

Public Law No. 438, approved February 6, 1942, authorizes an expenditure of \$450,000,000 for naval public-works projects.

Public Law No. 531, approved April 28, 1941, authorizes an expenditure of \$800,000,000 for naval public works projects.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Public Law No. 323, approved November 21, 1941, authorizes the construction of 400 vessels for local defense purposes.

Public Law No. 369, approved December 23, 1941, authorizes the construction of 150,000 tons of combatant vessels at an estimated cost of \$633,543,000.

Public Law No. 551, approved May 13, 1942, authorizes the construction of 200,000 tons of combatant ships. It is expected that this authorization will be used for the construction of submarines at an estimated cost of \$887,500,000.

H. R. 7184 authorizes the construction of 500,000 tons of aircraft carriers, 500,000 tons of cruisers, and 900,000 tons of destroyers, the construction of 800 small-type vessels, and the acquisition or conversion of 200 additional small vessels, at an estimated cost of about eight and one-half billions of dollars.

H. R. 7159 authorizes the construction of 1,200,000 tons of auxiliary vessels for the Navy at a cost of approximately \$2,500,000,000.

AIRCRAFT

After hearings by the House and Senate Naval Affairs Committees, a law was passed in July 1940 authorizing the President to build not less than 15,000 airplanes of various designs for use in the naval service. The use of the language "not less" gave the President authority to build as many as he thought necessary and could be produced with existing facilities; therefore, no legislation providing for further aircraft construction is now needed, and, furthermore, the total existing naval program calls for 27,000 planes.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT

Provisions prior to the last fiscal year were made for constructing 48 lighter-than-air craft. During the past fiscal year Senate bill 2196 was enacted increasing the authorized number of lighter-than-air craft from 48 to 200.

SALVAGE FACILITIES

Public Law No. 280, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizes an expenditure of \$3,000,000 annually to provide the Navy with salvage facilities. Senate bill 2193 removed the limitation of \$3,000,000 which could be expended for this purpose.

ADDITIONAL SHIPBUILDING FACILITIES

Senate bill 2153, an act approved July 29, 1941, authorizes an expenditure of \$300,000,000 for additional shipbuilding facilities and \$160,000,000 for additional ship repair facilities.

Public Law No. 420, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved January 29, 1942, authorizes an expenditure of \$500,000,000 for additional equipment and facilities for shipbuilding; \$275,000,000 for additional facilities for altering and converting naval vessels; and \$70,000,000 for additional ordnance and munitions manufacturing facilities.

LXXXVIII—427

An act approved March 17, 1942, authorizes an expenditure of \$100,000,000 for tools, equipment, and facilities for ordnance and munitions manufacturing purposes.

INVESTIGATIONS

The committee, in accordance with Senate Resolution No. 225, adopted by the Senate on February 17, 1942, investigated the fire and capsizing of the U. S. S. *Lafayette* (*Normandie*) and submitted a report to the Senate on May 27, 1942 (Rept. No. 1422).

The committee also extended the act, approved June 28, 1940, which was an act to expedite the national defense, from June 30, 1942, until June 30, 1944. This act continues the provisions of prior law which authorized the War and Navy Departments to negotiate contracts and to pay overtime compensation to various classes of employees in the shore establishment of the Navy. It also extends Public Law No. 100, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which authorized compensation for certain employees in the field services of the War Department, the Canal Zone, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard.

NOMINATIONS

The committee considered the nominations of a thousand or more naval and Marine Corps officers for promotion to higher rank.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Naval Committee is pleased to be able to report to the Senate that the progress which has been made in the Navy shipbuilding program is such that all types of combatant vessels are being completed well ahead of schedule.

The record of vessels completed during the period from January 1, 1942, to June 1, 1942, is most satisfactory and is much in excess of what was anticipated when contracts were entered into. In some instances the time of completion has been reduced over 50 percent.

The Navy Department has deferred the building of some of the battleships and larger type cruisers already authorized and has undertaken to convert some of the light cruisers and other vessels into aircraft carriers. The reason for deferment in the case of battleships is not because the Navy feels that there may not be future need for these ships but because of the difficulty in obtaining material for all types of ships considered essential.

The Navy is definitely of the opinion that it is more important at this period for a rapid production of other types of vessels, and also that it is necessary for the Navy to consider what priorities should be given the types of vessels that should be first constructed, the wartime strategic and tactical requirements for various types of construction, and arrive at a compromise in the allocation of available materials.

From time to time the committee has held executive sessions at which officers of the Navy presented to the committee a comprehensive review of the activity of the Navy from the opening of hostilities in December until the present time, together with a general visualization of the future conduct of the war, both in relation to the antisubmarine campaign in

the Atlantic and the extensive operations in the Pacific.

Also the committee in executive session has made a special study of the extent combatant vessels in the Navy have been finished during the past 7 months, as well as the progress being made in building of aircraft.

The committee learned that there has been a rapid and extensive increase in shipbuilding facilities and that the number of yards available for building ships has increased tremendously, with the result that the shipbuilding program has been speeded up materially. The speeding-up process has been accomplished not only by creating additional shipbuilding facilities but by working overtime, building new machine shops, and in every other possible way speeding up the program.

Officials of the Navy Department have been very frank with the committee and given them all available information, but the committee has refrained from seeking information in reference to the results of military operations, except such information as has been given to the public by the communiqués issued by the Navy from time to time.

As a result of the information furnished, the committee realizes that the Navy has been operating under extraordinarily difficult conditions, due to the necessity of the Navy's being compelled to operate on many fronts in different parts of the world, as well as the lack of adequate naval and air bases and the limited facilities for the production of needed equipment, and in some instances, shortages of raw materials—all of which handicaps are being overcome rapidly. The Navy has also, in a comparatively few months, had to absorb a large percentage of its officers, seamen, and pilots from reserves who have, of necessity, required special instruction and knowledge of naval methods and tactics, so that at the present time nearly three-quarters of the naval personnel have only recently been inducted into the service.

The committee is of the opinion that when it is practicable and advisable to divulge the methods that have been taken and the operations that have been carried out, the American public will better understand the most trying conditions, considering the means available, under which the Navy has operated.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 2703. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2704. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. A bill for the relief of Capt. Samuel N. Moore, United States Navy; and

S. 2706. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and title IV of the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1941,"

approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2707 (by request). A bill extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2708. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2709. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 with respect to certain persons who die prior to the effective date of insurance applied for under such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week commencing on the second Monday in October of each year as National Bible Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7378, the revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 75, line 15, after the word "spar" and before the word "and", insert the words "rock asphalt."

On page 75, line 19, after the word "spar" and before the word "and", insert the words "rock asphalt."

On page 75, line 22, after the word "mines" and before the figure "15", insert the words "and rock asphalt."

On page 76, line 9, after the word "mines" and before the word "section", insert the words "and rock asphalt mines or deposits."

In line 11, after the word "fluorspar" and before the word "or", insert the words "rock asphalt."

RADIO BROADCAST TO JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio broadcast made by Senator THOMAS of Utah to the people of Japan on August 7, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD BEFORE THE FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NEW YORK STATE FOOD MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him before the forty-first annual convention of the New York State Food Merchants' Association, in New York City, on August 3, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD BEFORE ULSTER COUNTY DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEEMEN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him before a dinner of the Ulster County Democratic committeemen, at Kingston, N. Y., on August 3, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT ABOUT CONGRESS?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address delivered by him at Cleveland, Ohio, on August 8, 1942, on the subject What About Congress? which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF DR. EARL N. BRESSMAN BEFORE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the statement submitted by Dr. Earl N. Bressman, Agricultural Division, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs to the Defense Investigating Committee of the Senate on May 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

BETTS v. BRADY—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the New York Times of August 2, 1942, discussing the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Betts v. Brady*, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES AND LETTER BY DAVID SARNOFF

[Mr. TRUMAN (for Mr. WHEELER) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "International Communications," published in the New York Times of January 29, 1942, and a letter written by David Sarnoff, which appear in the Appendix.]

IDAHO NAVAL STATION

[Mr. CLARK of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Naval Station in the Crags" written by Richard L. Neuberger and published in the Portland Oregonian of July 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business is closed.

CARGO AIRCRAFT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to make a report on the progress of the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee which has been holding hearings on the subject of cargo- and troop-transport aircraft. We have had before the subcommittee some of the outstanding men in the field of aviation. We have had famous flyers, well-known manufacturers, recognized engineers, and the highest governmental officials in the field of aviation. It was the unanimous opinion of every person who testified before the subcommittee that we need more cargo- and troop-transport aircraft. There was no difference of opinion on that point.

Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, has indicated that the Government intends to give Mr. Henry Kaiser a contract for the construction of 500 large flying boats like the Glenn Martin *Mars*. If this is done the purpose of the committee will have been in large measure accomplished.

Therefore, it is my purpose to ask for temporary suspension of the hearings on the subject of cargo- and troop-transport aircraft.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to give the conclusions which I have reached as a result of those hearings:

First, the Government must increase the production of medium-sized cargo-

and troop-transport aircraft by a greater use of plywood. There is an abundance of Douglas fir and other woods which are suitable for plywood construction. The use of that material would not in any way compete with the production of any other essential commodity.

Furthermore, there are many cabinet makers, woodworkers, piano makers, and furniture manufacturers who are not now engaged in war industry and whose services could be utilized. In fact, if they are not utilized many of those persons will be without employment, since production of civilian goods made of this material has practically ceased.

The use of plywood as a construction material for planes is universally approved. In some cases it may be second choice, but each witness on the subject agreed that plywood is a satisfactory material for the construction of planes.

Second, the Government must immediately launch a large-scale program for the construction of giant cargo and troop-transport flying boats. They should be built in shipyards which are already constructed. They should be built instead of the surface ships which are so easily sunk.

Such construction facilities must be devoted to the building of the Glenn Martin *Mars* type of plane, since it is no longer experimental but for the most part has been proven to be successful.

Testimony before the committee showed that about 70 percent of the facilities of the shipyards could serve without change for the construction of this type of flying boat.

Third, the highest priorities must be given to the construction of aircraft, both combat and cargo.

It is now evident that air power is the main weapon of warfare and that land and sea forces are both auxiliary to air power.

Therefore, first priorities must be given to the production of aircraft.

Everyone appearing before the committee favored increasing the production of cargo aircraft, but there was a defeatist attitude on the part of some who maintained that we could not increase the production of cargo aircraft without decreasing the production of combat aircraft. But such a defeatist attitude is not warranted by the facts.

It was said there is not enough aluminum. It was said there is not enough chromium. It was said that we do not have enough steel. It was said we cannot produce enough motors.

No doubt these critical materials present problems, but all of them can be solved. They must be solved. It is true that their solution may require still more sacrifice on the part of our civilian population.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise to ask the Senator if he does not believe that if, instead of constantly calling upon the civilian population to make sacrifices by curtailing what appear to civilians to be essential uses, the Government should engage in an all-out effort to produce in America the very materials

which are needed, we would be pursuing a wiser course?

For example, the Senator has very correctly stated that there has been a defeatist attitude among those who have discussed with him and with others the problem of increasing our aircraft flotillas. Every one of them said, "We have not enough steel, we have not enough chromium, we have not enough nickel, we have not enough this or that"; and yet at the same time the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys for a year and a half has been calling the attention of the Government to the fact that there are in this country unscratched, untouched, huge deposits of those very materials. The defeatist attitude is to be found throughout the Government bureaus which have not as yet been coordinated. If it had not been for what the Senator from Oklahoma has done with respect to cargo planes we would not now be able to say that Mr. Kaiser has been given a tentative contract for the production of 500 planes. But we must get over the idea of defeatism, and must undertake to make the maximum use of all the resources and all the manpower of America. Until we do that we shall not begin to win the total war.

Mr. LEE. I agree with the Senator from Wyoming. It is well known that we have mountains of iron ore available to us; and yet almost every day we are told that there is a shortage of steel. Perhaps those who say so mean a shortage of the facilities to translate iron ore into steel. If so, we should be busy building such facilities, instead of thinking up reasons why the necessary steel cannot be produced. I definitely agree with the Senator. There are available deposits of chromium and of nickel which may be of low grade, and therefore have not yet been developed, but we should be at the job of developing them and seeing what can be done.

With respect to the part played by the civilian population, I believe that the Senator will agree with what I shall presently have to say, because up to now we have referred to the civilians in merely a general way and have made an appeal based on voluntary effort. What I shall argue for presently is a systematic effort headed by more aggressive leadership in the Government to make available such materials as are necessary, and I shall point out that it is definitely my opinion that civilians not only will approve such a program but are waiting for it today.

What is everybody's business is nobody's business. Therefore the general invitation over the radio for everybody to make sacrifices is of no effect. We must have a systematic Government-ordered program which requires everybody in the same class to make the same sacrifice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. The civilian population of America understands that this is a total war and that that means that every single resource of the country should be mobilized in our fight to win the war. However, week after week and month after month we wait for the aggressive leadership of which the Senator speaks. We have talked about salvage campaigns.

For example, we hear talk about tearing down statues in the various parks. The Lord knows most of the statues are not worth the space they take. We might all agree to that. Most of the statues are eyesores from the point of view of sculpture and beauty, but, notwithstanding, in all the statues in America there does not begin to be one one-hundredth of the amount of metals that are lying untouched in the ground. To talk about tearing down statues or tearing up railroads, or, as the War Production Board was talking about the other day, taking the machinery out of the mines in the West in order to supply scrap iron, is the most absurd defeatism that it is possible for anyone to imagine.

We are confronted by the fact that in 7 years Hitler, with only a fraction of the natural resources we have, has built a mechanical army which is sweeping over Europe. He has guns enough; he has tanks enough; apparently he has airplanes enough. He has all the elements of mechanized warfare, and he has built it without a fraction of our resources.

Take, for example, iron ore. Hitler does not have in Germany a supply of iron ore to compare with what we have. Of course, he has taken over the iron-ore deposits of Norway and Sweden. But this country, equipped by nature with the greatest storehouse of natural resources to be found in practically all the world, witnessing the fact that our enemies are seizing the raw materials, is still putting along day after day without an all-out effort to produce. We have a War Production Board. It is busy almost exclusively in urging various branches of the Government to do something, instead of commanding them to do it. I am glad the Senator has raised his voice in appealing for leadership.

Mr. LEE. I will say, however, that Mr. Donald Nelson, in respect to the problem which the submarine sinkings present—namely, one of transportation—has been more progressive and more sympathetic with the effort to meet this problem by encouraging builders like Henry Kaiser, than have the officials of some of the other departments which should be equally interested in meeting this bottleneck of transportation.

With respect to the civilian question, it is my belief that the people are again ahead of the Government on the question of air cargo. Mr. President, if it is necessary in order to build these planes for the Government to collect all the aluminum from every kitchen in America, then it must be done.

If it is necessary to go into the hardware stores and requisition critical material, then that must be done.

Furthermore, if it is necessary for us to make a choice between many things we are using in civilian life today and winning the war, the American people are ready to make that choice.

The Government should collect all the automobiles in used-car lots. The Government should collect scrap iron. I will say that if there is a program that has been a flop, it is the one connected with the collection of scrap iron. We had the officials of the scrap-iron program before a subcommittee of the Military

Affairs Committee, and instead of showing a sympathetic attitude toward collecting scrap iron they always met us with arguments as to why certain things could not be done.

For example, one can ride through the State of Oklahoma today on a train or in an automobile and see from every point of view enough scrap iron to fill a large gap in our program. Throughout the oil fields of Oklahoma there is an abundance of scrap iron which has not been collected. On the farms of Oklahoma there is an abundance of scrap iron which has not been touched. We have a scrap-iron dealer in Oklahoma whose name is Mr. Fred Macduff. He has dealt in used material for oil fields, and of his own volition wanted to collect scrap iron. He started a scrap-iron program. He began sending in carloads of scrap iron until Frank Bain, who, I believe, was at that time connected with the War Production Board, went to Oklahoma and over the radio said that that program should stop. Mr. Macduff had been so successful in Texas that he sent several carloads from there, and he telegraphed that he wanted to give the Government a hundred tons of scrap iron. The subcommittee investigated the situation and called before it Mr. Warburg and Mr. Cabot. It heard their arguments as to why the offer could not be accepted. However, they finally accepted the gift of a hundred tons of scrap iron after some months and after the subcommittee had insisted that they were not very eager to collect scrap iron unless they accepted that offer.

We had testimony before the committee from a Congressman who had been in Oklahoma, and he said he saw no evidences of collecting the scrap iron by the committee which had been set up by the W. P. B. for that purpose. When asked about it the officials held up the great mysterious bugaboo that the bottleneck of collecting the scrap iron was the junk dealer, and said that it took an expert to tell the different kinds of iron. However, Mr. Macduff, who has been in the business for many years, said he could take any boy and in 30 minutes explain to him how to separate the iron. There are two kinds of iron; cast iron that breaks easily, and another iron which is less brittle.

Macduff's plan to collect scrap iron was based on the patriotic impulse of the country. He did not tell the business or professional men to take the scrap iron to the junk dealer and he would pay them so much a pound for it, but he put it on the basis of patriotism. He said, "Take it to the scrap-iron depot," and he put up a big sign. He dramatized the program. He said, "File it up, and when the pile gets big enough, we will call the junk dealers and let them bid on it. The highest bidder will buy it and it will go into the regular channels for handling scrap iron. Then we will give the check to the Boy Scouts or some other worthy cause." It worked so well that they did not like it. Evidently they want the junk business-as-usual method, which I repeat is a flop.

Then Mr. Cabot said that another reason why they could not collect it any

faster was because of the limited number of processing machines which the junk dealers have with which to compress the scrap into blocks so that it can be shipped.

In that connection, an interesting irony is that a company which has the two largest processing plants in Oklahoma, one in Tulsa, and one in Oklahoma City, violated one of the rules of the War Production Board. Mr. President, what do you suppose was the penalty for that violation? Was it a large fine?

The penalty was that they had to close down the two processing machines for 90 days, which meant that if they were closed down about 240 employees, who were already trained, would be gone and when operations were resumed it would be sometime before a new staff could be organized and trained.

I appealed to the authorities to assess some other penalty on those who violated the rule. I did not suggest that they be excused, but to fine them, or take their profits; in any event to keep the machines going. The last time I checked the situation the order that the company should shut down for 90 days had not been changed.

Mr. President, every time we come to the question of building cargo planes and building more planes we are told there is a shortage of steel. Mr. Cabot testified before our committee that we were doing almost all we could toward the processing of scrap iron. He went away feeling, I suppose, that he had done his duty.

I simply mention that because I happen to be the chairman of the subcommittee which investigated the scrap iron situation.

There is scrap iron all over this country and everybody knows it. If we put the collection of it on a patriotic basis, everybody will bring it in. We will see businessmen going down the back alleys, digging into junk piles, bringing the scrap iron in and piling it in the center of their town. If that program were dramatized and put upon the basis of patriotism and explained to our people, they would bring in the scrap iron and pile it mountain high.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that at least one of the officials in the W. P. B., in connection with iron production, made the statement to some of my constituents who took the trouble of paying their expenses to come here, that he was not interested in patriotism but in the policy of the W. P. B.

Mr. LEE. Mr. Donald Nelson, however, has been most helpful and most sympathetic and he has been of more help in this program than some of the men who are under him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have great respect for Mr. Nelson and a great deal of personal affection for him. Does not the Senator believe that the iron and steel situation will not be corrected until the death grip of certain representatives

of Big Steel, who are connected with various governmental agencies, and who are interested in the policies of the industry rather than patriotism, is broken?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have been inclined to think, though I have no definite proof, that there is an effort on the part of the big monopolistic interests—not only with respect to steel but with respect to rubber—to hold down production so that they can retain control of it after the war is over.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator said he did not have any definite proof of any monopolistic tendencies in connection with the fundamental metals which go to make up the necessities with which to fight this war. The record which was made by the special committee on the aluminum program and on the lead and zinc and copper program and the record which was made last Thursday and Friday on the steel program show very definitely that there is a strangle monopolistic hold on these fundamental metals and that certain interests undoubtedly are much more interested in what their position is going to be after the war than they are right now in furnishing the materials with which to win the war. I think we will very definitely prove that to be so before we conclude the hearings.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator for that contribution. We had before our committee Mr. Reynolds, the aluminum manufacturer, who said he could increase his production three times or perhaps more than that. He said there is plenty of bauxite in this country with which to make aluminum; he said it might be necessary, because of the power shortage, for the people to divert electricity from lighting their homes to the manufacture of aluminum. I say to you, Mr. President, that, in my opinion, the people of this country, if it comes to that, will light their homes with coal-oil lamps and will gladly do so if the electric power they are now using is required in order to make aluminum necessary to build these cargo ships.

We are making cargo airplanes out of stainless steel today. I believe that if the Government would give a contract to Mr. Henry Kaiser—and do not be deceived, for no contract has as yet been given to him—he would be able to turn out these flying boats in record time; then, he would break his own record, and then he would improve upon that, as he has done in the shipping industry.

The Commerce Committee was told a little over a year ago, when we were planning the program for merchant ships, that the standard schedule was to turn out one ship every 105 days. That looked like a very fast schedule. Mr. Kaiser now, however, is turning out a ship in 46 days; he says, given the steel and a little more time, he will be turning out one every 30 days, and I believe he will do so.

It is not my purpose to try to blame anybody; I think everyone having any responsibility at all wants to win this war; but some of them need to revise their thinking and their judgment. As I

recall, it was only 2 years ago when some of the high officials of the War Department before the Committee on Military Affairs were ridiculing the use of parachute troops. I know that one thing after another we have invented and proven Hitler has taken and used to advantage after we had discarded it on this side.

Today, if there is any one thing that has been proved in this war, it is that air power is going to win the war. I believe today that an officer of the air branch of the War Department should be placed in charge of all strategy, that all strategy should be figured from the standpoint of air power, and that the Navy and the Army should be auxiliary to that. Mr. President, if you study the record of this war, you will be convinced that such a course would be wise.

Even in the two battles which are pointed to as great naval battles, Coral Sea and Midway, other than antiaircraft guns, the Navy did not fire a single gun except into one of our own ships, the *Lexington*, in order to sink her after she was already mortally damaged. The naval ships of the two countries were not within striking power of each other except by the air arm, and the land-based planes played an important part in both those battles.

When the appropriation was brought in to build more floating air bases, more airplane carriers, I made a suggestion then that it might be all right to build small ones, so that we could get them built more quickly, since we need them now. But I did not favor building large ones, because, by the time they were completed, they would be as obsolete as the battleship. Today every surface ship is driven out of range of the enemy's land-based planes.

Certainly, I believe we should complete the construction of any large aircraft carrier which has already been started. In fact, I voted for the appropriation, but pointed out at the time that I believe we should build small aircraft carriers instead of large ones, because, first, the cost of each one would not be so great; second, they could be finished sooner; third, they would not be as easily sunk; and, fourth, if they were sunk, the loss would not be so great.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Upon whom should we rely as to whether to build the small airplane carrier or the large one? Upon whose judgment is the Senator willing that we should rely? Should we rely on the judgment of the Senator from Oklahoma on that question or should we rely upon those upon whom the Government has spent literally millions and billions of dollars to train in the Army and Navy and in air work? That is a point on which I should like to be enlightened, if the Senator from Oklahoma can enlighten me.

Mr. LEE. It is often true that the common man has more common sense than the experts. I say that time and again the Army and Navy experts have been proved to be wrong. I attribute much of Hitler's success today to the fact that he was a layman and planned this

war from the standpoint of a layman. He overruled his generals and liquidated some of them. The very fact that he made air power the spearhead of every one of his successful campaigns is proof that air power is the power that will win this war.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but notwithstanding that, Mr. Hitler is going, ultimately, to lose this war.

Mr. LEE. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. LUCAS. I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and let me say to the Senator I have listened not for days but for weeks to the testimony of officers who have come before our committee. I have tried to give everybody the benefit of the doubt in connection with the testimony I have heard from time to time. I heard the testimony in connection with large airplane carriers and small airplane carriers, about which the Senator is now talking, and I do not think there is a single member of the Naval Affairs Committee, after listening to the testimony by the best men the Navy can furnish in connection with the problems that are involved in this world-wide battle we are fighting, who does not agree with the conclusions of the men who have testified upon that point; at least, I have never heard anyone in the committee contend otherwise.

There may be some reason why small airplane carriers are better than large airplane carriers; it may be we should have more of them; I do not know; but, as a layman, I will say to the Senate that I cannot take the floor of the Senate and tell the world that we ought to have small airplane carriers rather than large airplane carriers, in view of the limited knowledge I have of the subject matter. I do not think the Senator from Oklahoma has any more knowledge upon it than I have. I simply cannot take that responsibility. I may be wrong and the Senator from Oklahoma may be an expert along that line.

Mr. LEE. No; I am not, and that is why I think I am in a good position to pass judgment on it. I can read what is happening and can size it up, and I believe I am in a better position to give it its fair proportion of value than can a man who has been in the Navy all his life and is full of Navy traditions—and honor to him for it—but who sees it from that point of view only.

It was not until after Crete that our War Department woke up to the value of gliders and parachute troops. Then it woke up; and to its credit it moved fast. Let it be said to the credit of General Arnold and the air branch of our defense that they see the situation which exists, and are progressing.

Coming back to the question of aircraft carriers, in the first place, the big flat top of an aircraft carrier is an open invitation to bombing. It offers an easy target.

In the second place, the aircraft carrier is a floating torch. It is full of fuel with which to replenish the planes which take off from it, and bombs which they must use for ammunition. When the *Lexington* was in her death throes, en-

veloped in smoke and flames, it is sad, but true, that 60 of the airplanes which had been in battle came back, and when the pilots saw the ship sinking they had to land on the *Lexington* and scramble out of their planes in order to save their lives, leaving the planes to go down with the noble old ship.

Mr. President, when we can see something, we do not need to be experts to draw a logical conclusion. I have eyes and I can reason.

The planes on an aircraft carrier must of necessity be slower than land-based planes. In every conflict between planes from an aircraft carrier and land-based planes, the land-based planes are superior. Every engineer before our committee told us so. The aircraft-carrier planes must be slow. They must have a slow landing speed in order to be able to land on the small landing surface.

When they go into a "dog fight" with land-based planes the chances are heavily against them. Today not only our Navy but every navy is driven as far from the shores of the enemy as the range of his land-based planes. I challenge anybody to dispute that statement. Why could not our Navy relieve the boys in the Philippines? Because the surface ship has been driven to the center of the ocean by the land-based planes. Why not wake up to this fact, Why does not the British Navy prevent Axis convoys across the Mediterranean? Why did not the British Navy prevent the invasion of Crete? Because of enemy land-based air power.

I love the Navy. I love its traditions. God bless those boys. Many of them are brought up in the Navy, and every one of them would die for America. Our Navy officers and men are second to none in the world. Man for man they are superior to the enemy. But why go on and on uselessly with something which we can see is a losing venture in order to maintain so-called Navy traditions? The entire war strategy should be based upon air power. In the attack on Pearl Harbor the Japanese used air power as the main weapon and the Navy as the auxiliary weapon.

What about our submarine campaign? If we are to believe the estimates—and they should be fairly accurate—which are based upon photographic information from reconnaissance planes taking photographs of the slips where submarines are launched, the estimates show that today about 100 of Hitler's submarines are plying the ocean; and from the increased number of slips it is estimated that there will be 430 submarines by December. Those submarines have concentrated on sinking our coastwise trade on this side of the ocean and on the supply lines to Russia on the other side of the ocean; and they have been most effective. As high an authority as Admiral Vickery says that we are losing our battle in the race to produce ships faster than the Axis can sink them.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course the Senator is correct when he talks about the submarine menace. There is much talk throughout the country, and some on

the floor of the Senate, about the failure to conquer the submarine menace. Ultimately we will conquer it. However, the Senator must remember, and the country ought to remember, that after the last war we entered into certain treaties with various countries throughout the world, limiting our ships on a 5-5-3 ratio. The airplane carriers, which the Senator does not like, were also limited in tonnage by those treaties.

The whole trouble was that from 1920 almost until December 7 last, the country was not in the mood to do what Hitler has done during the past 7 years. We cannot compare the production and preparation of this country with what Hitler has done. Hitler has been preparing for the past 9 or 10 years; and we have been preparing on an all-out basis really only since Pearl Harbor. We had and have today a one-ocean Navy. As the Senator knows, the greatest menace to the submarine is the destroyer. Our destroyers are on duty from here to Australia; from here to Hawaii; from here to the Aleutian Islands; and from here to Iceland, England, Ireland, and the North Sea.

Mr. LEE. The Senator does not maintain that we have been very successful in our efforts at destroying submarines, does he?

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all; but I do not condemn the Navy. I do not say, as one Senator said some time ago, that the Navy was criminally negligent for not seeing this thing years ago and being able to meet the situation when the submarines came over on this side.

Mr. LEE. Neither do I condemn the Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. Our Navy was planned in line with what the American people wanted after the last war. They wanted a one-ocean Navy. Very few individuals in this country ever wanted a Navy second to none. Very few individuals wanted an Army which was adequate. As a member of the American Legion, I attended many conventions which passed resolutions demanding a Navy second to none and an Army at least equal to that provided for by the Defense Act of 1920, which would have given us a maximum of 350,000 men. However, we could not get it.

Anyone who attempted to give the American Nation the semblance of a defense in the Army and Navy was called a warmonger, an interventionist, and other names, even in those days. We could not obtain an adequate defense. The people of America dreamed of being able to live forever in a land of peace, plenty, and happiness, and thought that we could isolate ourselves in one little corner of the earth, and that nobody could ever bother us. They believed that the Atlantic and the Pacific formed an impregnable barrier. When the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor on December 7, that fallacy was exploded forever in the minds of Senators and in the minds of the American people. We were not prepared, because of the attitude of the American people on those questions.

The Senator from Illinois is a peace-loving citizen. I love peace better than I love anything else; but we must look

the facts squarely in the face. We know that this country was not prepared. Those in charge of the war effort are now working overtime, 16 or 18 hours a day, in an honest attempt to do what they think ought to be done. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he will not take the floor and condemn them until it is proved to him beyond all reasonable doubt that they are guilty of the charges made against them. I believe that those in the departments are just as patriotic as is any Senator. I believe that the men in Donald Nelson's office are patriotic. Of course he has some men who make mistakes. Mistakes are being made everywhere. I think the Senator from Oklahoma makes a mistake when he puts himself in the position of a naval expert and tells the country that we ought to have small aircraft carriers instead of large ones, when the large ones are what the experts say we ought to have. It is a unique theory that an individual does not have to know anything in order to know it all. That is practically what the Senator from Oklahoma says with respect to airplane carriers.

Yes; a one-ocean navy is what we have. Under the program we cannot have a two-ocean navy until 1946. Today we have a one-ocean navy fighting on five oceans, spread out all over the face of the globe. It is not our fault; Japan struck us treacherously on December 7. The Senate of the United States by unanimous vote declared war on Germany and Italy. There is no question that since that time we have worked to the utmost of our ability to arm ourselves; but I say that these things simply cannot be done overnight, and the American people should understand that it takes patience and time and that many mistakes will necessarily be made in order to do the things that the departments and agencies are trying to do.

I beg the Senator's pardon for encroaching on his time.

Mr. LEE. That is quite all right.

Mr. LUCAS. However, it seems to me that all the time, day after day, I hear in the Senate criticism and carping about the war effort, and it comes mostly from our side of the aisle. Until I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the men engaged in the war effort are motivated by selfish and mercenary interests I cannot take the floor and condemn them for what they have done, and I feel obliged in my feeble way to defend them in order to attempt to create what seems to be so lacking, namely, a unanimity of feeling and a condition of harmony in the country. If on the floor of the Senate we keep making statements, without facts or expert knowledge—statements which arouse doubts with respect to such vital matters—there can be little or no national cohesion.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have been glad to have the Senator make the comments he has made. Most of his remarks seem to leave the impression that I was criticizing the Navy, which certainly I was not doing, and that I was criticizing the men in the Navy, when I said I did

not believe we should start the construction of any more large aircraft carriers. I believe the Senator said that the common people have no sense at all.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. LEE. I believe the Senator said that my conclusion was that those who do not know anything about anything know more than the experts know.

What I said was that sometimes the common people have more common sense than the experts have.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what the Senator from Oklahoma said; but the Senator cannot put words in my mouth as to my reply to his remarks. My statement was that the Senator from Oklahoma had presented a most unique theory to the effect that a person who knows nothing about technical matters knows more than an expert on such matters knows.

Mr. LEE. I was referring to the common people; so, in effect, the Senator from Illinois is saying that the common people know nothing.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can draw any conclusions he wants to draw. My remarks speak for themselves.

Mr. LEE. The Senator from Illinois also attempted, it seems to me, to put a number of words and implications in my mouth—ones which certainly are not true with respect to the Navy. If there has been anyone who has pleaded for national unity, I have. However, I do not believe that a desire for national unity means that we must go on and on making the same mistakes over and over. When we see that a policy or a strategy is not succeeding, I think the duty and obligation then is upon us to change the policy or the strategy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. LEE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct; but I simply cannot feel that, with all the duties I have as a Member of the United States Senate, I can pass judgment upon the men who are dealing with the important problems of production. Yesterday I talked to a man who spent all of Saturday in writing three important letters to three different individuals of the Government who had asked him for specific information. So important were the letters, and so sure was he that he had to be correct in what he said in them, because he would be criticized on the floor of the Senate if he did not dot an "i" or cross a "t" in the three letters, that he found it necessary to spend all of Saturday in writing them.

I simply cannot indulge myself to the point of feeling that I am an expert on any of these matters. From my brief communications with the men in the various departments in Washington and from my brief experience with them I know that, in view of all the great problems they are compelled to wrestle with day after day and the great decisions of judgment they have to make, until someone can demonstrate to me, through the Truman committee or otherwise, that there is fraud, corruption, or graft in connection with what is going on in Washington, I shall hesitate a long, long time before I severely criticize and condemn.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. LEE. The Senator would have to search a long time before he would find in anything I have spoken any word about fraud, corruption, or anything of the kind. Again I say that the Senator is by implication trying to put in my mouth words which were not there and which will not be there. The only two men I have criticized deserve to be criticized. They are the ones in charge of the scrap-iron program. I did not criticize them until several months after the hearing in which we showed them that their method was not clicking, and offered them a method to make it click. However, up to this time they have done nothing about it. Under the circumstances I thought it was my duty to call attention to the situation; and that is what I have done.

With respect to the Navy, let me say that if the Senator reads the transcript of my remarks he will not be able to find anywhere in them that I have criticized any member of the Navy or have criticized the naval experts. I have simply pointed out an obvious fact that a reading of the newspapers will show. Let us review the war. The air power of Hitler drove the British Navy out of the waters around Norway and won that battle. The only battleship which was sunk by another battleship was the *Bismarck*, which was sunk after she had been disabled by planes and was a derelict ship. I think perhaps the planes were from an aircraft carrier. The *Bismarck* was disabled by air power, and then a warship was allowed to close in and sink her.

What about the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*? Both of them were sunk by air power. The Japanese battleship which Captain Kelly sank was sunk by air power.

If in the face of all the facts and in the face of the strongest case which could possibly be built up in favor of increasing our air power, the Senator still insists that we continue on our former way because those who are so loyal to Navy prestige believe we should continue in that way—and I wish to say that the representatives of the Navy who have been before my committee were universally of the opinion that we should put all possible stress upon the development of air power, that the Navy itself must have air power, but again I point out that aircraft carriers cannot safely get within striking distance of land-based planes.

Today the Navy serves a purpose. I did not mean to imply that it does not. It serves a purpose out in the "blind spots," so to speak, that cannot yet be reached by land-based planes; but the rapidity with which land-based planes are extending their range makes the surface ship more and more useless as an arm of warfare.

Mr. President, I wish to continue my argument with respect to the civilians' willingness to cooperate.

The Government could collect all of the automobiles in used-car lots. The Government could take the iron railings from around yards, balconies, and estates. The Government could take the chromium-plated and nickel-plated fix-

tures from homes. If it were done without favoritism, the American people would approve it. More than that, they would applaud it. In fact, Mr. President, today they expect it; and every day that our program flounders is a day of disappointment to the civilian population of this country.

If the Government needs anything in the world that I have, I expect the Government to take it; so does every other patriotic citizen in the United States.

We do not believe we should lose this war for the want of materials which every civilian has all around him every day.

Mr. President, every day sees a greater threat to our supply lines. Every newspaper tells of the sinking of more of our surface ships. Every month Hitler loses more submarines to lurk in the caverns of the deep, with their sensitive mechanical ears listening for a victim.

Not only has the problem of supplying our allies become acute but there will be the problem of supplying our own troops while the toll of American ships mounts.

Mr. President, I repeat, the American people expect our Government to take action in this crisis. They are prepared to make any sacrifice which is necessary in order to win this war.

ATTACKS ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESS— FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at the outset of my address to have printed as a part of my remarks at their conclusion certain letters and excerpts from letters received by the Chicago Tribune concerning its support of America's all-out war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BROOKS. America faces her gravest task, a task which will demand greater sacrifice, greater suffering, greater service, and greater unity than our people have ever been called upon to make in the span of a little more than a century and a half of our Nation's history.

We must win this war. We will win this war. We must be willing and ready to lay our all, our individual lives and our fortunes upon the altar of this, our fight for freedom. The freedom we are determined to defend, perpetuate, and extend by victory in this war is founded upon the original freedoms, the freedom of press, freedom of speech and assembly, and the freedom of religion. These freedoms are being challenged. They have been attacked from abroad. We must defend them against that attack from abroad, but we must also be willing to lay down our lives, if necessary, to defend them here at home.

I speak today because of a series of events which have taken place throughout the country and particularly in my State events which, I believe, will materially hamper our war effort and which are destined to destroy the morale and the unity of our people.

First, I wish to speak of the purge and smear campaign that was directed against Members of the Congress of the

United States. The American people can still remember the vicious attacks made upon our Supreme Court, and they remember, too, that the people overwhelmingly supported each of the men who defended the Court, even though they, too, were marked for the purge at that time.

There can be no question that this present purge campaign is well organized, resulting, among other things, in the despicable and deplorable attack upon the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. It is well financed, aided, and abetted by those who were the most determined and aggressive in their effort to get us into the war. Since then a group of men have set themselves up as a committee known as the Union for Democratic Action, and, with the aid of the Communist Party and the left-wing New Republic magazine, they listed a group of Members of Congress to be purged and defeated in the recent primaries or the coming elections. They honored me, Mr. President, by placing my name at the head of the list of 3 United States Senators who should be defeated at all costs, no matter to what extremes they must go to accomplish their ends. They named the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and myself, as the 3 Senators to head the purge list with some 29 other Members of Congress.

In my State a new paper, the Chicago Sun, was started and joined in the attack, soon announcing as a part of its policy the defeat of WAYLAND BROOKS for the Senate. Joining in this demand and determined effort to defeat me was the Chicago Daily News, which is controlled by the Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, and from which he receives \$60,000 a year for "advice," while receiving \$15,000 a year salary from the Navy. Their attacks were made editorially, with vicious cartoons and by using cleverly selected portions of my statements for incorrect interpretations and by other news stories intended to defeat me in the primary.

I had made definite pledges prior to my election to oppose by every honorable means our becoming active shooting participants in foreign wars unless we were attacked. I pledged to support every measure to build the strongest possible national defense for our own country which would not directly lead us into shooting participation in foreign wars. I kept my pledges to the people of Illinois who had elected me and presented myself for renomination on my record.

On April 14 the people of Illinois, at an open and free primary, rendered their verdict at the polls, and by a vote of approximately 5 to 1, renominated me for the Senate. Immediately, and in face of this overwhelming expression of the people, the Chicago Daily News on April 16 printed a vicious cartoon showing Hitler wearing the iron cross and the Nazi swastika, smiling. The title of the cartoon was "Someone else was happy, too." In smaller print it showed Hitler smilingly holding up a newspaper with the headlines reading "Brooks Wins Grand Old Party Nomination" and in smaller type "Isolationist Victory in Illinois." This was more than an insult to the 696,000

patriotic men and women who had voted for me, many of them former soldiers with whom I had fought against Germany in the last war, many of them fathers and mothers who had sons in the armed forces, ready to die to defeat Hitler. In spite of the fact that we were at war, that we had been viciously attacked, that I had promptly voted to declare war on Japan, Germany, and Italy, that I again volunteered to serve in the armed forces of my country, that I had supported every measure to transform America from a nation dedicated to peace and national defense to an all-out war nation, in spite of the fact that we needed national unity above all else, this newspaper, controlled by the Secretary of the Navy, made this attack on the people of my State, who, by a vote of 5 to 1, had renominated me for office.

I have not publicly complained about these attacks, although I believe they definitely caused disunity. I believe in the freedom of the press, and even though they attack me maliciously, I will fight for their right to continue to enjoy that freedom. I believe in the right of free speech and even though designing people from without my State lay their malicious intrigue and plans to defeat me, I will fight for their right to continue to enjoy that freedom.

The people of Illinois need no assistance from the Communist Party nor any other self-appointed purgers from without to tell them who will represent them in the Senate of the United States during the uncertain and trying days which lie ahead.

When this smear and purge attack failed to defeat Members of Congress, the agencies of Government were brought into play to assist those newspapers that had opposed my renomination and were used as an instrument to attack newspapers which had supported me.

Specifically, a vicious, malicious, and constant attack has been made and is being made upon the Chicago Tribune. Some have advised that I remain silent on this issue, but I cannot do so. Whether WAYLAND BROOKS is returned to the Senate or not is incidental, but whether the power of this Government is to be used to suppress the freedom of the press is of vital and burning importance to all the American people.

I speak of this today not because of the Tribune alone but to call attention to the method that is being used to intimidate, coerce, or control any legitimate newspaper, for if it can be done to one it can be done to all. I would defend the freedom of the press and protest against any undermining of this right, though it were launched against the smallest newspaper in America, printed on a hand press. Freedom of speech guarantees every soldier in the front line, every worker in the factory, every father and mother an honest evaluation and appraisal of our war effort.

The tragic truth is that wherever dictators have been set up, freedom has disappeared. Freedom of the press was always the first to go and all other freedoms fell in rapid succession.

This attack happens to be leveled at the Chicago Tribune. It is directed momentarily at the publisher, Col. Robert

R. McCormick, and its managing editor, J. Loy (Pat) Maloney. They are among the 8,000,000 constituents I represent here, and I wish to review briefly their record of patriotism and sacrificial service to their country, as well as the attack that has been and is being made upon them now.

Pat Maloney enlisted as a private in the first officers' training camp at Fort Sheridan in 1917. He volunteered for aviation training which he received at the University of Illinois and Chanute Field. He went overseas November 15, 1917, as a member of the fourteenth foreign detachment, was commissioned a first lieutenant of the Air Service in April 1918 and ferried planes to the front and from England to France during May and June 1918. He was ordered to the front July 14, assigned to the famous Rickenbacker squadron and participated in the Battle of Chateau Thierry. After the Armistice he served with the Rickenbacker squadron in the American Army of Occupation and was stationed at Coblenz. Lieutenant Maloney was transferred to General Pershing's headquarters at Chaumont in March 1919 and there aided in the preparation of a manual on scout plane fighting. He was ordered home in May 1919.

Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, served as a major in the First Illinois Cavalry on the Mexican border in 1916 and 1917. He was ordered to France on General Pershing's staff, assigned to the intelligence section, and later assigned to the front line at his own request. He was cited in brigade orders and was promoted from major to lieutenant colonel and from lieutenant colonel to colonel for service at the front. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and, following the Armistice, was returned to the United States and served as a commandant at Fort Sheridan. His name was on the list of officers suitable for General Staff assignment and for appointment to general rank. I wish now to read the citation his Government gave him:

AWARDS OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

Robert R. McCormick, colonel, Field Artillery Officers Reserve Corps, then colonel, Field Artillery, United States Army, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As commander of the first battalion, Fifth Field Artillery, in the Ansaerville sector and in the Cantigny sector, France, between January 18 and May 28, 1918; and as lieutenant colonel, One Hundred Twenty-second Field Artillery, May 13, 1918, he displayed rare leadership and organizing ability, unusual executive ability, and sound technical judgment. By his ceaseless energy and his close supervision of training, discipline, and command in action against the enemy, he contributed materially to the successful operations of the artillery of the American Expeditionary Forces. By order of the Secretary of War: John J. Pershing, general of the armies, Chief of Staff.

But that is not the only Chief of Staff of the United States Army that appreciated Colonel McCormick's courage, his devotion to duty, his love of country. And now, I wish to read a cablegram sent to Colonel McCormick March 25, 1942.

The date line is Melbourne, Australia. It reads:

Appreciate greatly your fine message. Wish you were here with me. Signed, MacArthur.

America's most gallant soldier records his desire to have the services of this gallant American by his side.

Such is the record of these men who now are under attack.

I would not and I do not approve the reporting of any information that would in any way aid the enemy and neither would Colonel McCormick nor Pat Maloney. I have not always agreed with Colonel McCormick and he has not always agreed with me, but I have always believed, and believe now, that both he and Pat Maloney are outstanding, patriotic, heroic American citizens. They are subject at the present moment to the continuing investigation of the Chicago Tribune, this time by a grand jury in the city of Chicago.

Mr. President, may I remind you that we are bringing home our gallant heroes from the various fronts of the war to have the President decorate them with the Distinguished Service Cross, the American Navy Cross, and the Congressional Medal of Honor? Those who are wounded and live to tell the tale will be eligible to wear the Purple Heart. Do you suppose that these same heroes of today will be belittled, smeared, or indicted 20 years from now, merely because they want to enjoy the rights of freedom for which they were willing to die—merely because they may not agree entirely and subversively with whatever administration may be in power at that time?

Are we fighting this war just to talk about the "four freedoms" everywhere else in the world, or are we fighting to be sure that they will never die in America?

This campaign of Government discrimination against the Chicago Tribune goes back a considerable time. In November 1940, when the Army was planning to take a prominent group of Washington correspondents on an airplane tour of various Army camps, Walter Trohan, of the Tribune Washington Bureau, who had been covering the War Department, reports the following:

He had been approved to make the trip. Lowell Mellett, then Chief of the Office of Government Reports, appeared at the War Department and scanning the list of correspondents who were to make the trip, scratched off the name of Trohan. "What are you doing that for?" asked an Army officer. "Don't you know he represents the Chicago Tribune?" said Mellett. "Yes, what of it?" continued the officer. "Don't you know the Tribune is opposed to the administration?" continued Mellett. "If you cross that name off the list, I walk out," said the officer. "Nothing like that is going to be done here, while I am in charge." Grumbling, Mellett returned to his own office and Trohan was finally permitted to make the trip.

In April of this year, Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and at that time, Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, in two speeches delivered in New York, made a bitter attack on newspapers which had been critical of any

inefficient conduct of the war. He spoke before the American Society of Newspaper Editors and before the annual meeting of the Associated Press. Prior to this meeting of the Associated Press, the F. B. I. sent agents to visit every member newspaper which held Associated Press franchises throughout the country, and I believe every newspaper in my State having such a franchise was visited by a member of the F. B. I.

At that time, the Chicago Sun, the new competitor of the Chicago Tribune, and with an announced policy to defeat me for office, was asking to obtain an Associated Press franchise. The Associated Press was threatened with indictment, and I believe for the first time in the history of America, the F. B. I. was sent to visit all the members of this great press association throughout the country.

Can there be any thought that it was not for the purpose of intimidation? Can anyone suspect that this is a part of the American way of protecting freedom of the press? Under threat of indictment, the Associated Press changed its rules and then promptly as freemen, voted to refuse the Chicago Sun a franchise.

On July 22, the Chicago Tribune printed a story revealing how Secret Service agents, again acting on specific orders from Washington, descended on the Tribune plant and seized a cardboard mat containing photostatic reproductions and prints of two canceled United States Treasury checks. The checks had been reproduced in connection with the story of an administration pay-roller, charged with being on both the Federal and the University of the State of Illinois pay rolls. A number of newspapers throughout Illinois also reproduced the canceled checks, but only the Tribune was visited by Federal agents.

Recently the Chicago Tribune revealed that a customs official found himself hounded by Government investigators because he had ordered a well-deserved and authenticated refund to the Chicago Tribune in connection with an overpayment of duties on imported paper pulp. It was the first time in 30 years of service to the Government that suspicion was cast in the direction of this man. There was nothing in the record on which to base the investigations except the chronic determination on the part of the administration to get the Chicago Tribune.

Nor has the activity of the Department of Justice been confined to discrediting the Chicago Tribune. It was leveled against others. Recently an indictment was returned against 28 individuals, charging them with violation of the sedition laws and with violation of a law prohibiting interference with the armed forces. No one—certainly not WAYLAND BROOKS—wishes to complain against an indictment against any individual who is guilty of violation of either of these laws. In the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate I have consistently supported the Attorney General in his request for funds to increase his staff; and I commend him for his splendid work in prosecuting criminals and

enemies of our Government. However, I condemn smearing the names of many honorable citizens by merely naming in a general indictment the organizations to which they belong. True enough, the organizations were not indicted, but they were included by name as being guilty of wrongdoing in connection with an indictment for sedition and interfering with the armed forces.

Among the organizations named and thus charged with associating with some known criminals was the America First Committee. That organization was headed by a distinguished American citizen, Gen. Robert E. Wood, national chairman; by a distinguished American, Gen. Thomas S. Hammond, head of the Illinois division; by R. Douglas Stuart, Jr., national director; and Col. Hanford MacNider, national committeeman. To drag in the names of these distinguished, loyal, and patriotic Americans and thousands upon thousands of others who were associated with them, and by innuendo to connect them with known criminals is a crime against decency in free America.

Where are these men today? Gen. Robert E. Wood is a member of the advisory board of the Chicago Ordnance District. He joined the district last January as Chief of Purchasing. He was forced to resign when the job as acting president of Sears, Roebuck & Co. was added to his duties as chairman of the company board. His responsibilities were increased by the loss of Donald Nelson to head the War Production Board of the Nation. Gen. Thomas S. Hammond is serving as Deputy Chief of the Chicago Ordnance District. He left his post as president of the Whiting Corporation to serve this important ordnance district. R. Douglas Stuart, Jr., is a lieutenant in the armed forces, and Col. Hanford MacNider, former national commander of the American Legion, is now in Australia, in charge of the shipping problem for General MacArthur.

This indictment was an insinuation against the good character of thousands upon thousands of citizens of Illinois, equally patriotic and loyal. Included among them are fathers and mothers who have contributed their sons upon the altar of the defense of America's liberty.

I protest against this method of casting aspersions on the loyalty of such heroic and patriotic men and women merely because they did not agree with the administration before Pearl Harbor. We are at war. If we continue to divide our strength quarreling over past opinions, we shall lose America's future.

The present grand jury investigation of the Chicago Tribune resulted from the publication of a story concerning the battle of Midway which was provided by Stanley Johnston, who had written a series of articles on our Navy's gallant achievements in the Battle of the Coral Sea. The Coral Sea stories were released by the Tribune without charge to all press services and all newspapers of the Nation. I firmly believe that these stories did more to build confidence and renew faith in the prowess of the Navy of the United States than any other thing or series of things has done since the beginning of this war.

Our commercial ships were being sunk faster than we could build them, along our Atlantic coast, in the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Caribbean Sea. Finally, the startling news came that an enemy submarine had sunk a ship in the mouth of the Mississippi River. The question that was in the minds of all Americans, including some Senators, was, What has happened to the leadership of our Navy? Where is our Navy? In the midst of a spirit of confusion and growing despair, like the rising of the morning sun, came the stories of Stanley Johnston, relating the heroism, the brilliance, the daring courage, and the excellent achievement of our American Navy at Midway.

Many officers of the Navy have written and wired their thanks and appreciation to the Tribune. People everywhere have expressed their joy and gratitude not only for the graphic story of the heroism and brilliance of our American boys, but for a new insight into the tactics and problems of modern warfare at sea and in the sky. Not alone did Stanley Johnston, the only reporter present to give this detailed news to America and to the world, perform an excellent service to the Navy and our people in general, but because of his personal courage and perseverance he was cited for bravery. Although a noncombatant, daring beyond the call of any duty, he faced death to render a service to the boys of the Navy before the *Lexington*, the carrier on which he stood and worked and wrote, was sent to the bottom of the sea.

But, because he was a representative of the Chicago Tribune, grand jury action is called for; and grand jury inquiry, and investigation by the Department of Justice are being made, with insinuating implications to be mouthed and the facts distorted by the originators and the propagators of the purge. And this, according to the press, was instigated by the Navy, headed by a man who controls and receives \$60,000 a year from a competing newspaper in the city of Chicago. I speak of this because I believe these tactics will do more than anything else to break the morale and the faith of the American people in our American system of government for which perhaps a million men will lay down their lives.

When our Allies cry for steel, for supplies, for support, for food, for planes, for bombs, there are those who would divide the energies and the efforts of a Nation by undertaking to purge, to intimidate, and to smear Members of Congress, members of the press, and loyal American citizens whose heroic patriotism can never be challenged, merely because they did not agree before Pearl Harbor.

There are dark days ahead for America. More than 250,000 of the sons and daughters of Illinois have already responded, and wear the uniforms of the armed forces of this country. They are serving on all the fronts, in all the skies, and on all the seas in this vast war. Thousands more will be immediately called upon to respond, and they will respond, to defend their country, the freedom of their press, their freedom of speech, their freedom of assembly, their

freedom to worship their God. They will be called upon to die, and they will die, to defend the freedoms of every American citizen; but they were not told that they were to die to defend those who wish to smear and intimidate and cast aspersions on the loyalty of men who have proven their willingness to lay down their own lives on the altar of American freedom.

I protest against such gestapo tactics and procedures because they do not support the sons of America and our Allies—our boys far from home, facing death by day and by night to defend America, the free America that they love. This is now the people's war. It will not be fought by those of any one nationality, any one creed, any one color, or any one political party within our country. There will scarcely be a home in all America that will not display a blue, a silver, or a gold star before this war is won. There will not be a home in all America that will not have made a tremendous sacrifice either in blood, flesh, funds, or energy before this war is over and won. No sacrifice is too great for the American people to make, and make willingly, with courage and with confidence, if they know that they make that sacrifice for their right to be a free people and to continue with their freedom of press, freedom of worship, freedom of the individual, and the freedom of their own conscience.

Mr. President, we all have a duty to sacrifice everything we possess and hold dear, if necessary; but in the effort to win this war we have also a right to have a voice as well as the right to die.

Dogmatically to smear, destroy, or dominate the Congress, to intimidate and arbitrarily control the press, to set up a Government of fear through investigation and intimidation, is not a part of the American way for which we fight, and will die. Such tactics are only causing fear in the hearts of the American people.

I protest in the name of our common country. I protest in the name of our people. I protest in the name of our national unity, in the name of the supreme effort that we must all make to win this war. We must stop this smear. We must stop this insidious intimidation, and by all means we must stop importing the purge into America.

EXHIBIT A

G. R. Wolff, Trident magazine, professional publication for midshipmen and graduates of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis:

"While trying to think of copy for the next issue of the Trident, I happened on the story of the Coral Sea battle. Most of the regiment of midshipmen were on leave or cruising while these articles were being run, and since the story Mr. Johnston wrote is so pertinent, it is almost a necessity that the regiment be given the opportunity of reading it in its entirety. Would it be possible for you to send us a copy of the articles, and grant us permission to publish them in our September 1 issue?"

G. R. Wolff (second letter):

"Thank you very much for the clippings you sent. If we can ever be of any service to you, please feel free to get in touch with us. Do you think it would be possible to send us a review copy of Mr. Johnston's book (to be published soon)?"

Maj. Robert Ransom, public-relations officer at the Santa Ana, Calif., air base:

"Thank you very much for your permission to reprint Stanley Johnston's articles (on the Coral Sea battle). I shall see that you receive copies of our Post paper containing these articles."

Lt. R. A. Winston, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.:

"A few weeks ago a series of articles written by Stanley Johnston regarding the Coral Sea battle were released through your syndicate. The accuracy of Mr. Johnston's account has created a great deal of favorable comment among naval aviators. Personally I consider it the finest war story which has come out of the present conflict. It has been suggested that the Johnston articles would be excellent preparatory reading for prospective naval aviators and might be of considerable assistance to the naval recruiting program. Are these articles available in book or pamphlet form?"

James M. Carmody, civilian aid, aviation cadet examining board, No. 2, Chicago:

"We can't thank you enough for the wonderful color poster. Major Showalter wanted me especially to offer his personal thanks. We believe that the poster will be so effective in stimulating applications for cadet training that we should like to have many more of the posters for distribution. Would we be out of line if asked for 5,000 to 10,000?"

Capt. Thomas W. De Mint, acting assistant adjutant general, Sixth Service Command, Service of Supply, Chicago:

"I want to tell you what a magnificent job I think was done by your color reproduction of Mr. Parrish's cartoon 'Make 'Em Yell Uncle.' The appearance of this page, together with the front-page story on the Chicago air force sponsors was the finest send-off the sponsors could have hoped for. I have sent yesterday's Tribune to the Adjutant General's Office, Washington, and to the Chief of Public Relations, Army Air Forces, to show them how Chicago and the Chicago Tribune go 'all out' for Army recruiting for aviation cadets."

Lt. David N. Goldenson, United States Navy, retired, who was in charge of the recruiting drive in Chicago:

"Chicago's 'I Will' spirit has triumphed again in obtaining 10,000 volunteers for the Navy during June. It has triumphed because of your all-out effort in the campaign. * * * Words cannot express our deep feeling of gratitude."

Capt. C. E. Smith, commanding the Navy Preflight School at Athens, Ga.:

"I wish to convey the thanks of this school to the Chicago Tribune for sending us 25 copies of the Graphic Supplement dated April 19, 1942. These papers show the insignia of the various ranks and ratings of the Navy and Marine Corps. They will be used in instructing cadets of this station."

Rear Admiral John Downes, commandant of the ninth naval district:

"It is a great pleasure to extend to you my thanks and appreciation for your willing cooperation in making Chicago's Navy Month recruiting drive an outstanding success. The intelligent awareness which you and the whole staff of the Tribune have shown in grasping the problems of our greatly expanded Navy is an excellent indication of the determination of Chicago's people to win this war. It is to you and the other newspapers and organizations who cooperated that the success of the drive is due. I want you to know that the Navy is grateful."

Maj. Gen. Dawson Olmstead, Chief Signal Officer of the Army:

"May I thank you for the service you have done for the Signal Corps in publishing this cartoon? It is very timely * * * there is no reservoir of trained men from which the Signal Corps may secure the technicians it needs. Men must be selected and trained for the special duties for which they are required. * * * Your cartoon, therefore, hits at the core of our problem. The Signal

Corps has large technical schools for basic and higher training. These schools are equipped with modern plants and afford opportunity for young men to learn while they serve. * * * Please thank Mr. Parrish for his contribution to our problem. I have written at some length because I want you to know that your cartoon is 'Right down our alley.'"

Oscar Mayer, chairman of the Chicago and Cook County War Savings Committee:

"Your response to our request for your aid in this campaign was most wholehearted and generous and I wish to express the thanks and appreciation of the committee for this fine cooperation."

F. E. Pulte, Jr., of the War Savings staff:

"Mr. Perlman has informed us of your splendid cooperation in making available without charge to the Treasury 10,000 posters of your colored page on corsages. We want you to know how deeply we appreciate this."

Nathaniel Leverone, Salvage Director for Illinois:

"From the start of the 'Salvage for Victory' campaign, we have received the grandest kind of assistance from all your editorial departments. As the problem of shortages in vital materials became more acute, we did not have to ask the support of the Tribune, but rather have received valuable advice and ideas, as well as good publicity from members of your staff."

Norman B. Collins, War Savings staff administrator for Illinois:

"I want you to know that I sincerely appreciate the thought which prompted you to call me and which resulted in a very fine article on Wednesday. It is cooperation of this kind that is going to put over the drive, and our whole office is very much pleased with the manner in which the Tribune has been taking hold."

Benjamin H. Namm, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

"Chairman of the Retail Advisory Committee of the Treasury. I have just brought to the attention of our committee your full-page color illustrations of 'The Victory Corsage' of War Savings stamps. This is one of the finest and most helpful pieces of publicity that our campaign has received to date."

Ray Schaffer, chairman of the Sales Outlet Committee of the War Savings campaign in May:

"The Cook County Retail Council and the War Savings staff have asked me to express their very great appreciation of the color page on War Stamp Corsages which appeared in the Tribune. Retailers have been swamped, and the demand has far exceeded our ability to supply."

W. L. Ayers, State information chairman of the successful sale of War Savings bonds and stamps in May:

"In particular, the War Savings staff appreciates the extremely generous space accorded to the campaign in the columns of the Chicago Tribune. The many news stories, photographs, editorials, and cartoons which you have published must have resulted in the sale of millions of dollars' worth of bonds and stamps."

E. R. Richer, chairman of the retailers for victory bond breakfast in July:

"Had it not been for the marvelous cooperation you gave us in connection with the full page that you ran on Thursday morning, and the wonderful news stories that you used as well, I know that the affair would not have been the success that it was."

Harry Perlman, of the War Savings staff of the United States Treasury:

"We would appreciate very much if the Tribune could furnish the War Savings staff of the Treasury Department 10,000 copies of the color page of the War Stamp Corsage that appeared on the back page of the Tribune on May 18. This color page has been a tremendous factor in the promotion of the War stamp corsage. Washington

wants these sheets to be sent to all department stores and chambers of commerce throughout the country, in conjunction with a plan to help promote the War Stamp corsage nationally."

John I. Yellott, chairman, war training committee, Illinois Institute of Technology:

"The Chicago Tribune has done a splendid war service by enabling Illinois Institute of Technology to enlarge and better its war training for women program. The Tribune, through the news coverage it has given these courses, has secured such students (those who could give full time to studies). The Tribune in its regular daily task has done another important war job, and done it well."

Robert J. Dunham, president, Chicago park district:

"May I express the appreciation of the park district for the excellent article, Northwest parks fill role in war. Articles like yours help to make the efforts far more fruitful and effective."

Col. C. N. Sawyer, signal officer of the Sixth Corps Area:

"I have just learned of your splendid offer to run Mr. Parrish's Signal Corps cartoon as a full page color feature in the near future. I can think of no finer evidence of the Tribune's patriotic cooperation, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you and your staff."

Michael F. Mulcahy, rationing director for the metropolitan area:

"I should like you to know that I appreciate the publicity you gave on the registration for consumer rationing, usually referred to as sugar rationing. * * * In my opinion, you did a distinct and definite service of much value to the Nation in its war effort. It was unusually helpful to me in my position, and I want to thank you sincerely."

A. L. Murphy, picture editor, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Washington, D. C.:

"We should like to send the attached cartoons by Mr. Orr, The Mark of Cain and It's Their Own Shadow, to a list of newspapers in South America, and we respectfully request your authorization to do so."

Peter L. Schauble, special assistant to General Olmstead:

"We would like very much to secure either the original drawing or a photographic reproduction of this cartoon which we might use for reproduction purposes. We would also like your permission to use it as a poster, and in other ways, for the encouraging of recruitment of high-type personnel in the Signal Corps." (This request was granted.)

Capt. Leland P. Lovette, Assistant Public Relations Officer of the Navy, thanking the Tribune for a bound portfolio of color maps:

"I think these maps are the best of their kind in the country. The portfolio just arrived and it certainly is a beautiful job."

Holman D. Pettibone, chairman, Chicago United Service Organizations campaign:

"Mr. Sterling E. Peacock has passed along the check from the Tribune as a contribution to United Service Organizations. We appreciate very much, not only this contribution but the active interest and support which the Tribune and members of your staff have given throughout our campaign."

Capt. R. S. Robinson, headquarters, Seventy-eighth Division Artillery:

"I have just seen an excellent cartoon strip put out by your paper entitled 'How to Spot a Jap' and am writing to inquire if you will send me as many as the enclosed coin will purchase. They will help as instructional aids to the new recruits of this organization."

Dowell Baker, branch manager of the Decentralization Service of the Public Buildings Administration:

"It has been brought to my attention several times lately that inquiries for listing apartments and rooms for decentralized Gov-

ernment employees, referred to your paper, have in turn been directed to this office. This splendid cooperation has been most sincerely appreciated. The entire cooperation of the Tribune in the matter of publicity and interest in this move of decentralizing Government groups has aided materially in making available suitable living quarters for our new Chicago residents."

Col. F. H. Pope, assistant in the headquarters of the Quartermaster General of the Army:

"May we express to you our deep appreciation for your very fine cooperation in helping us observe the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the Quartermaster Corps. We feel that your efforts did much to point out to the American people that the American soldier has the best food, best clothing, and best motor transportation of any fighting man in the world."

Brig. Gen. Donald Armstrong, commanding the Chicago ordnance district of the Army:

"The tribute paid the Chicago ordnance district and its deputy chief in your editorial of Saturday, May 23, has given all of us much happiness and gratification. The morale of this organization and its esprit de corps are very dear to me and what you have written is bound to encourage the personnel here. I am deeply grateful to you for this expression of confidence. I should like to add that the Chicago ordnance district has always enjoyed from your representatives very fair, accurate, and uniformly well-written reports on its activities."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the address delivered by the Senator from Illinois. I desire to comment only briefly upon what I presume was the basis of his remarks today. I assume that his speech today is based upon a release given out last Friday evening by the Attorney General of the United States announcing that the grand jury in the city of Chicago had been or would be requested to investigate whether certain violations of the law had taken place in connection with the publication of confidential information concerning the Battle of Midway. In the same release it was announced that a former Republican Attorney General had been asked to take charge of the investigation—Mr. William D. Mitchell, who was Attorney General in the administration of former President Hoover.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield there, let me say that Mr. Mitchell is a former Democratic Attorney General, who served under a Republican administration. That should be said if his politics is to be identified. However, I do not believe it makes any difference.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt whether it makes any difference; but at least he was serving under a Republican President. If the Senator desires to castigate former President Hoover, he may do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I am castigating no one. The Senator from Kentucky sought to put a political identification upon Mr. Mitchell, and I thought he would welcome having the truth stated in connection with that matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that Mr. Mitchell had been a Democrat, but he had voted for Mr. Hoover on at least two occasions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At any rate, he is a very high-grade man.

Mr. BARKLEY. His voting for Mr. Hoover at least identified him with Mr. Hoover; and I mention that only for the purpose of pointing out the fact that the very appointment of Mr. Mitchell to take charge of the investigation robs it, it seems to me, of any partisan character or nature.

Mr. President, I have no desire to go into the history of the America First Committee or any other committee or organization which existed prior to Pearl Harbor with respect to our foreign policy. On numerous occasions I have stated on this floor that, regardless of politics, regardless of the membership or nonmembership of any Members of this body in any organization fostered for the purpose of influencing public opinion, by and large, and in the main I have confidence in the patriotism of the men and women who took a position on either side of the dramatic questions which faced the American people with respect to the war which was precipitated in September 1939.

I shall not go into the question of the propriety or the wisdom of any effort on the part of anyone to purge anyone else. I have always believed, and I now believe, in the freedom of the press of the United States and in the freedom of speech, not only in the Senate of the United States but outside the Senate. Therefore, I believe that if any newspaper or magazine honestly and sincerely believes that the election or defeat of any man who is a candidate for election to a responsible position in our Government is of sufficient importance to justify it in taking a position upon it, it has the right to do so; and if the editor or manager of any newspaper or magazine in this country or if any man whose voice reaches the public has in the depths of his conscience believed that the election or the defeat of any man in public life was vitally connected with the welfare of our country, that newspaper or magazine editor or manager or that individual had the right to say so. We cannot deny to such individuals or to those in charge of such publications the right to say so, although perhaps they disagree with us, for if we should do so we would then destroy the very foundation upon which freedom of the press and freedom of speech are buttressed.

I do not personally know Colonel McCormick. So far as I recall, I saw him only once, and that was when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations to testify as a witness on the subject of the lend-lease bill which was then before that committee. He made a very interesting statement. He did not declare himself for or against the lend-lease bill; but he showed an amazing knowledge of geography, and I listened to his statement with great interest. I had occasion later to listen to him over the radio, and here in my place I made a few remarks in which I complimented him for his radio speech, and later I received a letter from him thanking me. In that letter he stated that Pearl Harbor washed out, or blotted out, everything that had happened up to that

date, and that from then on he was, without attempting to quote him literally, a hundred percent for the policy of our Government.

I was gratified with the letter because it seemed to me to reflect the proper course for a man who had opposed the administration's foreign policy to pursue.

Whether he has justified that statement by his subsequent attitude I do not know. I am not a subscriber to the Chicago Tribune. I am not a regular reader of that newspaper, and therefore I am not in a position to say at this time whether Colonel McCormick has followed out the course which he in the letter to which I have referred marked as his future purpose.

I also recall the articles contained in the Chicago Tribune, and one or two other newspapers associated with it, either financially or by filial consanguinity, regarding the battle of Midway, and I recall that there were various comments made at the time to the effect that no other newspaper association, no other individual newspaper, had been given access to the intimate facts, if they were facts, which were revealed in the reports of Mr. Stanley Johnston, a correspondent of those newspapers, in regard to the battle of Midway. I recall that there were some comments as to the mystery of any one particular newspaper correspondent obtaining what was supposed to be, or may have been, confidential information with respect to that subject. I do not know about that because I do not know Mr. Johnston, and I am not sufficiently familiar with the intimate confidential facts which were given into his possession, to know whether Mr. Johnston revealed any confidential information, and therefore I express no judgment whatever upon the subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall, however, that the Chicago Tribune did a very unusual thing, one which in my observation was unique, in tendering Mr. Johnston's story, although it was an exclusive story so far as Mr. Johnston was concerned, a story of the most tremendous interest to the American people, to other newspapers. The Chicago Tribune at the very inception offered to permit the reproduction of the story by any other newspaper of the United States that wanted to reproduce it, instead of standing on its copyright, which it would have had a right to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that that was done.

The question is, Mr. President, whether in revealing any of the facts, or alleged facts, in the Johnston articles, Mr. Johnston or anybody connected with the newspapers in which his articles appeared violated any law of the United States. I do not know, and I do not attempt to pass upon the question. I make no statement which will justify a

conclusion so far as my opinion may be concerned.

However, I wish to make this observation: I make no accusation, I do not know enough about the facts to know whether the law was violated, but if Mr. Johnston, or anybody connected with any of the newspapers in which his articles appeared, violated the law of the United States they have no more right to immunity than has any other violator of the laws of the United States. If they violated the law, the Espionage Act of 1917, or its amendment of 1940, I know of no reason why they should be exempt from investigation to a greater extent than any other violator of the laws of the United States.

Whether they have violated the law, I do not know, and I make no intimation. Whether they have violated the law is a matter for the courts to determine. That question cannot be decided in the columns of the newspapers of the United States; it cannot be decided upon the floor of the United States Senate.

The smear highway of which we hear so much, Mr. President, is not a one-way street by any means. It has become fashionable in recent years to charge anyone who opposes our views, or anybody's views upon any public question, and especially with respect to our foreign relations, with seeking to smear somebody. It is a weapon which may be used by anyone who wishes to use it or to attempt to use it, if deliberate and unconscionable, or by those who seek to destroy, by innuendo and by insinuation, men in public life, no matter whether they are in the legislative or executive branch of the Government.

The newspapers involved in this particular episode have deigned now and then to travel that highway in one direction or another; but I do not wish to go into that. I do not like the word "smear." I do not even like to hear it because it is an insinuating word and it has come to be used some against men who oppose them on important questions which divide our people, and I do not think it is fair to say that every time that someone opposes our views with respect to any particular question he is trying to smear us in the Senate of the United States, or that whenever we oppose others or disagree with them we are trying to smear them.

The point I wish to emphasize—and that is all I have to say, and it is the only reason I rose to my feet—is that if there has been any law violated by anybody involved in this episode, the people are entitled to know it.

Whether it was wise or appropriate for the Department of Justice to announce that the grand jury would be requested to investigate this matter is not a question upon which I wish to pass any judgment. However, in view of the fact that a former Attorney General of the United States under a Republican administration had been invited to take charge of the investigation, I do not see how it could have been possible to have withheld that information from the public. That is all that the Attorney General's release on last Friday evening con-

tained. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it, but I ask that it be printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Attorney General Francis Biddle today announced that as a result of a preliminary inquiry and upon the recommendation of the Navy Department he has directed an immediate grand jury investigation, at Chicago, into the publication by certain newspapers on Sunday, June 7, 1942, of confidential information concerning the Battle of Midway.

The Attorney General said that the grand jury will be directed to investigate the possible violation of any criminal statute, particularly violation of the act of June 15, 1917, as amended by the act of March 28, 1940, concerning the unlawful communication of documents or information relating to national defense. (Sec. 31d, title 50, U. S. C.)

Mr. Biddle also announced that he has appointed Mr. William D. Mitchell, of New York, former Attorney General of the United States, who has been in charge of the preliminary inquiry, as a special assistant to the Attorney General, to direct the grand jury investigation and any prosecution which may result therefrom.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not concerned with any personalities involved in newspaper rivalries in the city of Chicago. There is only one question in which the American people are interested, and they are interested in it regardless of any previous opinions held by the Chicago Tribune, Colonel McCormick, the Chicago Daily News, the Secretary of the Navy, or anyone else. That question is, "Has the law of the United States been violated?" If it has not been violated, the American people will be unanimous in their demand that justice be done to those against whom not only a charge but even an insinuation may be directed.

If the law has been violated—a question upon which I have no opinion and pass no judgment—the American people will expect, as they ought to expect, that the same type of fearless investigation will be conducted in an impartial non-partisan way as has been conducted with respect to other charges and other insinuations which may have been hurled against men in public life.

I reiterate that these matters cannot be tried on the floor of the United States Senate; no determination can be reached here as to the guilt or innocence of men or of any organization; and neither can they be tried in the columns of newspapers. The Federal courts are available; the people of the United States, in my judgment, have confidence in their courts, and they will respect any judgment or any verdict or any decision which may be rendered by them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in the course of his remarks, in recounting the attempt on the part of some officials in the Department of Justice to smear the America First Committee by merely mentioning them in the indictment, although no attempt was made to indict anybody in connection with them, which was obviously a smear attack, the Senator from Illinois men-

tioned the name of Col. Hanford MacNider, of Iowa. I merely desire to call attention to the fact that at this moment there is upon the desk of the President of the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Col. Hanford MacNider, who is now in Australia, as a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

Apparently the President of the United States did not believe that the fact that Colonel MacNider had been a leading member of the national committee of the America First Committee and that Colonel MacNider had been one of the most eloquent and outspoken opponents of intervention in the whole United States, debarred him from the rank to which his splendid soldierly ability entitled him in the United States Army.

If the theory of Mr. Archibald MacLeish and of the Union for Democratic Action and the New Republic and some of the officials of the Department of Justice, particularly the gentleman who is responsible for the attempted smear in the indictment referred to, is correct, if all the people in the United States who were opposed to our entrance into the World War shall be branded as outlaws, as the New Republic and some others attempted to do, then, it would be the duty of the Senate of the United States to reject the nomination of Colonel MacNider to be brigadier general in the United States Army.

Colonel MacNider has a superb record as a soldier; he has a splendid record in civil life, and, because of those qualifications, undoubtedly, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate his nomination as brigadier general. I make bold to predict, Mr. President, that the Senate when it comes to the consideration of the nomination will adhere to the views of the President of the United States rather than to the views of this aggregation of rag-tag and bobtail who are attempting to besmirch and brand as outlaws everybody in the United States who did not happen to agree with their views as to precipitating the United States into this war. I further predict that Colonel MacNider, as brigadier general, will render the same superb service which he rendered through all the ranks up to lieutenant colonel in the last war and carry out the splendid record as a citizen he has made in civilian life.

DISPOSITION OF PRIZES CAPTURED DURING PRESENT WAR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Justice, I should like to call up for consideration at this time Calendar No. 1606, House bill 7211. I think it is a noncontroversial bill. I have spoken to the majority and minority leaders about it, and I do not

think there is any objection to the consideration of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7211) to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire merely to say a word on the subject which was dealt with by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I understand that the motion to consider the bill is debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No motion has been made. There is a request pending for unanimous consent to consider the bill, and that is not debatable.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7211) to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has said that it is merely a question whether the indictment in this case and other indictments are obtained for a violation of the law. I want to say I think the question is much broader than that. We have passed laws so general with relation to espionage and other war matters that, as a practical matter, it is possible to consider almost anything a violation of the law, particularly in time of war. When the Attorney General appears before a grand jury or a petit jury and says, "The Government of the United States, whom I represent, thinks that this act violates the law," that carries with it a weight in wartime far beyond anything that happens in time of peace.

It seems to me we have placed on the Attorney General and on the executive officers of the United States a far greater responsibility than they have in peacetime. They must exercise their discretion as to whether particular acts are acts which really violate the spirit of the laws that have been passed by Congress. In my judgment, it is peculiarly important, therefore, that there should be no opportunity afforded to charge that indictments of this kind are inspired by prejudice or by political motives. It is peculiarly important that the Attorney General should exercise the utmost fairness in proposing such indictments.

Of course, I do not know all the facts in the Chicago Tribune affair, but I have read the statement issued by that newspaper. It seems to me that if this kind of an indictment can succeed, no editor in the United States hereafter can safely publish an account of any battle that has not been issued word for word by the communications office of the Army or the Navy; that no editor can take advantage of the services of an expert who embellishes the facts he has obtained from the Government by adding from his experience and his own knowledge and his own conversation in Washington with men he meets from time to time.

I say I do not want to pass judgment on the facts in this case, but I think that it is not merely a question of black and white—is it a violation of the law or is it not a violation of the law?—but the question is one of protecting the freedom of the press, and of reconciling that effort with a desire to enforce the law and prevent the giving of aid to the enemy. The Attorney General should exercise his power with the utmost fairness. It seems to me, for instance, that the manner of conducting the grand jury proceedings in Washington, particularly because of the way publicity was handled and handed out improperly before the matter was even presented to the grand jury shows that there is a prejudice in the Attorney General's office.

The facts brought forward by the Senator from Illinois show that there has been a prejudice against the Chicago Tribune, for instance, and perhaps others. Therefore, I think it is right that there should be put on record in the Senate a protest against any action which is not taken with the most scrupulous fairness. I believe the Senator from Illinois is justified in making that protest, and I believe, if we are going to preserve the freedom of the press in this country, the Department of Justice must take a very different attitude from that which it has been taking.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me suggest to the Senator, without disagreeing with his general observations, that my experience has been that as a rule Federal grand juries are composed of intelligent, level-headed, substantial men—and women, now that we also have women on our juries. I question the probability of any Attorney General or any district attorney of the United States compelling a grand jury made up of such men and women as we know compose such juries to bring in an indictment against anybody for anything unless in their judgment, under their oaths, they thought that a prima facie case had been made to support an indictment.

Of course, as the Senator from Ohio well knows, a grand jury cannot try both sides of a case. Frequently grand juries bring in indictments, and petit juries, trying the cases and hearing both sides, dismiss the accused. A grand jury must operate upon the basis of such evidence as is brought before it to create the belief on its part that a crime has been committed. To intimate that as high a personage as the Attorney General of the United States would bring about the indictment of anybody for anything which might be regarded as a violation of the laws of the United States, against the judgment and conscience of the grand jury which heard the case, seems to me to be an attack upon the whole grand-jury system, which is guaranteed by our laws and our Constitution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have practiced law for a long time, and I have seen few prosecuting attorneys who did not think that they could persuade the grand jury to indict anybody they had any reasonable ground to indict, in time

of peace. I do not wish to discuss that question; but I say that in time of war, if an assistant Attorney General appears before a grand jury and says, "The Government of the United States takes the position that a certain person has violated the law and has aided an enemy," there is hardly a grand jury in the United States which would not indict that person at the request of the Attorney General. I say that the responsibility for determining whether an indictment should be returned rests on the Attorney General, and that we can hope that this system will work only if he operates with fairness, justice, and absolute impartiality.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that for 4 years I myself was a prosecuting attorney. I recall that many times I prepared what I thought was a good case against somebody charged with a crime, and the grand jury did not agree with me. Furthermore, frequently when the grand jury indicted upon the evidence submitted, the petit jury did not agree with me, and discharged the defendant. That is the situation in connection with all prosecutions. It would be utterly impossible to have a petit jury convict everybody who is tried before it; and it would be impossible to expect a grand jury to indict every person against whom the prosecuting attorney brings what he regards as prima facie evidence of guilt.

Of course, an ordinary local prosecuting attorney cannot claim distinction and influence commensurate with that of the Attorney General of the United States; but in this particular situation I think the very fact that the Attorney General has turned this matter over to a former Attorney General in an administration with which he may not have been in sympathy, indicates a desire to be fair and not exercise any prejudice or partisan influence.

Mr. TAFT. As the Senator himself pointed out, it is customary in the case of grand-jury investigations not to announce publicly the name of the person against whom charges are being heard before the grand jury. That is proper. The proceedings before the grand jury are supposed to be secret, so that a man will not be "smeared." I do not use that expression in any special sense; but the purpose of secrecy in grand-jury proceedings is to avoid an unjustified attack on the reputation of the person involved who may never be indicted. It is even more important in time of war, because the mere mention of the fact that a man is being investigated by the grand jury for aiding the enemy in time of war is itself an attack on that man's reputation from which he may never completely recover. The mere announcement of the fact that a certain individual is being investigated by the grand jury—and certainly the indictment itself—accomplishes the purpose of an attack on his reputation. To repeat, I believe that the utmost impartiality should be shown by the Government in connection with any kind of war indictments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Ohio

has said as to the impropriety of the Department of Justice, or any other prosecuting agency, giving out releases before a case has been presented to the grand jury. In that connection, as showing an obvious attempt to "smear" somebody, I am informed that yesterday—and I speak entirely from hearsay, because I do not read the sheet—the little pipsqueak, so-called newspaper, PM, in New York, which is merely the veriform appendix of Marshall Field's Chicago newspaper, came out in blazing headlines with regard to the announcement of the President of the United States. The headline was, "News Axis chain under investigation by Government." That is the effect of the Attorney General's release, and it is very doubtful in my mind as to whether or not that was the purpose of the release.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill H. R. 7211 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2579 will be indefinitely postponed.

ALLOWANCES FOR SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Friday, August 7, the Committee on Military Affairs met to hear representatives of the War Department on Senate bill 2684, introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], to amend section 107 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942. At the same time the committee considered Senate bill 2699, an identical bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

As all of us know, the purpose of both of these measures is to remove from the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 a provision which prevents the payment of the family allowance prior to November 1, 1942. It is unfortunate that this provision of the law has been construed by a portion of the public as having been enacted for political reasons. I am glad to be able to state that this construction is entirely erroneous.

The November 1 date of payment was written into the law at the express request of the War Department. At the time the bill was being given final consideration by the conferees of the Senate and the House, representatives of the War Department were emphatically of the opinion that they would need a minimum of 4 months in order to set up the machinery and establish a smooth-working organization for the prompt payment of allowances and the efficient administration of the allowance system. This conference was held on June 15, 1942, and therefore November 1, 1942, was the date which would allow the War Department the required 4-month period.

In the report made by the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], in reporting Senate bill 2467 to the Senate, the following statement is made:

The bill expressly provides that, even though family allowances are payable for the

period beginning with the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment, such allowances shall not actually be paid until after the first day of the fourth calendar month following the date of enactment. While the committee was aware of the fact that there are quite a few cases in which it would be most desirable to have the allowances paid sooner, it has been guided by the advice of representatives of the War and Navy Departments to the effect that it would be impossible to provide the necessary administrative machinery for making the payments until the later date.

A letter from the War Department to the Senator from Michigan, which was read on the floor several days ago, was misconstrued by some of us to indicate that the War Department is now in a position to commence payments almost immediately. The Committee on Military Affairs called upon the Secretary of War for an immediate report on the bill of the Senator from Michigan, and on August 7 questioned representatives of the War Department upon the status of its organization for payment of the family allowances. The testimony of the War Department representatives has developed the fact that work has been progressing satisfactorily to set up the family-allowance system. Some of the machinery and equipment has been obtained and a part of the personnel is in a reasonably good state of training. However, printing of most of the required forms was completed less than 2 weeks ago, and the distribution to the field is far from complete. The War Department expects that there will be a period of 3 to 5 weeks before any volume of applications with the essential data can be received in Washington. In many cases it will be longer before it will be possible to receive the minimum of information upon which to base payments to the dependents of enlisted men serving overseas.

The administration and payment of family allowances on the large scale contemplated by the War Department present a problem of great magnitude. The Department estimates that the family-allowance system, when in full operation about November 1, will employ over 3,000 persons. A little over 50 percent of this personnel has now been obtained, and some of them have received partial training. Such training is essential if the system is to operate efficiently, reduce errors to a minimum, and prevent the unnecessary expense which untrained personnel would occasion. The issuance of well over 1,000,000 checks a month, which the War Department estimates will be their volume on and after November 1, must be accomplished by mechanical means if the payments are to be made regularly and promptly.

The acquisition of machinery is governed by priorities, and all the necessary machinery cannot be obtained at one time. The War Department has scheduled the acquisition of mechanical equipment on the basis of commencing payments on November 1, and the Department's representatives state emphatically that, because of priorities, the schedule cannot be speeded up. Some of the equipment is of a nature which requires highly trained operators. Personnel to operate the machines cannot be trained

much faster than the equipment can be obtained. In order to be in a position to issue checks promptly on and after November 1, the Department must carry on the work of analyzing, investigating, and computing the allowances as the applications are received. The first payments due November 1 must be computed on the basis of the 5-month period from June 1 through October. If Senate bill 2684 were to be enacted, all computations previously made would have to be recomputed if any payments were to be made earlier. In view of this fact, it is very probable that the work of recomputing the allowances might further delay the payment, even beyond November 1. Much of the time and expense involved in the work already done would be wasted.

After personally considering the report of the Secretary of War and thoroughly examining the representatives of the War Department, your committee has concluded that November 1, 1942, is the earliest practicable date on which the family allowances can be efficiently and promptly paid. Therefore, the enactment of Senate bill 2684 would be without effect, inasmuch as it would not advance the date of the initial payment. On the other hand, the enactment of the bill would undoubtedly create in the minds of the public an impression that payments were to commence immediately. Such a result would entail a large volume of correspondence to the War Department which would have to be answered, and also would flood the offices of all Senators and Representatives with communications from their constituents which we would have to refer to the War Department.

The committee has decided not to report the bill, but believes that the Members of the Senate are entitled to this explanation of its action.

In connection with what has already been said, I ask that there be printed as a part of my remarks the letter of August 7 from the Secretary of War in regard to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 7, 1942.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military
Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of S. 2684, a bill "To amend section 107 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942."

The purpose of this bill is to provide that the family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the armed services provided for by the basic act shall commence to be paid at the earliest practicable date. At the time that the legislation was enacted, the War and Navy Departments asked the Congress for a period of delay in payment to enable them to get the very complex procedure ready to make payments in an orderly manner. The work has been progressing satisfactorily, some of the machinery is in shape to operate on a partial basis, and a part of the personnel is in a reasonably good state of training. However, printing of most of the required forms was completed only within the past week, and their distribution to the field is far from complete. It is expected that there will be

a period of 3 to 5 weeks before any volume of applications with the essential data can be received in Washington. In many cases it will be longer before the minimum of information can be received upon which to base payments to the dependents of enlisted men serving overseas. The War Department is accepting the applications of the enlisted men themselves on their face value as bona-fide evidence upon which, in the absence of information to the contrary, to make payments. However, it will be recognized that payments made on the application of dependents must either be subject to verification by the soldier or, if the reasonable interests of the Government are to be protected, must be subject to at least a minimum of investigation into the status of the person making the application.

The provision of the act which makes the payment of allowances retroactive to June 1, 1942, requires a large amount of computation and other labor in preparing the authorizations for the first payment. This work is going on all of the time, and must continue at least until an amendment such as S. 2684 becomes law. This work is involved in every application which has been received and in every application which will be received. Although a very few of these are completed, payment of these few at this time would amount to payments in advance to include the month of October, which would be illegal, or would necessitate the recomputation of each authorization, thereby doubling the work and further delaying payment. If the act should be amended as proposed in S. 2684, every application received up to the date of enactment of this bill would have to be recomputed, and the payment would be further delayed, in many cases until after November 1, 1942.

A problem of great magnitude is involved in setting up the machinery to operate the dependent's allowance system. It contemplates, first, the regular payment of the prescribed allowances to the proper persons, monthly and on definite dates; and, second, the protection of the interests of the Government inherent in any system of disbursement of public funds. The Allotment and Allowance Branch of The Adjutant General's Office must determine who the dependents are, their proper names and addresses, and whether they are legally entitled to payment. To commence payment on November 1, 1942, a large force of reasonably well-trained persons, many typewriters, and the necessary desks, filing equipment, and forms are required. All equipment is subject to priorities, and it has been necessary to plan for the gradual acquisition of such equipment during the period from the date of enactment of the law to November 1, 1942. Under present conditions even the best-planned schedules cannot always be met, and the acquisition of equipment for this office is at present unavoidably behind schedule. Personnel must be trained if accurate and efficient work is to be done, and a large office force can neither be obtained nor trained all at one time.

The Allotment Division of the Office of the Chief of Finance must set up the machinery for the issuance of well over 1,000,000 checks per month beginning November 1, 1942. This can only be done by mechanical means, the necessary machines are subject to priorities, and all cannot be obtained at once. The schedule of acquisition is being met satisfactorily, but earlier deliveries cannot be expected. These machines require highly trained operators, and operators cannot be trained very much faster than machines can be obtained.

The War Department is in favor of commencing payment of family allowances at the earliest practicable date, but the Department is firmly of the opinion that November 1, 1942, is the earliest practicable

date upon which payments can reasonably commence.

A similar report on an identical bill, H. R. 7461, was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which advised that there was no objection to the submission of such report as the War Department deemed appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thought the Senator from Utah had concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I simply wanted to make a brief observation regarding the situation disclosed by the Senator's very frank statement. First, I desire to thank the able Senator from Utah and his committee for the very prompt attention which was given the matter. I thank them also for sending me the complete transcript of the testimony, which I have read very carefully. I freely concede that a tremendous problem is involved in organizing the payment of the dependency claims. From the record as disclosed in the hearings I think it is perfectly clear that there was nothing politically sinister about the mere coincidence that the payment date determined upon happened to be the day before election. However, Mr. President, after listening to the able Senator's statement and after reading the testimony I still am unable to understand why this very simple measure—and I understand that textually it is precisely the same as the one which has been introduced by the able Senator from Missouri—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator that I did not know he had introduced his bill, or else I would not have introduced mine. I understand that the bills are precisely the same.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All in the world that either the Senator from Missouri or I am trying to do is to strike from the dependency bill one sentence which provides that the War Department shall not pay any dependency claim under any circumstances until the November date.

What would be the net result if that single sentence were taken out of the dependency bill? The net result would be that the War Department would pay as soon as it could, and then the responsibility would rest squarely upon the War Department to pay as soon as it could.

Unfortunately, in responding to inquiries upon the subject the War Department seems to be in the habit of saying, "We cannot pay before November because Congress has said that we cannot pay before then." I think the able Senator from Utah will recall that in the hearings before his committee one of the witnesses expressed regret that he had invited that interpretation upon some of the War Department's corre-

spondence. I am correct about that, am I not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. From the record and from the hearings it is perfectly clear that Congress had nothing whatever to do with the selection of the November 1 date except to register it after the War Department had said, "That is the earliest date on which we can pay." Congress had just one purpose, and that was to start the payment of the dependency claims as soon as possible. The War Department said, "November 1 is as soon as possible." Congress put that date in the bill.

If we take November 1 out of the bill—and that is all in the world that the Senator from Missouri and I are seeking to do—we simply restore to the War Department the responsibility, which it took in the first instance, of determining when it can pay the dependency claims. That is the only objective I have in mind. The 1st of November is still nearly 3 months away. There are many cases in which the prompt payment of the dependency claims is highly essential to life and livelihood. As the able Senator from Utah said on the floor when I introduced my bill, if it is possible to advance the date, every one wants that done. Who determines when it can be done? The War Department. Why not leave the responsibility where it belongs and where it has been assumed from the very beginning, namely, in the War Department; and if the War Department can pay sooner, why should it not pay sooner? Why should it be able to point to a statutory sentence and say that the responsibility lies with Congress for saying that it shall not pay before November 1 even if it can pay before November 1?

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply wanted to make an observation in connection with the bill. I think that the point made by the able Senator from Michigan is a good one, especially so in view of the fact that certain segments of the press have indicated that the New Deal, or the present administration, is responsible for fixing the date as of November 1, and have gone so far as to say that that has been done solely for the purpose of catching votes.

The Senator is very frank, and I commend him for the statement he made, in that there was absolutely no sinister political motive on the part of anyone in the Congress in connection with fixing the date; but the date selected was put in the bill because the War Department happened to say that November 1 was the earliest possible date on which it could start properly to administer the law.

I wish to commend the Senator for the frank statement he has made, because of the fact it has been bandied over the country, in the press and otherwise, that this date was put in there by the administration. In other words, there has been an attempt to indicate that the President of the United States

had something to do with it for the sole purpose of catching votes. It now develops that those responsible for it are in the War Department, and that the Congress merely acted upon their suggestion. I believe that in the interest of everyone the Senator's amendment is a good one and should be adopted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in view of the circumstance to which the able Senator from Illinois has referred, if the date of November 1 is merely coincidental with respect to the election date—and I assert that it is my belief that it is wholly and purely coincidental, because I cannot quite conceive of the War Department's playing politics with the bill—but if it was coincidental, I think that is all the more reason why the date should be eliminated. If that should be done no one could thereafter say that Congress told the War Department it could not pay the claims until the day before election even though it were in a position to pay them 30 or 60 days sooner.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I said a moment ago, on Thursday I introduced a bill to effectuate the same purpose as is indicated by the bill of the Senator from Michigan. I was not aware of the fact that he had introduced his bill.

I should like to suggest to the Senator from Utah that the Committee on Military Affairs, through his statement, is making an informal report which does not change the disposition of the bill. It does not in any way charge the right of the Senate to take it up.

If the Committee on Military Affairs is convinced that the bill should not be passed, why can it not make an adverse report on the bill, which would have the effect of putting it on the calendar and enabling any Senator who so desired to make a motion to take it up and test the sentiment of the Senate on the question?

As the Senator from Utah knows, I have great respect for him and for the other members of the Committee on Military Affairs. However, I am totally and completely in disagreement with them in their position that there should be retained in the law what amounts to a specific prohibition against earlier payments to dependents of the men in the Army and Navy, even though it might be physically possible, as the Senator from Michigan has suggested, to make such payments much sooner.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it is not physically possible, that is the end of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is not physically possible there is nothing mandatory in the bills introduced by the Senator from Michigan and myself to compel the Department to make the payments one day sooner than the date on which it says it will be physically able to make them. The War Department is the agency which will determine the matter.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, in introducing the bill which I introduced I had no thought whatever

of any political consideration. I had no thought that the administration was planning that the checks should be received a day or two before election. I introduced my bill because there had been called to my attention a very great number of instances of actual dire hardship at the present time. In many cases, dependents of men in the fighting forces of the United States are actually being compelled to seek charity in order to hold body and soul together. It is a disgrace to the United States, this great rich country, engaged in a great war effort, to permit such a condition to continue if it possibly can be obviated. Therefore, I say that it should not be allowed to continue, and that we should not put in the law a flat prohibition against paying the claims before November 1.

Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Utah that if the Committee on Military Affairs is determined to adhere to the view not to report the bill favorably, in all good conscience it should report the bill adversely, so that it can be taken up and so that the sentiment of the Senate regarding it can be tested.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, unless I change my mind—and I do not often do so—if the matter is delayed I intend to make a motion to discharge the committee. I am very reluctant to move to discharge a committee when it has had a bill before it for only a few days; but, in view of the intention of the committee not to report the bill, I think it should be discharged from further consideration of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Every member of the committee which considered this bill had the same sentiments for the dependents and for the men in the service as those which are entertained by Senators who have spoken. We want the payments to dependents to be made as soon as possible. That is the reason the date has been inserted in the law. If the date were taken out, what would happen? I know it will be said in answer to the question that the law does not provide that everybody shall be paid on November 1; but if that date were taken out all the work which has been done, all the work which is to be done, and all the organization work which will necessarily be done will be of no avail, and there will be no "aiming" date at all.

Every Senator knows that there is a statute which makes it unlawful to make payments in advance. The Government cannot plan to date its checks at a given time and be sure that all the figuring necessary to ascertain the correct amounts will be done by that time, and that the checks will be ready.

The Committee on Military Affairs and the committee representing the House of Representatives have tried as hard as they knew how to make provision to have the checks ready at the earliest possible date, provided that the Congress of the United States should decide to enter upon this extremely revolutionary type of legislation for taking care of dependents. They knew the difficulty of the task; and when the bill was being drafted the War Department was asked how long it would take to make the payments. The De-

partment replied that at least 4 months would be required. As I remember, the House of Representatives put in its bill a definite date. The bill passed with the provision, as I have already read it, that no payments should be made prior to 4 months after the effective date of the law. The Senate accepted that provision. The Senate received notice of the proposal through the report which was submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. It was discussed. The House of Representatives put a definite date in the bill. The date was impractical because it did not allow sufficient time in which to make the necessary arrangements.

Mr. President, I believe that Members of the Senate do not have to be told that when payments are made by the United States Government they must be made on properly drawn vouchers, in accordance with law, and in accordance with fact. It seems to the ordinary person very simple to pay dependents so much money. However, it is first necessary to know whether those who are to receive the money are dependents. It is necessary to know whether the soldier is willing to accept certain persons as dependents. It is necessary to take into consideration all the necessary elements in making a proper record.

Two branches of the War Department will be used in any review made by the General Accounting Office of these payments. First of all, the determination of dependency is left to the Judge Advocate General's department. It is a legal matter. It is not simple. It is extremely complex. Each draft and each payment made must be made in accordance with the facts furnished by the individual soldier or presented by his dependents in case the individual soldier refuses to present a claim for dependency allowance.

We must all remember that this means interviews with some 4,000,000 persons who are not all in the city of Washington but who are scattered all over the world; that it means a review by company commanders and a review in many other cases, some of which may be exceptional, to be sure. We must also remember that there may be a change in dependency status at almost any time. We all know these things.

I take it for granted that the bills were introduced for the sake of doing good and seeking information, and the Military Affairs Committee has accepted them in that spirit and a report has been made in that spirit; but the suggested amendment will do exactly the opposite to what those who suggest it want done.

The original bill became law in June. Forms had to be made out; the Government Printing Office would not promise a printing of the forms in less than 3 weeks. It took about 4 weeks. By July 22 the forms were received first by the War Department. They began to send them out. By August 6, the day before the committee met, the War Department had distributed—but that does not mean that the applications had been received—about three and a quarter million forms to cover about three and a quarter million cases. By the middle of August the total number of forms will be sent to all.

The scheme of the War Department is to send these blanks the greatest distance first and then send the blanks to those places which are nearer.

The War Department and the Navy Department both requested that payments be made at the same time. The reason is, probably, a psychological one. The War Department and the Navy Department want unity in regard to these payments.

After considering the facts adduced at hearings, after having word from the War Department, and after, incidentally, chastising the War Department for sending the type of letter it did to the Senator from Michigan, wherein it seemed to give as the reason for adhering to the date of November 1 that it was in the law—and the Senator from Michigan can see in the record that the representatives of the War Department said they inadvertently left out the sentence that the date was proposed by the War Department at the time the law was written.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. With one more sentence, and I will be through. After going over all these various considerations and accepting, as I did accept, the theory of the Senator that everybody would want soldiers' dependents paid as soon as they could be paid, I came to the conclusion that they will be paid very much sooner if the law is not changed.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Utah has referred to the letter of the War Department to me on this subject. I am afraid it has written other letters of the same nature. I want to call attention to the precise language used. It is all very well for the Department now frankly to say it was "inadvertent"; indeed, I think the officer used the word "stupid"; I think he said he was "stupid" in omitting certain language.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah, of course, would not use that word.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to call attention precisely to what the War Department does say:

While the act grants the War Department no discretion to change this date—

The responsibility for the act is on the Congress.

While the act grants the War Department no discretion to change this date, the Department itself has nevertheless adopted a policy tending to alleviate any hardship that a soldier's wife and children might suffer if the monthly deduction of \$22 is withheld from his pay for monthly family-allowance purposes.

The Department itself has adopted a policy tending to alleviate hardship. The big-hearted Department is anxious to alleviate hardship, but Congress says it cannot do a thing about this payment until the first of November.

Mr. President, that is the construction that the country has put upon the situation; rightly or wrongly, that is what the

country thinks about it; and the War Department has invite the country to think so. That is not what Congress thinks at all. We are all in agreement that this date got into the bill at the urgent request of the War Department; this date is the War Department's date. The attitude of the Congress has not changed in the slightest. It wants these dependency claims paid the minute they can be paid. The only question in the pending legislation is whether it shall no longer be possible to say that there is a statutory bar against the payment of these claims as soon as possible. Why should there be a statutory bar against the payment of these claims as soon as possible when everybody wants to pay them as soon as possible?

Mr. President, I want to appeal to the able Senator from Utah along the line of the plea made to him by the Senator from Missouri. It does not seem to me that it is fair to the Senate that a question of this rather intimate importance to many of us—for it is that sort of a subject—should be settled in the Senate Military Affairs Committee by way, as it were, of the pigeonhole. It seems to me that the able Senator should bring either of these bills back to the floor of the Senate with his adverse report if it must be adverse, so that the Senate can decide for itself whether the able Senator from Utah is right in believing that this statutory bar should remain or whether some of the others of us are right when we think that the War Department should pay as soon as possible, in its own discretion. Does not the Senator think that, as a matter of fair parliamentary procedure, the decision belongs on the Senate floor instead of in the committee room?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah, of course, will not answer that question because there has been no unfair parliamentary procedure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator understands I am not accusing him of anything unfair, and I am not using the word invidiously. I am referring to the method which the committee has followed of stopping the progress of the bill in committee instead of bringing it back to the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah has no objection to carrying both the message of the Senator from Michigan and of the Senator from Missouri back to the Senate Military Affairs Committee. The Senator from Utah is not chairman of that committee, and probably should not be a spokesman for the committee at this time. The conclusion which was reached was in accordance with the best judgment of Senators who were present in the committee. That judgment was not arrived at quickly; it was arrived at after much consideration and discussion.

I can only answer by repeating what has already been said in regard to these matters. The payments on November 1 will include payments for all the time from June 1 until November 1, or from the time the bill became law until November 1. That means that on that date

the War Department is planning to make all the payments it can lawfully make up to that date.

The adjustment of the soldier's own pay has nothing to do with the payments for dependents. It has long been a practice of the War Department to adjust the pay of soldiers. That is another matter. It has been doing so right along, and will continue to do so.

When we come to the dependency payments we start an entirely new scheme of governmental accounting. It is estimated that, to provide for the accounting and payment of the vouchers, 3,000 clerks will be required in 1 department and 500 in another. At the present time, because of the scarcity of workers, the Civil Service Commission has been able to obtain only about 1,500 workers, and they are not trained. Furthermore, there is a shortage of about 700 typewriters. With the date of November 1 in the law, and after this discussion, there is no doubt in my mind that every check which can be physically ready by November 1 will be ready.

If we are ready to change the law, let us consider practical things. We have all been administrators. We have all had relations with administrators. If we change the law and remove that date as something to aim for and by which to make calculations and computations, we know what will happen. If 4 months were required from the middle of July, 4 months will be required from the middle of August if we should change the law; and 4 months from the middle of August will be a long time after the 1st of November.

To my mind, the decision requires common sense. We cannot expect the General Accounting Office to pass a check which is not properly vouchered. We cannot expect any disbursing officer in the United States to violate the law of the United States and issue a check which is not yet due.

Suppose we should change the law and decide that we should try to get some of the checks out by October 1 instead of November 1. That would require a recalculation on all such checks. With the date of November 1, we start the system all on one day. The Army and the Navy start on the same day. The beneficiaries will begin receiving their checks, and on December 1 they will receive the next checks in the regular order.

It is always confusing to start a new Government undertaking, especially in a government which operates by law and which recognizes the various kinds of checks. No Member of Congress would suggest that the General Accounting Office be less diligent than it is. That Office is a creature of Congress, and is supposed to take care of the funds which Congress appropriates. No one would suggest that the finance office of the War Department be allowed to make determinations about dependency. That is a legal matter, and it should be left in the hands of the Judge Advocate General's department.

No Member of Congress would suggest that the obligations resting upon company commanders with troops in the field

should be made less. The rights of the boys should be taken care of, and the rights of their dependents at home should be taken care of. No Member of Congress would suggest that anybody in the Government be given authority to override the rights of the boy who says he has no dependents when alleged dependents come forth with affidavits. Both sides have rights. No Member of Congress would suggest that we take short cuts in regard to illegitimacy cases, divorce cases, or alimony cases, or in regard to changes in dependencies due to birth and death.

We have set up one of the most complicated pieces of accounting that has ever been undertaken in the history of our Government. It involves more than 4,000,000 persons—those are the President's figures, not mine—scattered all over the world, each having an individual right which must be guaranteed by the Government of the United States. He has the right to say whatever he wishes to say in this connection. He has the right to give a part of his pay if he wishes to do so. He has the right to challenge the right of anybody to take it away from him.

Other Senators are greater students of government than I am. They know that in a government by law we do not pick out a particular case because it is simple, and go ahead with that case contrary to the normal procedure.

Mr. President, in all earnestness, I am perfectly willing to have the responsibility of the committee taken away from it. I am perfectly willing to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan or that of the Senator from Missouri. I realize that their hearts are right. It seemed that an injustice was being done. I also realize that the looseness with which the War Department sent its letter to the Senator from Michigan was worthy of chastisement; and I believe the War Department has had it.

However, I believe it is wrong for anyone to allow the impression to go out to any dependent person who is in want that the Government is able to make a payment sooner than it can possibly make it, and that it is holding up payment because of arbitrariness on the part of some official in the Government. That is the worst thing we could do. When I say that, I have chastized the writer of the first letter to the Senator from Michigan. I believe that amendments would be very much in order if there had been any laxity on the part of anybody. Congress tried wholeheartedly to take care of dependents in a way in which dependents have never been taken care of before in the history of the United States.

We do not want scandals in connection with this activity. We want the administrators of the Army to administer the act in accordance with the wishes of Congress, and see that the dependents get what is coming to them, and get it regularly. However, we cannot expect that to be done if we impose upon them an utterly impossible task. I wish that all who think that the matter of paying the dependency claims is simple would take a pencil and figure for themselves how many forms must be handled even in getting ready for payment as of Novem-

ber 1. Four million forms are a very great number when it is necessary to pass separately upon each individual one of the 4,000,000, and when each of the 4,000,000 forms must be passed upon by two distinct branches of the War Department and Navy Department, and then in turn by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Missouri will not press the matter any further. I will report to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs as to what has been done; and if an adverse report is in keeping with the ideas of the members of that committee, such a report will be forthcoming.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I refer to what the Senator said with reference to referring the matter to the Committee on Military Affairs and explaining to that committee what has happened in the Senate. I hope that when the Senator does so he will properly describe what has happened here. There are now 5 Senators on the floor of the Senate. I hope the Senator will not tell the committee that an overwhelming majority of the Members of this great assembly consisting of 96 Members requested that he take that course. I hope the Senator will give to his committee a true picture of the number of Senators now present.

I am expressing no opinion as to what the committee should do. I have no objections. I do not care whether the committee reports the bill, so that it can be taken up and discussed here, or whether it does not report it. I have listened to all the debate today regarding the bill. I listened to it the other day when probably not so many Senators were present as are now present. I should hate to have the Committee on Military Affairs receive the impression that the Senate is outraged by the committee's course of conduct and that the Senate wants a report from the committee.

I say this only because I do not want the Committee on Military Affairs to get the wrong impression. I cannot say that I am opposed to what the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Missouri want. It is so unimportant. I have listened to the explanation given at three different times by the Senator from Utah, and probably he will proceed to give it at least twice more today in order to satisfy the Senate if some Senators now rambling around the streets should happen to drop in and ask for another explanation.

However, my only impression is that this is a discussion as to the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. I do not care whether the committee reports the bill or does not report it, or whether the Senator from Missouri makes a motion to discharge the committee. Of course, he has a right to do anything that the rules provide for.

However, when the Senator from Utah reports to his committee, I want him to present a true picture of what has been

occurring in the Senate and not to try to convey to the committee the idea that every Member of the Senate wants such a course pursued in order that the bill of the Senator from Michigan may be passed and become a law.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah will observe the Senator's request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say just a word, let me point out that it would not be necessary to notify the Military Affairs Committee that some Senators were absent, because only several of the members of the committee are now on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it should be noted that the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, is now on the floor of the Senate, together with the distinguished Senator who made the report.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSIER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers for appointment, by transfer, and several officers for promotion, all in the Regular Army; and

Kenneth H. McGill to be a principal statistician in the Selective Service System, under the provisions of law.

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

Capt. Bernhard H. Bieri to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of April 1942; and

Capt. James C. Jones, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 31st day of May 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Douglas Flood, of Illinois, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, August 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 10, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL GENERAL TO IRAQ

Thomas M. Wilson, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to act as Minister Resident and consul general of the United States of America to Iraq.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENI-POTENTIARY TO ICELAND

Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Charles E. Dierker, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma. Mr. Dierker is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 24, 1942.

J. Charles Dennis, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the western district of Washington. Mr. Dennis is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1942.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Norman Louis Zwickel to be assistant dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

APPOINTMENTS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Hanford MacNider, Infantry (Reserve), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 37, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved June 15, 1933.

Col. Joseph Wilson Byron, Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United

States under Public Law No. 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 22, 1941.

Col. John Reed Kilpatrick, Cavalry (Reserve), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 37, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved June 15, 1933.

Col. Reginald William Buzzell, Infantry (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Kenneth Frank Cramer, Infantry (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Henry Cothel Evans, Field Artillery (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Edwin Whiting Jones, Corps of Engineers (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Alexander Galiatin Paxton, Field Artillery (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Nat Smith Perrine, Infantry (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Ralph Clifford Tobin, Coast Artillery Corps (National Guard of the United States).

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Harry James Malony (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul Lewis Ransom (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Benjamin Anderson (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert Richard Cook (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Oscar Barton (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul Everton Peabody (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edward Hale Brooks (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Carlos Brewer (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Cortlandt Parker (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Philip Gross (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Richard Jaquelin Marshall (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Homer McLaughlin Groninger (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ernest Nason Harmon (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Roger Baldwin Colton (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Muir Stephen Fairchild (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Walter Melville Robertson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Wilhelm Delp Styer (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Augustus Irving (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harold Lee George (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Withers Alexander Burress (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Carey Lee (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Louis Homer (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Harlan Nelson Hartness (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Louis Joseph Fortier (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. George Leland Eberle (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Boniface Campbell (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Manly Busbee (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Herman Frederick Kramer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Caldwell Duncel (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Bryan Lee Milburn (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Willard Wadsworth Irvine (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Alexander Russell Bolling (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. George Price Hays (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Morris Clinton Handwerk (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Horace Lincoln Whittaker (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Stephen Hunting Sherrill (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Harris Marcy Melasky (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Guy Orth Kurtz (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Don Forrester Pratt (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Willis Eagles (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Louis Ready (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. John Russell Deane (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Williston Birkhimer Palmer (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John James Bohn (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Morrill Ross (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Love Mullins, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Howard Louis Peckham (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Horace Dunlop, Adjutant General's Department.

Col. Ralph Prunledge Lovett (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Armprister Stroh (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Theron DeWitt Weaver (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. George David Shea (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. David Sheridan Rumbough (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Ray Wehnes Barker, Field Artillery.

Col. Allison Joseph Barnett (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Creswell Garlington, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Raymond Eccleston Selveira Williamson (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. William Frazer Tompkins (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. William Hesketh (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Jerry Vrchlicky Matejka (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ray Edison Porter (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Albert Charles Stanford (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Claudius Miller Easley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Franklin Giles (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Watkins Weed, Medical Corps.

Col. Edgar Lewis Clewell (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Archie Arrington Farmer (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Fred Warde Llewellyn, Judge Advocate General's Department.

Col. Eugene Lowry Eubank (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Howard Arnold Craig (major, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clements McMullen (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Gale Breene (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Carl Chauncey (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Grandison Gardner (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Lester Thomas Miller (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Aubrey Casey Strickland (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edmund Walton Hill (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Leon Phillips (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Daniel Noce (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Augustus Keating (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lowell Warde Rooks (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Albert Kuali Brickwood Lyman, Corps of Engineers.

Col. James Kirk, Ordnance Department.

Col. James Kerr Crain, Ordnance Department.

Col. John Elliott Wood (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Herbert Daskum Gibson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edmund Bower Sebree (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Nicholas Dalton (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Anthony Clement McAuliffe (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Elbridge Gerry Chapman, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. George Pierce Howell (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Joseph Gaffey (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Richard S. Edwards to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of August 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. (temporary) Allen H. Turnage, now serving under a temporary commission for a specified duty, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service for general duty from the 29th day of March 1942.

Brig. Gen. (temporary) Ralph J. Mitchell, now serving under a temporary commission for a specified duty, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service for general duty from the 30th day of March 1942.

Col. Bennet Puryear, Jr., assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of brigadier general for temporary service from the 28th day of March 1942.

The below-named colonels to be brigadier generals in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 28th day of March 1942:

James L. Underhill

Keller E. Rockey

Col. Matthew H. Kingman to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps on the retired list for temporary service from the 29th day of March 1942.

The below-named colonels to be brigadier generals in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 29th day of March 1942:

Alphonse DeCarre

Samuel L. Howard

The below-named colonels to be brigadier generals in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 30th day of March 1942:

DeWitt Peck

Archie F. Howard

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 10, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Douglas Flood

Robert F. Woodward

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS FROM DATE OF OATH

John Safford Wiley

Charles Case Spencer

August Thomas Rossano, Jr.

Frank Tetzlaff

Kaarlo William Nasi

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Marion C. Farrar, Avondale Estates.

Alvin W. Etheridge, East Point.

John Day Watterson, Eatonton.

John E. Phinazee, Forsyth.

William E. Wimberly, Rome.

Mary E. Everett, St. Simon Island.

Charles H. Orr, Washington.

ILLINOIS

Helen T. Fisher, Delavan.

Joseph Kreeger, Elgin.

Helen H. Wiebers, Emden.

Oscar E. Bantz, Fithian.

Thomas L. Roark, Macomb.

Bert Baird, New Baden.

John F. McCann, Oglesby.

Grace M. Lennon, Plainfield.

Helen G. McCarthy, St. Charles.

Esther C. Schmitt, St. Jacob.

Emil A. Rahm, Staunton.

George C. Miller, Sullivan.

Martha G. Bailly, Table Grove.

Ora C. Maze, Tower Hill.

OKLAHOMA

Martin G. Kizer, Apache.

Benjamin D. Barnett, Cement.

Debra E. Grubbs, Jenks.

Roy McGhee, Miami.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 1942

The House met at 12 noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Guntton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast dispelled the darkness of the night and illumined the earth with the radiant glory of a new day, we are lifting our hearts and voices in gladness and gratitude, for through Thy mercies we are spared and through Thy power we are sustained.

We pray that we may open widely the doors of our minds and souls to receive the benediction of Thy gracious presence. Grant that in the assurance of Thy continuing providence and unfailing love we may find consolation and courage.

Guide us in all our perplexities and inspire us to stand valiantly for those loyalties and values which Thou hast ordained. Help us in humility of spirit to discipline ourselves to perform our duties faithfully and diligently.

Hear us in the name of Him who is the author and finisher of our faith. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 6, 1942, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications from the Department of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 5, 1942.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take pleasure in transmitting herewith for such disposition as you may deem appropriate a copy of a dispatch from the legation at San José, Costa Rica, enclosing therewith translations of a letter of July 21, 1942, addressed to the Minister from the President of Costa Rica and a letter of July 11, 1942, from the secretary of the Costa Rican Congress, expressing their thanks for the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives on February 2, 1942.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA,
July 27, 1942.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE:
Washington.

SIR: Referring to the Department's instruction of April 29, 1942 (file No. 120.1/576A), enclosing enrolled copies of resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives on February 2, 1942, expressing appreciation for the courteous treatment accorded a visiting group of Congressmen last year. I have the honor to transmit herewith copies and translations of the letter dated July 21 from the President of Costa Rica and the letter dated July 11 from the Secretary of the Costa Rican Congress, expressing their thanks for the above-mentioned copies of the resolutions of the House of Representatives. It is respectfully requested that copies of these letters be delivered to the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT SCOTTEN.

SAN JOSÉ, July 21, 1942.

The Honorable Mr. ROBERT SCOTTEN,
Minister of the United States, City.

DEAR MR. MINISTER: I beg that you will be good enough to express to the House of Representatives of the United States of America my most heartfelt gratitude for the courteous gift of a luxurious copy, beautifully bound, of the resolutions which the above-mentioned House took on the 2d of February last, expressing appreciation for attentions received in Costa Rica by the delegation headed by Representative RABAUT, of Michigan, who honored us with its visit.

I likewise beg that you will express to the House of Representatives of your country that it has nothing for which to feel grateful, and that we only regret not having had all the necessary means by which to show them in a more eloquent manner our full appreciation.

I take this occasion to reiterate myself.
Your affectionate friend,
R. A. CALDERON GUARDIA.

SAN JOSE, July 11, 1942.

The Honorable Mr. R. M. SCOTTEN,
Minister of the United States of America,
City.

MR. MINISTER: Under instructions of the president of the Constitutional Congress of the Republic of Costa Rica, I acknowledge receipt, through you to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, of the copy of the resolution adopted the 2d day of February of the current year, which commemorates the visit to Costa Rica of the delegation of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the United States, headed by the illustrious Representative RABAUT, of Michigan.

With expressions of my high consideration and respect, I am,

Respectfully yours,
RAUL GURMAN, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 3, 1942.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Guatemala with a note of July 21, 1942, enclosed a message addressed by the President of Guatemala to the House of Representatives of the United States. I take pleasure in enclosing for such disposition as you may deem appropriate a copy of this note and the message from the President of Guatemala with a translation of the latter.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

SUMNER WELLES,
Acting Secretary.

LEGACION DE GUATEMALA,
Washington, D. C.

The Minister of Guatemala presents his compliments to His Excellency the Secretary of State and requests that he be good enough to see that the enclosed message from the President of Guatemala be forwarded to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. The message is a message of thanks from the President of Guatemala for a resolution adopted by said high legislative body.

The Minister of Guatemala avails himself of this opportunity to reiterate to His Excellency the Secretary of State the assurances of his highest consideration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 21, 1942.

GUATEMALA, July 10, 1942.

MR. SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C.

MR. SPEAKER: The House of Representatives was so kind as to adopt a resolution, which has been forwarded to me, in which it thanks the people of Guatemala and me personally for the proofs of esteem and cordiality shown

to five distinguished members of your credit committee during the visit they made to this Republic.

Your high body was good enough to recall the cordial relations of friendship which have united our two countries, based on the mutual respect due to two sovereign nations, and it considers those proofs as a warm demonstration of American solidarity.

I greatly appreciate the very sincere expressions confirming the uninterrupted friendship of more than a century between our peoples and Governments—a friendship strengthened now in the common struggle for the defense of America and the democracy and freedom of the world.

I beg you, Mr. Speaker, to be good enough to make this message known to your enlightened legislative body.

Respectfully yours,
JORGE UBICO,
President of the Republic of Guatemala.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT

MR. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that when we last met on Thursday last we had up the question of unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill I have introduced to permit the payment of the allotments and allowances to the dependents of the men in our armed forces without waiting until November 1. I stated to the gentleman from Missouri then that I would be willing to poll the Committee on Military Affairs before this measure was brought up again.

I have done that and have received replies from a majority of the members of that committee stating that that would be satisfactory with them. However, I received a message this morning from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, informing me that he could not reach here by this morning and asking that the matter be carried over until next Thursday. Therefore, I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, and I wish to state that I am willing to carry this measure over until Thursday, under those circumstances.

MR. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

MR. HARE. Does the gentleman have any assurance from the chairman of the committee that he will consent to the passage of this bill on Thursday?

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Kentucky informs me that he is in sympathy with the purposes of the measure.

Let me clear up one misunderstanding. I notice from the press, especially from some of the New York papers and some other metropolitan papers, that it is intimated that the Army and Navy say that if this measure were passed it would complicate matters, and so forth. My understanding is that the Navy can make payment in settlement of these emergency cases now if we give them permission to do so, and I think the Army can do the same thing. This measure

does not make it mandatory that the cases all be settled now, it merely makes it permissive for the Army and the Navy to take care of these emergency cases, of which there are a great number, where these dependents are suffering as a result of this limitation in the law.

MR. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MR. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I myself, of course, took some part in the debate on this subject the other day, and am certainly willing to abide by whatever decision the Committee on Military Affairs makes in the matter, but one of my reasons for objecting was my conviction that this bill of the gentleman from Mississippi will not do what he thinks it will do. I believe the gentleman will admit that this is an important measure, and under the understanding that was had between all the Members of the House no important legislation was supposed to be considered.

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. No controversial legislation.

MR. EBERHARTER. On that basis I entered an objection so that the matter would be given consideration. I think the gentleman will agree with me, judging by the perseverance with which he has acted in this case, that he does consider it to be important legislation.

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania is entirely wrong. We have passed a great deal of important legislation within the last week or two. The understanding was that we would not take up any controversial legislation which would force roll calls, and so forth. The measures that come up by unanimous consent are not controversial measures as far as the Members of the House are concerned. I am sure not a Member of the House would object to this measure when it is properly laid before them.

MR. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman that a controversial measure is any measure on which every Member of the House does not agree. The gentleman will also admit that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and most of the members of that committee, who had considered this particular legislation and had heard testimony on the subject, were not aware that the gentleman was going to bring up any such a measure, to amend an important law. Therefore, I think it could be considered as at least important and also controversial legislation.

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I do not intend to take it up today. Besides, I conferred with the members of the Committee on Military Affairs. As I understand, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

MR. EBERHARTER. I am not a member of that committee.

MR. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In view of the fact that these payments are to be made to dependent parents in many cases, and as many of them are farmers, this comes at a time when the dependency fund will prove to be of unusual value to those people in rural areas, particularly in my section of the country, where they harvest their crops between now and November 1. They are unable to harvest the crops themselves, and since their sons have been called into the Army, they need these funds to employ someone to harvest crops for them. The fact that they are dependent is the basis upon which the compensation will be paid. If you wait until November these people, without funds, will be unable to employ anyone to harvest their crops, but if you pay them now, hundreds and possibly thousands of farmers will be able to employ someone with this money to assist them in harvesting crops already grown.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I have received pathetic letters from wives of soldiers, sailors, and marines, who are in financial distress because of the limitation placed in this law, which prohibits the War Department and the Navy Department from making these payments.

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

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I appreciate the concern the gentleman from Mississippi feels, and I assure him that when the proper time arrives I want to vote for this bill, but his making the request at this time is a little embarrassing to me because I have instructions from the leadership on this side not to consent to anything which amounts to business of importance.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I say to the gentleman from California that I am not making the request now for the consideration of the bill. I have just stated that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], is on his way to Washington and has asked that we hold up this measure until Thursday, until he can get here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DIRECTORY OF OFFICIALS, SERVICES OF SUPPLY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], which I send to the Clerk's desk, be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings on the military appropriation bill, 1943, I suggested to General Somervell the desirability of having us supplied with a list of the officials directly in charge of the various activities under his cognizance as commanding general, Services of Supply, and those activities, as you have experienced, embrace practically every phase of the Army with which we are called upon to transact business.

The general, who has a reputation for getting things done, has conformed with my suggestion in the way of an abbreviated telephone directory, in which the several activities are alphabetically arranged, followed by the names, telephone branch, and room number of the principal officials, all as of the first of this month.

I am sure this directory will prove to be very handy and will save much time here and at the Department in establishing contacts with the right people promptly.

I have had a copy of the directory placed in each Member's mail box in the House post office.

JOSEPH J. SINNOTT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting we should pause for a moment today to pay tribute to the oldest employee in point of years in the House. Yesterday, the Honorable Joseph Sinnott, our doorkeeper, was 82 years of age. Fifty-five years of that time he has been an employee of this House. I am sure it is needless for me to say anything about the great service he has rendered and I know all Members join with me in congratulating him and wishing him many more happy returns of the day.

[Applause.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me sincere pleasure to join with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri in extending congratulations and good wishes to our dear friend, Mr. Sinnott. It is a remarkable record for a man to spend 55 years out of his 82 in one position as a servant of this House, and I want, as a friend of Mr. Sinnott for 18 years, personally to express to him my appreciation of his many courtesies and my admiration for the qualities of his character which have made it possible for him to maintain his position with such success and honor to himself and satisfaction to the House. I would like to say that I wish for him long years of health and happiness. I hope he will be able to make his employment here at least 60 years. He illustrates one passage of Scripture which is very appropriate—he would rather be “a doorkeeper in the House of the Lord than dwell in the tents of wickedness.”

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, strange as it may seem, I probably have been associated with the Doorkeeper, Mr. Sinnott, longer than any other Member of the Congress. He was the first man I met when I came to Congress in 1904, 38 years ago. Of course, I did not come as a Member at that time but as a secretary to the Congressman from my district. The first man it was my privilege to meet in the Capitol was the Honorable Joseph

Sinnott, our very estimable, lovable, and efficient Doorkeeper. In the meantime I have had an opportunity to observe and be associated with him and it is a great pleasure to be able to congratulate him on his eighty-second birthday and to wish him many happy returns.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the entire Virginia delegation and the people of Virginia appreciate the tributes that have been paid to Mr. Sinnott. All of the Members of the Virginia delegation learned long ago to love him and to depend upon him wholeheartedly. He has been of immeasurable help to all of them. I have said to him frequently that a review of his services here, portraying the men he has met, the changes he has seen, the legislative history he has helped to make, the progress in parliamentary procedure which he has observed, and the personal incidents of his career, would contribute materially to a better knowledge of the history of the period of his service. All the time Joe Sinnott has been here, he has rendered distinguished, eminent, and faithful service. He has been untiring in his attention to Members, new and old, regardless of party affiliation. He has been courteous at all times and sometimes under the most trying circumstances. He has been diligent to his duties, coming to the House often when his friends felt he should have remained at home. He has never failed in his duties. He has been an example and an inspiration to all of us. Virginia loves him. When I am no longer a Member of this House, but shall have gone as soon or later each of us must go, I shall be flattered if it can be said of me that I served always as faithfully, and performed my duties always as well as Joe Sinnott served and performed his duties here.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ON THE REVENUE ACT OF 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 2392) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2333, current session, accompanying the bill (H. R. 7378) “To provide revenue and for other purposes,” and I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 7,500 additional copies of House Report No. 2333, current session, on H. R. 7378, entitled “To provide revenue, and for other purposes,” of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 200 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 2,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 300 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE VOTE OF MATTHEW LYON, OF VERMONT, ELECTED THOMAS JEFFERSON PRESIDENT IN 1801

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 2393) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 512) authorizing the printing of the manuscript of an article showing that the vote cast by Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, was the deciding factor in the election of Thomas Jefferson as the third President of the United States, be printed as a House document, and I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript of an article prepared by William P. Kennedy, showing that the vote by Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 17, 1801, was the deciding factor in the election of Thomas Jefferson as the third President of the United States, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on post-war difficulties and to add in the extension an editorial by David Lawrence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial from the Allegan Gazette, of Allegan, Mich., dated August 6, a very short editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have several unanimous-consent requests on behalf of several of our colleagues.

On behalf of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Pathfinder, a national publication, which article he wrote himself, and is entitled "For Want of a Nail."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK], I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Journal of Commerce of Saturday, August 8.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], chairman of the Special Committee on National Defense Migration, I ask unanimous consent that

he may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], I ask that he may extend his remarks and include therein certain newspaper editorials and clippings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his own remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his remarks and to include therein certain newspaper editorials and clippings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks and include a poem from the official publication of the Order of the Purple Heart.

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

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Pondera County Farmers' Union relating to selective service.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS] may have leave to extend his remarks and include therein a letter from one of his constituents.

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

There was no objection.

THE KAISER PROPOSAL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the proposal of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to bring up Thursday for passage his bill (H. R. 7461) to eliminate from the law providing dependency payments for dependents of servicemen the provision that no payments shall be made until November 1 next. This provision should be repealed because many of these dependents are now in dire need of the necessities to maintain life. Wives, mothers, fathers, and children of many servicemen need food, clothing, shelter, and medical care. Why postpone the payment of these subsistence allowances

to these needy dependents of our servicemen for 4 months? The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi is not mandatory, but only permissive. In those cases where the Department needs time in which to make payments under the Rankin amendment, time would be had. In the emergency cases where immediate help is needed to prevent hardship, the payments could be made forthwith. I will support the Rankin amendment and commend the gentleman from Mississippi for his zeal and sound common sense, and his great concern for the welfare of our men in the service and their dependents in insisting that his bill be passed without waiting until September. Those of us who are here are ready to act now and not prolong the suffering of these needy dependents entitled to immediate relief. It will be a comfort to our fighting men at the front to know their loved ones at home are being cared for.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer again to the proposal of Henry J. Kaiser, from my district, to build supercargo flying boats. Mr. Donald Nelson has advised me that the proposal has received his favorable consideration and the War Production Board has given approval to Mr. Kaiser to proceed. It will be hoped that the Navy Department will not permit the plan to be sidetracked or delayed. Our enemies are sinking our surface ships faster than we can build them. We are seeing immense quantities of precious war material go down to Davy Jones' locker with the ships carrying them. Four hundred and nineteen have been reported sunk since Pearl Harbor. Mr. Kaiser is a man of great foresight and he is a master builder. Success attends all of his undertakings. He reduced the time for the building of ships from 105 days to 46 days. Kaiser not only holds the record for speed in ship construction but for efficiency and effectiveness. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of August 7, as follows:

LARGE, GIANT, AND COLOSSAL

Upon the United States Navy is now placed responsibility for forwarding the cargo-plane idea. After considering the factors involved—time element, materials required, plant necessary, labor, and general probabilities of success—the War Production Board has now approved a plan for construction of 500 of the 70-ton flying boats of which the Martin Mars is the prototype.

With this approval has gone a recommendation to the Navy that it let Henry J. Kaiser start on 125 of these planes in his west-coast shipyards. In addition, the War Production Board suggests to the Navy that it begin construction of an experimental 200-ton twin hull, superflying boat, capable of carrying 50 tons (or 2 medium tanks) 3,600 miles at 200 miles an hour.

It is to be hoped the Navy will follow this recommendation at once. Even should Mr. Kaiser prove able to fill his amazing promise to be turning out planes of this type in quantity within 6 months, the sooner the 6 months begins the better.

Cargo planes come, like California olives, in three general sizes: Large, giant, and colossal. The large variety includes such ships as the Douglas DC-3, favorite of the airlines, the Lockheed Constellation, and the Curtiss Commando. They can carry troops, certain light equipment, even jeeps. They

cannot carry medium tanks, or many of the heavy items included in the 1,000 tons of supplies it is figured that an infantry division uses in a day of attack.

The *Mars* is an illustration of the giant ship. It can carry heavier items longer distances. Air authorities have estimated that 40,000 of these could take the place of every surface craft now in the United Nations shipping pool.

The 200-ton plane must be classed as colossal. Authorities on materials have said that 180 of these ships could move 450,000 tons of cargo a year, and that the planes could be built with 18,000 tons of raw materials, against 238,000 tons of raw materials to build surface ships able to carry the same load.

We do not accept these figures as proved. Only experience can show their accuracy. But we do feel that big cargo planes have a definite place in today's war. The Axis is believed to be concentrating about 20 percent of its plane production on the large variety of cargo planes.

The giant and colossal planes are needed to give the United Nations the edge they require in a war which hinges so largely on transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the operations of the Kaiser shipbuilding plants and other war industries in my district has brought 100,000 workers into the area, which has created a housing shortage. We have been urging upon the housing authorities and the Maritime Commission the urgent necessity of providing at once temporary housing for these workers who cannot be housed with existing housing. I am glad to report that Vice Chairman Vickery, of the Maritime Commission, has advised us that 6,000 additional apartments in Portland will be provided by the Commission. The Commission will start the construction of 2,000 apartments August 15, 2,000 September 15, and 2,000 October 15. We are assured that before these are completed, if it be ascertained additional units are required, they will be provided to meet the demand. I trust there will be nothing arise to prevent the carrying out of these plans now definitely agreed upon.

SERVICEMEN'S ALLOWANCES

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor immediate passage of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to permit the allowances to dependents of men in the service to be paid as soon as possible instead of waiting to November 1. I believe that every effort should be made to pay the allowances long before that date. To require a delay of 5 months will work hardships in many cases and I am opposed to it. It seems unjustifiable to me.

Furthermore, the charge has been made by newspapers all over the country that the date was purposely fixed by Congress at November 1 so that the dependents would receive their checks a few days before the election on November 3, and was done to influence the result of the election. We all know that is not true. It was the Army and Navy who

insisted upon that date and alleged that they needed that period of time to make the necessary preparations and arrangements for payment. However, that protracted delay is inexcusable, in my opinion, is not the fault of Congress, and we should correct this situation next Thursday, as proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

[Here the gavel fell.]

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the House will not meet again until next Thursday I think it is appropriate at this time to call attention to the fact that tomorrow is the anniversary of the birth of one of the most distinguished Members of this House.

When the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] felt compelled to take a much-needed and well-earned rest it became necessary for some Member to take over his duties temporarily. He chose the very estimable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to carry on those burdens, as Mr. COCHRAN had already amply demonstrated his abilities in acting as assistant to the majority leader.

Tomorrow is the anniversary of the birth of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. I do not think he would want me to say exactly how old he is, but I can say he is much older than he looks and much older than he acts. He has had many, many years of service in the House. During all of that time he has been conscientious. He has a valuable knowledge of legislative procedure. He has earned the reputation of being the watchdog of the Treasury. With all of his manifest duties he has never lost his sense of humor, and he has endeared himself to every Member of the House. He has been particularly helpful to the younger Members.

On this occasion I want to congratulate him upon reaching the age he has reached with so much vigor and having so much before him in the years to come, which I hope will be very, very many.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Missouri is not as old as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is he?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not care to discuss that particular angle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. I would like to say a word in connection with this birthday celebration of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. I have known him for a long period of time. Of course, as compared with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and myself, and

the gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE, he is a mere infant. I have just passed my seventy-second birthday the 10th of last July, so he has a long way yet to go before reaching the age of discretion.

Let me say, regarding the gentleman from Missouri, that in my estimation he is and has been since his induction into the service of the United States Government one of the most valuable Members of the Congress. I think he is one of the best and most capable legislators that I have known in my long period of service here. He carries with him always that Missouri tradition and characteristic—"show me." He has evidenced that time and time again as the years have gone on in his advocacy of sound legislation.

I congratulate him on his birthday tomorrow, and hope he will live to have many happy returns of the day.

Mr. BLAND. May we not include that he is one of the best fishermen we have in the House?

Mr. CROWTHER. I am not a judge of fishermen.

Mr. BLAND. Well, he is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes on next Monday after the work of the day is concluded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter and a statement from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on another topic I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include excerpts from an article on a prominent pro-German in the United States, Dr. Ferdinand Curtiss, taken from the weekly magazine *The Hour*.

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

There was no objection.

END THE PRACTICE OF HONORING AND REWARDING IDLENESS BY ARMY AND NAVY COMMISSIONS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the most egregious example of blundering on the part of the "brass hats" is that of giving a commission to Horace Dodge, Jr., of Detroit. He is one of a long list of playboy scions of wealthy families of America who toils not, nor does he spin, and who is constantly bored through lack of some new thrill, the experiencing of which he is persistently seeking. The large cities of the United States are full of these parasites who are

busy spending inherited money tossed to them by opulent and overindulgent parents.

Since Pearl Harbor the Army and Navy "brass hats," seeming to desire to curry favor with the wealthy families of our country, have handed out, promiscuously, commissions to these pleasure-seeking offspring of wealth. The last ones to whom we should accord authority and honor are representatives of this class. How can they inspire soldiers or sailors to follow them? A dissolute and dissipated life, marked by guzzling cocktails and doing the conga at 2 a. m. in the Stork Club or El Morocco, is not exactly the training ground to make tough officers to fight the most efficient military machine in the history of the world.

I cite the example of Horace Dodge, Jr., not because he is an isolated case, but because he is typical of this reprehensible practice. Here are young men whose lives are placed in the hands of a playboy. The outcome of a campaign and a war might be dependent upon such officers. What kind of morale can we build by giving honor to those among us who are most undeserving?

Attempts have been made to befuddle and delude the public by starting such gentry in the Army or Navy as privates or unrated sailors and then promoting them without fanfare every 3 or 4 weeks. Eventually they emerge as a commissioned officer and then are touted as having come up the "hard way."

Experience is the only builder. None of us would want to be operated on by a medical student who used to be a butcher. It is folly to put military command, in this perilous hour, into the hands of fly-by-nights.

Now we come to the case of Horace E. Dodge, concerning whom the Detroit Free Press editorially said on July 30:

WHY A MAJOR?

Horace E. Dodge since the day his father died has done nothing in life but spend money and change wives. This wastrel playboy has no more training or experience in the commanding of men than has a 14-year-old Fiji Islander.

Yet he has been commissioned a major in the United States Army.

Perhaps someone in authority can tell us why.

Horace E. Dodge is the son of one of the original two Dodge brothers who made the Dodge automobile, both of whom died in 1920. Horace is 42 years old. His mother has the income of his father's \$75,000,000 estate during her life, and at her death Horace Jr., now Major Horace Dodge, son of the original Horace Dodge, will inherit one-half of the \$75,000,000 plus accumulations unspent. Most of his father's fortune is invested in tax-exempt bonds—all but a small percentage of it.

In 1925 the great Dodge automobile factory was sold to Dillon Read & Co., then at the inception of a skyrocketing career as Wall Street brokers. Dillon Read paid to the Dodes the sum of \$146,000,000 cash for the transfer of this enterprise. Thereupon, Walter Chrysler, who had been playing around with the old Maxwell car, came into the picture and formed his own corporation to take

over the Dodge plant. One-half of the \$146,000,000 went to the estate of Horace Dodge; the other half to the estate of John Dodge.

Horace Dodge, Sr., had only two children, Horace Jr. and Delphine. Delphine married James H. R. Cromwell. They were later divorced and Jimmy then married Doris Duke, sometimes called the richest girl in the world because of her inheritance of the Duke tobacco empire. Horace Dodge, Jr., has had several wives, from each of whom he has been divorced serially.

When Detroit's finest hotel, the Book-Cadillac, was built, "Major" Horace Dodge's mother, now Mrs. Hugh Dillman, held the first evening ball in it, in honor of "Major" Horace's sister, Delphine. The decorations for that evening's affair cost \$20,000, and the total outlay was upwards of \$32,000 for the dance.

"Major" Horace Dodge's mother gave him a yacht, named *Delphine*, which was built by the Great Lakes Engineering Co. in Detroit at a cost of \$1,500,000 and which cost \$5,000 a day to operate. When built it was supposed to be the finest afloat.

This is the Horace Dodge to whom the Army now hands out a commission as a major. How uninspiring. How silly. How stupid.

Those responsible for such an asinine bandying about of Army commissions should be disciplined or discharged.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to the President by Mr. Truman Ward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech I made on the challenge for service in the Navy.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein messages by the American Christian clergy on the persecution of the Jews in Europe.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some remarks on the war-work plan.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders today I may be per-

mitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today following the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JAPANESE IN THE ALEUTIAN ISLANDS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full time allotted to me inasmuch as the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] will proceed for 20 minutes later today on the same subject.

Mr. Speaker, it was pleasing to read in Sunday's paper the Navy's communiqué which said, "United States naval forces bombarded enemy ships and shore establishments at Kiska," and further it read:

On August 8, east longitude date, a task force of the Pacific Fleet bombarded enemy ships and installations in Kiska Harbor (Aleutian Islands).

We cannot permit the yellow man to remain longer in this hemisphere. He started his penetration by landing a small force on the island of Attu in early June. He next nested on the island of Agattu, and later penetrated the prize package of all, the island of Kiska, with its fine harbor suitable to accommodate even more ships than Pearl Harbor.

I am sure the Navy and War Departments appreciate the gravity of this situation, and they should be commended for the consistent peppering given the Japs who are based there. But the people of this country cannot understand why the job of driving them from our territory hasn't been finished long before this time.

I trust that the United States Navy and the United States Air Forces will send bombers in such magnitude as to completely annihilate the Japs in the Aleutians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

A STUCK PIG SQUEALS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a time of crisis in our war of survival. It is a time when every American, every real American, must wish—as I do—that he could be with our troops in the field, offering the strength of his body and the courage of his heart as a bulwark against our enemies and as a weapon for their destruction.

It was not until the Army rejected my application for combat duty that I consented to running for Congress. And to myself—and to my constituents—I then made a vow which I mean to keep.

I made a pledge that I would use this office to the best of my ability as an instrument of victory.

If I were refused permission to fight our enemies abroad—then with all the strength that is in me, and with the help of God, I would deal with our enemies at home.

In a campaign speech delivered last May 13 over a Pittsburgh radio station, I said:

To wage an all-out war, we must deal firmly with the defeatists, the sowers of dissension, the spreaders of hate, who are working with the Axis war lords to interrupt and hamper our country's war effort. The fifth columnists may expect no mercy nor tolerance from me. I want them ferreted out from their slimy hiding places. I want them exposed—those in high places, in the so-called Cliveden sets, as well as the half-cracked tools of Goebbels' propaganda machine.

So, no higher up told me what to do, Mr. Speaker. My conscience told me what to do.

I came to Congress, the most junior Member of this distinguished body. The people of my district had told me what to do.

I had never seen the Washington Times-Herald until I came to Congress. I had seen the New York Daily News from time to time. It is sold in Pittsburgh, because it has so many comic strips. In Washington I began to read the Times-Herald. I read it first incredulously—then I got mad—then I began to investigate.

I realized that here—in the persons of the Patterson family—were the "defeatists, the sowers of dissension, the spreaders of hate." Each day the editorial columns of their papers carried further evidence that Joseph Medill Patterson and his little sister Cissie were the arch-type of fifth columnists in high places—more dangerous by far than the "half-cracked tools of Goebbels' propaganda machine," such as the Pelleys, the Dillings, and the Nobles.

I took the floor of this House last Monday to say just that.

I knew what I was getting into. I am a junior Member of Congress, but I have been in politics for a long time. I know the power of money. I know what it means for a man in public life to incur the feverish hostility of a combination of newspapers whose circulation runs into the millions.

There is an old saying on the south side of Pittsburgh, where I come from, about the unwisdom of entering a poison gas engagement with a skunk. That is triply true when the skunks are a species

that travels in packs, or at least in family parties.

The best reply, off-hand, that Joseph Medill Patterson could think of was "You're a liar." Not so flashy for a supposedly able newspaperman.

The best reply little sister Cissie could think of was "That goes for me, too. You are a liar." Imitative, and rather unladylike for a former ornament of the European nobility.

Then Joseph Medill Patterson called up his distinguished ancestors from their sleeping places to testify as character witnesses for him. I will venture to say he found them turning in their graves. That family was accustomed to smash copperheads—not breed them.

Said Joseph Medill Patterson:

One of our grandfathers was born of Scotch-Irish parents in New Brunswick, Canada, whence he was removed as an infant to the United States. The families of the other three grandparents had been in the United States for several generations. Members served in the Revolutionary, Civil, and World Wars. There is no German, Italian, or Japanese blood in us. We are of Irish extraction (both north and south), with a trace of Holland Dutch.

I come of the same strain myself—Irish extraction, both north and south. But, I should be ashamed to use my racial antecedents, and them alone, as a proof of my loyalty to this country.

Vidkun Quisling, whose name will forever live in infamy, is a pure-blooded Norwegian, and a traitor to his country.

Pierre Laval is a pure-blooded Frenchman from the heart of the Auvergne, and a traitor.

De Grelle is a Belgian; Mussert is a Dutchman; Pavelitch is a Croatian; and all have betrayed their countries.

Sir Oswald Mosely is an Englishman, born to the purple, and he is in an internment camp for enemies of Britain.

Even Benito Mussolini, Hitler's body servant, is an Italian, born in the Romagna. Yet he delivered his country to Hitler.

No, Mr. Speaker; it is not by blood that we can prove our Americanism. It is by word and deed.

I would rather put my trust in the patriotism of the boys of my district who are in the services—sons, as they are, of Slavic steelworkers, Polish mill men, Hungarian craftsmen, Jewish merchants, Irish railroaders, and the rest—than I would in the finely distilled Americanism of Joseph Medill Patterson.

Their love for this country is real and vibrant—a living thing. Patterson's love for this country has been consumed in his hatred for its President.

And, I would rather trust the men of this country who come of German or Italian stock, whose parents came here seeking freedom, who have been bred and brought up as Americans, than I would Joseph Medill Patterson.

While Patterson sabotages the war effort at home, generals named Eisenhower and Spaatz prepare to carry the war to Hitler—and patriots like Fiorello LaGuardia give him lessons in what it means to be an American.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is Adolf Hitler and Joseph Medill Patterson and the Ku Klux

Klan who tell you that a man's behavior is governed by his ancestral blood.

Joseph Medill Patterson is in fit company—the company he seeks, and the company where he belongs.

"This country has treated us well—superlatively well. What could we gain by having it fall?" asks Joseph Medill Patterson.

France treated Pierre Laval well—superlatively well. He had held the highest office in the state—that of premier. He had accumulated great wealth. He had married his daughter into the highest social circles.

Yet this man betrayed France, because he lusted for power, absolute power, and because he hated democracy and the French Republic. So he and others like him pushed France over the precipice and in collaboration with the Nazis they are despoiling the fair land of France, and selling her people into slavery.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, it is by their words and their deeds that men shall be judged, on earth as before the throne of God. Their protestations mean nothing. And Joseph Medill Patterson and his little sister Cissie stand accused, and stand convicted, out of their own mouths.

It is natural for a stuck pig to squeal, Mr. Speaker. I expected loud and terrifying howls when I spoke last Monday, and I expect even more blood-curdling screams of hate and passion to follow. I am not a bit scared. I have always liked a fight, and this fight is for my country.

This is a fight for the boys in service—a fight we owe them, to make sure that they are not betrayed at home while they die on battlefields across the seas.

This is a fight for the parents of America who have given their boys to our country—a fight to make sure that their boys do not fight in a cause lost because of the rich and powerful enemies of democracy at home.

It is the kind of fight I like.

I said I would prove in this House that the Patterson papers follow the lines of Hitler's propaganda. I am going to do just that.

I have just read every editorial published in the New York Daily News since the outbreak of war. It will take me some time to wipe the slime off. Let us see, today, how extracts from those editorials tie in with the propaganda war waged by Hitler and Goebbels.

I have no time today to deal with the use of the Letters to the Editor columns as a vehicle for Nazi viewpoints. I have not the time to deal in detail with the coloration of news stories, with the character of a man named John O'Donnell, chief of the New York Daily News' Washington Bureau, with the innuendo and character assassination of the gossip columns of the papers. Those things will come later. Or, perhaps, the Department of Justice will relieve me of the responsibility.

The editorials in a newspaper are the direct responsibility of its publisher and editors. They are considered statements. They are not rushed by dead lines, and their writers have plenty of time to check facts.

What does Hitler want the American people to believe?

Through his propaganda, we know he wants us to believe, for one thing, that our Allies are weak, cowardly, undependable, and unworthy of our support. Of course, he wants them to believe the same things about us.

How does Patterson serve his game?

I am not going to furnish dates as I go along, because that will slow up this speech and consume time—but all of these statements, which I will quote, have been made since the first of December 1941—the week preceding Pearl Harbor and the time elapsed since.

Of the brave and indomitable Dutch, Patterson says:

If we fight in the Pacific, shall we be fighting to keep the Dutch East Indies forever the property of the exiled government of Holland? That government was bowled over on its home grounds in 5 days by the German steamroller attack of May 1940; it now lives in London. Are we obligated to fight to keep that shadowy regime forever possessed of a set of islands on the other side of the world?

Thus, he pays his respects to one of the finest, bravest, most truly democratic people whom the world has ever known.

Of the people of the Philippines, who fought so bravely side by side with the men of Bataan:

We shall be hearing a great deal both from Philippine politicians and American emotionalists about our sacred obligation to defend the Philippines after this foul attack upon them without warning by the Japanese. That is just too bad, we think.

That is Joseph Medill Patterson speaking of the Filipinos.

Of the Russians, who have fought so stubbornly and well:

Of course, if the Russian victories carry through to the ultimate smashing of the German military power, we face the prospect that Russia will insist on communizing Europe. Czar Alexander I insisted on autocratizing Europe after his armies gave Napoleon the shove that finally led to Waterloo. So it may be that when and if the first enemy on our list, Germany, is put down, we may find that Communist Russia is the next enemy we've got to fight.

And this at a later date:

Stalin made a nonaggression pact with Hitler once before and Stalin always acts for his own interests first. We cannot pump enough stars into our eyes to believe that "Pal Joey" is incapable of making a separate peace if he feels that is his only way out, or even of changing sides.

And further:

There is always the danger that peace between Stalin and Hitler might break out at any time.

That is how Patterson regards the nation which up until now has made by far the greatest contribution to the war against Hitler.

The commonest Nazi argument addressed to the British people is the tale that the United States is fighting to inherit the British Empire and dominions. Of course, over here they use the opposite face of the story. They say that America is fighting to preserve the British Empire.

Patterson serves both facets of this trick.

He agitates for the annexation of Canada to the United States:

We think Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mackenzie King, who is going to sit in on some of the White House conferences, might well consider the possibility of a merger of Canada and the United States.

That is ideal grist for the Nazi propaganda mill in Berlin. And Patterson also says:

If the British do not strike now for the heart of Hitler's power, there is danger they will lose the British Empire beyond our ability to help them retrieve it.

To further instill good feeling between comrades in arms, Patterson puts the guilt for this war on Britain—the nation which went so far in trying to appease Hitler in a vain effort to keep the peace that it almost broke the heart of the free world. Says Patterson:

The British didn't go into World War No. 1 with the assumption that we would help them win. But it seems apparent to us that they started World War No. 2 for the protection of Danzig and the Polish Corridor on that assumption.

There he accuses the British of starting this war.

The Chinese have been fighting our enemy, Japan, for 5 years, fighting with bare hands, dying by the millions, but fighting on—unconquered and unconquerable.

Patterson pays this Asiatic people, our ally, this gratuitous insult:

The line between the yellow and white races in the Pacific will have to be definitely drawn some day.

The good-neighbor policy of the President and Secretary Hull is a favorite target of Nazi propaganda. The Nazis always picture this country as an imperialistic nation bent on exploiting the lands to the south, and their flow of propaganda poison to Latin America is unabated. Joseph Medill Patterson helps them, as follows:

It is a big scheme.

What it will amount to, if adopted, will be that the United States will assume a kind of protectorate over all Latin America, meaning over every now independent country south of the Rio Grande. . . . We think the plan is a blueprint for making the Western Hemisphere over into a giant Switzerland—a nation of many languages, numerous sectional frictions and misunderstandings—with Uncle Sam holding the entire bag.

That is how Patterson aids the good-neighbor policy—for Hitler.

It does not matter what nation it is or where in the globe it fights for freedom. If it is on our side, the New York Daily News and the Washington edition, gotten out by little sister Cissie, can find nothing good to say about it. In this respect they follow the Hitler propaganda line.

The next phase of the Hitler propaganda, addressed to our country, is based on defeatism: the argument that the war is unnecessary—that it cannot be won—that even if it is won, democracy will be lost and life will not be worth living. In following this part of the Hitler line, Patterson excels. Here are some choice bits of Patterson defeatism:

On the precedent of history, we assume that this war will end some day—perhaps even in our lifetime, who knows?

And:

So at this time it looks as if this war will not be finished in all theaters for 5, 8, maybe 10 years. At the end of it all we ought to have a fine Army and Navy and Air Force, even if we have nothing else.

And:

There may be finally some kind of federation of the world, parliament of man, league of nations, or whatever it may be called. But we think this will come to pass, not after the present war, but after several more big wars.

Further:

The most probable result is what is technically called national bankruptcy.

Further still:

The present war is going to end sometime, as did World War No. 1; but the odds are safe at 999 to 1 that World War No. 2 is only going to sow the seeds of another war of like size when the crop of youth is ripe once more.

And this climax:

From Mr. Hull's speech, it appears that we are to fight gladly and for quite a long while, barring some huge stroke of luck, to force our ideas of democracy on the rest of the world, while losing much of our democracy at home in the meantime.

That is what is going on, all right. It is more annoying than serious when an eastern motorist can't buy 6 gallons of gasoline for his car in 1 week. It is something else again when the Government can tap any man between 20 and 44 on the shoulder and say, "Son, you've got to go and fight for the freedom of New Caledonia, in New Caledonia."

Mr. Speaker, we have troops in New Caledonia, troops sent there to keep that island, a vital point on the supply line to Australia and a great repository of nickel, an essential war material, from falling into the hands of the Japanese. That statement of the New York Daily News, made in its issue of July 25, is to my mind an incitement of troops which may be sent to reinforce that garrison—an incitement to mutiny. It is as seditious as anything ever uttered by that foul-mouthed traitor and seditionmonger, William Dudley Pelley, who will soon be sentenced for a long term of imprisonment.

Adolf Hitler profits by every drop in the morale of the American civilian population or in our armed forces. Joseph Medill Patterson serves Adolf Hitler faithfully and well when he urges his 2,000,000 readers to get drunk and stay drunk for the duration of the war. This in his astonishing statement:

In short, to fight to preserve the American way of life, we are checking large pieces of that way with Mr. Mars for the duration of the war. Our hopes of restoring the world after the war to anywhere near its pre-war condition are small. We'll be lucky if we can recognize the old place at all. So if you've always been going to write a book or a play some day, you'd better write it now. If you've been going to swear off liquor or tobacco, better do it now, or, contrariwise, swear on. (Our advice would be to do the latter; it's a short life at best, so why not make as merry a one as may be?)

Throughout the country, millions of patriotic men and women are working

hard in civilian defense activities. Patterson calls them "peanut Hitlers, show-offs, slackers, and agitators."

Hitler could not do better.

The conservation of scarce materials is an essential of war. The Axis radio stations continually commiserate with the American people, because rationing is affecting our luxurious way of life. They are awfully sorry for us, and it is all the fault of the Washington bureaucrats, headed by that terrible man Roosevelt.

Patterson is their cheer leader. They pick up their tips from him. His motto is, "This business of enforced and needless deprivation, just to make us sorrowful, is silly."

To him, a possible shortage in Martini cocktails looms as a tragedy of war. I quote:

So, while no serious shortage of rye or bourbon is now expected, an acute shortage of gin is reported more than likely. That will be tough on Americans who simply do like Martinis and don't like Manhattans—meaning quite a number of Americans. Why their personal liberty should be destroyed in this matter, we cannot see.

When you read a thing like that, and think of the men who lived on mule meat on Bataan and the sailors who drift in open boats without food and sometimes without water—it makes you sick at the stomach.

It is simply and utterly foul.

American civilians have not yet felt the pinch of war except in the most minor degree. Yet Patterson says:

We cannot keep up our home-front morale if our gasoline and oil are to be cut off and our food curtailed, while Washington bureaucrats tell us such deprivations are good for us and will make better men and women of us.

He sees totalitarianism in the simple request that the people turn in their old tubes of toothpaste, and in the elimination of cuffs on trousers. Nazi propaganda is always aimed at making Americans, who are predisposed toward democracy, believe that their own Government is becoming dictatorial. This is Patterson's loudest cry.

Three days before Pearl Harbor this was his cry:

In short, Roosevelt is now a dictator. * * * We think it is entirely conceivable that the Roosevelt dictatorship will believe it to be its duty to mankind to postpone the 1942 congressional elections in this country on some pretext or other.

This theme has been frequently repeated, even as the primary elections proceed.

And, this part of the Patterson-Axis line:

As for getting our liberties back after the war—we won't get all of them back in any event. We can be confident that after the war, we'll be more totalitarian than ever before. That is how those things go.

Everyone knows that the President of the United States is the chief target of the Nazi propaganda machine everywhere in the world. Hitler knows that Roosevelt is the man who stands between him and world domination. He hates the President and would destroy him.

Patterson shares that hatred and he too seeks to destroy the President. He blames Roosevelt for the war. I quote:

Perhaps if our leaders had tried to keep this country's skirts clear of the fight, and had made frequent and sincere offers to negotiate, we could have stayed out.

That is just what Hitler says over and over again.

On the day of Pearl Harbor he honored the President of the United States with the same kind of diatribe he gave me the other day. Patterson called me a liar. Of the President, he said: "How can we believe him?"

While Jap planes were bombing Pearl Harbor the presses of the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald were printing an editorial attacking the veracity of the President of the United States and berating him for sending troops to Iceland and Greenland. If he had not done so, Pearl Harbor may well have been duplicated on our eastern seaboard at New York, Boston, and Baltimore.

But, to Joseph Medill Patterson, the President, like Congressman HOLLAND, was a liar.

The Patterson venom, the Patterson hatred, foamed up and boiled over in an editorial on August 2, in which Franklin D. Roosevelt, chosen President of this country by a free vote of the people—against the opposition of the wealth and most of the press of the country—was compared to the military conqueror, Julius Caesar.

The assassination of Julius Caesar is the most famous political crime in history. The Patterson papers all but state—through the filthy parallel they draw—that only a similar political crime can end the tenure in office of the President of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a limit somewhere to freedom of the press. Democracy cannot permit the very freedoms which it cherishes to destroy the very structure of freedom. We cannot permit our liberty to be destroyed by those who use it as a weapon against the security of our country.

I believe that the press of the United States, opposed though it may be to many things which I believe in for the domestic welfare of this Nation, is the fairest, the best informed, the most honest, and the most patriotic press in the world. It has always been so. I know that today it is ashamed of the Pattersons and their cousin in Chicago. I know that the decent press of America wants to win this war, just as every decent American wants to win this war.

The term of "vermin press" was coined to designate the rags published by the Pelleys and the Coughlins and the other organs of fifth-column opinion in this country.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald and their middle western brother in sedition, the Chicago Tribune, belong in the same category. Despite their cloak of prosperity, their fine buildings, their vast circulations, their comic strip, their feature stories,

their press association memberships, these three papers are in spirit and in conduct members of the "vermin press." Separate their editorials from the trappings of a large city newspaper, publish them as a separate book, and read them as a continuous theme. You will see their net effect is to preach defeatism among our civilians and mutiny among our soldiers, to spread dismay among our allies, and to create joy in the hearts of our enemies.

Since I addressed this House last Monday the Department of Justice has announced that it is investigating the publication of confidential naval information by the Chicago Tribune, the Washington Times-Herald, and the New York Daily News.

This is not their first offense.

In the week of Pearl Harbor, they obtained confidential military reports on the organizations of American forces if it became necessary, as it is now necessary, to invade the Continent of Europe. The Washington Times-Herald published that story under these headlines:

"War plan exposé rocks Capitol."

"Perils Army appropriation bill."

"Congress seethes over secret plans for 5,000,000 A. E. F."

"Eight billion Army appropriations bill periled by exposé."

The filching of confidential military information and the subsequent propaganda aimed at delaying appropriations has never been explained to the people of the country.

I suggest it as another item for grand-jury inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, the crimes of Adolf Hitler have shocked and revolted the human instincts of us all. The shooting of hostages, the starvation of Greece, the extermination of the leaders of the Polish people, the repression of religion, the massacres of the Jews, the razing of the little Czech town of Lidice—these things are cruelties which will never be forgotten by the civilized world. Americans in all walks of life have not hesitated to express their horror.

But not Joseph Medill Patterson. Nowhere in the editorial columns of the New York Daily News, since the outbreak of the war, will you find a single expression of sympathy for Hitler's victims or a trace of indignation over the crimes committed by the Nazis.

Joseph Medill Patterson has cynicism and criticism and mockery in plenty for our allies, but he has nowhere demonstrated that he possesses a sense of moral outrage for the brutality of the Nazis. Here, too, Joseph Medill Patterson follows the Nazi propaganda line.

Even in the matter of the second front, Joseph Medill Patterson aids Hitler. We all recognize that a second front is a matter of military urgency. We know that our Government undoubtedly desires it, and is pushing plans for it.

Patterson, too, advocates a second front—but he says it is a job for the British, and the British alone.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that nothing can be so calculated to delay the opening of a second front in Europe as the sowing of suspicion in Britain that

when the front is opened, Americans will not be there to support it. Here, again, Joseph Medill Patterson serves Hitler's game, and serves it with a vengeance.

It is not necessary to be in contact with the enemy in order to bring him aid and comfort.

It is not necessary to receive a daily memo from the Wilhelmstrasse to know what will weaken America and strengthen her enemies.

It is only necessary to share a common hatred; to desire the same results; to think in the same patterns.

And I repeat again that Joseph Medill Patterson and Eleanor Patterson walk in the path of Hitler, share his hatred of Roosevelt, share his hatred for Britain, share his hatred for Russia, think with him that democracy is degenerate and freedom archaic, desire with him to create a world in which Europe will be dominated by Hitler, Asia by Japan, and the Western Hemisphere directed by a Fascist America, working in unison with its overlord across the seas.

This is a foreign war, Mr. Speaker, yet it is also a war of ideas—the war of the idea of freedom versus the idea of tyranny.

There are those in this country, I am sorry to say—a tiny group, but a powerful group—who have become infected with the virus of tyranny which has unleashed this dreadful plague upon the world. To the end that this group consists of Americans, Mr. Speaker, this war is a civil war as well as a foreign war. It cannot be won until our enemies at home are conquered and rendered harmless.

Mr. Speaker, six Nazi saboteurs were electrocuted at the Washington jail the other day.

We are not a sadistic people, but we were glad to see those men executed. They had been sent here to make war upon us, stealthy war of sabotage, to wreck our industries, to smash our transportation systems, to attack our war effort on our home grounds with dynamite and fire. We called these men saboteurs and spies, and we executed them.

Mr. Speaker, had those men actually succeeded in blowing up the main line of the Pennsylvania Railroad at the Horseshoe Curve, as they plotted to do, they would have inflicted a great blow.

But all the physical sabotage they planned, had it been successfully executed, could not accomplish one-half the damage done by the moral sabotage committed by Joseph Medill Patterson, Eleanor Patterson, and Robert McCormick.

Daily these publishers rub at the morale of the American people. Daily they sow suspicion. Daily they preach that we are a nation of fools, led by rascals into a hopeless struggle.

Daily they wear at the moral fiber of the people, softening it, rotting it, preparing us for defeat.

And in war, as Napoleon Bonaparte said, the moral is to the material as three is to one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE LATE CHRISTOPHER D. SULLIVAN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of my former colleague, Christopher D. Sullivan, who was a Member of this House from 1917 to 1940. He was a Member from the district adjoining mine in the State of New York.

Christopher Sullivan was born in the city of New York in 1870, and was educated at the St. James Parochial School and St. Mary's Academy.

He received his early instruction in politics from his well-known uncle, known to the people of the East Side of New York as Big Tim Sullivan.

"Christy" Sullivan began his career as a printer, and then as a real-estate man, but through Big Tim and a brother Florrie he was drawn into politics and became a Democratic leader on the lower East Side. In 1908 he was elected to the State senate, where one of his colleagues, a few years later, was Franklin D. Roosevelt. He remained in the State senate until 1916, when he was elected to Congress from the Thirteenth District. From then until 1940 he served continuously as a Representative, retiring in 1940 to give his entire time to the leadership of Tammany Hall, to which he had been elected in 1937. He served as leader until recently, and upon relinquishing the post as leader of Tammany Hall he reverted to the leadership of his own district.

It was in the clubhouse of his own district that he passed away suddenly on August 3, 1942. While discussing the affairs of the club with some of the members he said he felt ill. He was persuaded to lie down on a lounge in the room. When it was noticed that one arm was hanging limp the others in the room tried to get a doctor from a nearby office, but he was not in. They then called Gouverneur Hospital and police headquarters. A police emergency squad worked over him with an inhalator, but he was beyond aid. Father Edward, a member of the Franciscan Order of the Roman Catholic Church of the Most Precious Blood, Canal and Baxter Streets, administered the last rites.

It was typical of Christopher Sullivan that in the more than two decades in which he served in the House of Representatives he never made a speech. However, when the time came for a vote he was always here. He was literally a man of few words, sincerely modest, almost shy in manner, but a witty and forceful conversationalist in informal gatherings. His strong influence in politics grew from his understanding of the intricacies of the game and from his unswerving loyalty to his political associates.

Among his friends Mr. Sullivan was noted for his devotion to his family. His 11 grandchildren were one of his chief prides. His wife, the former Nell Donahue, died in 1910, and he never remarried.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, there are very few men in this House who can boast of a record of being in the Congress of the United States from 1917 to 1940 without making a political speech or without even extending their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the country has lost a great citizen and his district has lost a

great friend. We will remember "Christy" Sullivan, as he left us in 1940, a statesman, a gentleman, and a fine citizen. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the entire delegation from Mississippi joins in expressing profound sorrow at the passing of our distinguished friend and former colleague, "Christy" Sullivan, of New York.

During all the years I have served in this House I have never been thrown with a more congenial member; a man of courage, a man of integrity, and a man whose love of his country, whose patriotism, was above question. I believe it was Longfellow who once said:

I shot an arrow into the air,
It fell to earth I know not where.
For so swiftly it flew the sight
Could not follow in its flight.

I breathed a song into the air,
It fell to earth I know not where.
For who has sight so keen and strong
That it can follow the flight of song.

Long, long afterward in an oak
I found the arrow still unbroke.
And the song from beginning to end,
I found again in the heart of a friend.

Every one who ever knew "Christy" Sullivan found in his heart the song of friendship, the love of his fellow man, and a supreme devotion to the welfare of his country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Christopher D. Sullivan, known to all of us as "Christie" Sullivan, in New York a week ago was a shock to his many friends, especially to those who have come in contact with him in recent months because he appeared to be in perfect health.

I met Mr. Sullivan when he came to Washington in 1916 as Representative in Congress from the Thirteenth District in Manhattan, and he served continuously until 1940, when he voluntarily retired. At the time of his retirement he was the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

He was educated at St. James Parochial School and St. Mary's Academy in New York. He entered the real estate business, but in 1908 entered politics and was elected to the New York State Senate, at which time he sat beside a newly elected Senator, who was none other than Franklin D. Roosevelt. He continued his service in the New York Senate until 1916, when he was elected to Congress. Mr. Sullivan left Congress, becoming the leader of Tammany Hall, which position he held until about a year ago.

His district was on the lower East Side in New York, and his success was

due to his contact with the people of that section. The door of his office was always open and it was in his office that he passed away. He had made it a habit for years to interview those who desired to see him on Monday and Wednesday nights, and he was talking to his friends when he was stricken. The poor of the East Side in New York will really miss him, because he was their friend. Although he never engaged in debate he was a power on the side lines. His outstanding personality made him friends with everyone with whom he came in contact. He was loyal to the party that he represented.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all here who knew him in extending sympathy to his children and his many grandchildren.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues from New York and other States, including the State of Pennsylvania, have asked me to submit a general request, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of the late Christopher D. Sullivan.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOTMENT BILL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 3 of this year a joint resolution was introduced which had for its purpose the amendment of what is known as the servicemen's dependents allotment bill, Public Law 625 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Unanimous consent was asked at that time for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution and at that time I reserved the right to object and stated that in the first place there was an understanding that no important legislation would be passed at this time and that the granting of such unanimous consent request would not be in conformity with such understanding.

In the second place, another reason for objecting was because I sincerely and honestly believed that there was very good reason for that clause being inserted in the original act, and in the third place I do not now think and I did not think at that time that the purpose which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had in mind when he first submitted the unanimous consent request would be served; in other words, it would not, in any way, fulfill his intention.

As far as I am personally concerned, I certainly will be agreeable to the passage of an amendment to that bill which will permit such payments to the dependents of servicemen at any time the War Department or the Navy Department is ready to do so, provided that the Committee on Military Affairs which

had charge of the bill will so recommend or provided a majority of the members of that committee are willing that it be done.

One of the reasons which should be taken into consideration by the membership of the House, and one thing that I want the people of the country to know is that in the first place there are at the present time approximately four and one-half million boys in the service. It is estimated that the War Department will have 1,700,000 applications from soldiers for payment of allowances to their dependents. There will be approximately 100,000 applications from sailors for payment of allowances to their dependents. There will be many from the marines. There will be many from the Coast Guard and from the other services.

Now, suppose the War Department would start to send out checks as soon as a few cases had been approved. We would then be in the position of paying a few of the large number of dependents many, many weeks ahead of others. Suppose in one block on one street a soldier's last name commences with the letter "A," and the War Department or the Navy Department, under the system which they might establish would first send out checks to those whose names commenced with the letter "A"; and in the same block there would be some other dependents whose name began with the last letter of the alphabet, "Z." Those people would not get their checks for many weeks after the others. The question is, Would that be fair? Should not all dependents get their checks at the same time?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am supporting the Rankin amendment. I believe it is working a hardship in many cases upon wives and children when the head of the family and breadwinner is in the service and these payments should commence immediately and be expedited as rapidly as possible, I will say. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the press of the country now is apparently, either acting under a misapprehension or deliberately misrepresenting the purpose behind the clause in that legislation to which the gentleman has referred, deferring the time of payment to November 1? I wish to read an excerpt from an editorial published in my State and district:

Congress has been generous in its grants to wives, children, mothers, and sisters of men in the armed forces of the country. The bills have been passed and signed by the President. But several months' delay will now result and many dependents who need this money will not receive it until the 1st of November.

Then a few days before election, a flood of checks will descend upon the Nation, just as in previous elections other relief and Work Projects Administration checks have been sent out on the eve of vote taking. Congress inserted a provision in the bill, practically prohibiting the payment of these benefits until November 1, although the Army and Navy could probably have begun to make the payments soon after the first of September, even though the bookkeeping task is tremendous.

Meanwhile wives and children who need the money now will have to wait until just before the election, when they will be expected to show the proper gratitude by voting right a day or so after the checks have been received. This is a cheap political trick to play on those whose loved ones are facing the dangers of wars.

I will ask my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania if there is any justification or anything that could be construed as the truth, as set forth in this editorial, in view of the fact that it was the War Department that insisted upon having the date fixed at November 1, and this was done in the other body.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In answer to the gentleman I may say in the first instance, as he was speaking it occurred to me the provisions of the law require that none of these checks shall be actually paid until November 1. In other words, none can be paid before November 1, but it is not mandatory that they be paid on November 1. Now, if they are mailed out on November 1, with respect to the gentleman's own particular district, if they are mailed from Washington they certainly could not be delivered by election day, which is on November 3. It could not apply to constituents in his particular district.

When this bill passed the House, as I understand, it did not contain this clause and the matter had not been brought to the attention of the membership of the House. The bill passed the House without that clause in it. It went to the other body and the Army officers who will be in charge of these payments and the Navy officials both requested that this clause be put in the act, because they felt it would be only fair that all dependents get their allowances at the same time.

In addition to that, it is a tremendous problem to set up the machinery by which these payments will be made. I have heard, unofficially, that it will require 1,200 to 1,500 additional employees in the War Department and the Navy Department in order to pass upon and get these checks out.

Now, suppose a mother has three or four boys in the service. Perhaps they have been in the service for 9 months or 12 months. One boy is with a contingent that is in Ireland, another with a contingent in Iceland, and another in Australia. Naturally, it will take a considerably greater length of time to prove their cases and get their applications back than it would in the case of a mother who has only one boy in the Army and he in a camp in this country. In the case where the boy is in a camp right handy, the mother would get her checks months or weeks before the mother who had three or four boys in foreign service.

Such a distribution may be the cause of a great deal of discontent and dissatisfaction on the part of those who are entitled to these checks, and may in a general way help to lower the morale of the people, because it is very, very difficult to explain to every dependent in the country why it is necessary for their checks to be delayed while other checks have been sent out weeks ahead of theirs.

In addition to that there would be so many inquiries coming to the War Department and the Navy Department ask-

ing, "Why haven't I received my check?" because the neighbors had received theirs, that the War Department would be under the necessity of answering thousands and thousands of communications or of totally ignoring them. It would place a tremendous burden on the War and Navy Departments or, by ignoring them, it would help create further discontent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GATHINGS). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes. Several Members have indicated they want me to yield, and I would like to yield to them.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I think the gentleman has made a very full and what seems to me to be a very logical explanation. Is it not a fact that even if the clause which is now so objectionable and which is contained in the legislation, is eliminated it would still probably be physically and otherwise impossible to make simultaneous and uniform time payments throughout the country? That is, it absolutely could not be done for the reasons the gentleman has so well pointed out. You have the element of distance, you have the time of making the application and the investigation in each individual case, and then preparing the checks after the records have been made up, and mailing out the checks, which is a process that requires a great deal of time and a great deal of clerical and bookkeeping work, which would require a very large personnel which would have to be organized. You would have to set up a vast machinery of personnel which as I understand it has not yet been done. It seems to me the practical and sensible procedure would be to omit the time limitation and permit the payments to be made as rapidly as possible, which is the usual procedure and start doing it at once. Does the gentleman know whether the personnel has been provided?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The machinery is only in the process of being initially set up.

In further answer to the gentleman, may I say that I was informed by an officer of the War Department that the War Department originally requested that the proviso state that no payment should be made until 6 months after the passage of the bill, but the Members of the Congress who had the matter under consideration thought that that was too long a period and insisted that the War Department endeavor to pay these checks within 4 months. The date of November 1 was just accidentally chosen.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman has stated that that was done in the other body, before the Senate committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is my understanding. The bill did not contain that proviso when it passed the House.

As far as the clause is concerned, I call attention to the fact also that this is certainly not a partisan matter as between the Republicans and the Democrats, because the Republicans and the Democrats in both branches of the Congress have voted almost unanimously for this provision, so that no blame can be attached to either party.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Is it not a fact that this provision never came before the House as a separate amendment or was voted upon in any way except as a part of the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It came to the House in a conference report to which all the conferees agreed, as I understand.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When the bill was up in the House, if the gentleman will recall, it provided that the payments should begin 4 months after the passage of the act. The gentleman will recall that I offered an amendment making it 2 months, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who was in charge of the bill, accepted the amendment and the House agreed to it unanimously, both Democrats and Republicans. Then the bill went to the Senate, and there the Robsion amendment, adopted in the House, was eliminated, and the date of November 1, 1942, was placed in the bill.

As pointed out by my friend and colleague from Washington, I do not think it is just the best thing or the proper thing, or the most equitable thing to do, to require beginning all these payments on a certain date. We do not do that about anything about proving claims.

I have been over my district recently and have found hundreds of hardship cases where husbands have been taken into the service leaving dependent wives, and, in some cases, dependent children. I believe that at the time we passed the bill the War and Navy Departments already had records of 160,000 dependents.

I think there ought to be a shorter time, and I am going to favor the Rankin amendment. I think we ought to cut down the time and get these checks to the dependents as rapidly as we can, because it is important that we do so. Some husbands and fathers were in the Army and Navy months and months before we passed that bill and, with their small pay, were unable to get more than a very little money to their wives and children. To put off this payment until November 1 means that in many cases needy wives and children will have to go without this assistance for 8 to 10 months. It is a serious question with a lot of people, and I think the law ought to be changed.

As to the personnel, the building in which this activity will be housed was erected in Northeast Washington before we passed the law. I went out there a number of times, for weeks and weeks before we passed the law, speaking with the colonel in charge out there of developing the personnel to handle this work. I am not insisting one way or the other about any political implications. All I am urging is the great necessity for

earlier action than we have contemplated, because if we do not get it hundreds of thousands of needy wives and children throughout this country will be without any care at all.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he does not agree with me that the charge of political implications is absolutely baseless and unfounded?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I do not know why it was put in there. The fact of the matter is that I did not know until afterward that it was put in there.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman realizes that it was put in there at the request of the War Department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard that, but I do not know just why the amendment was put in there. The bill as it came to the House provided that payments would begin the fourth month after the passage of the bill. I offered an amendment, which was accepted by the member of the Committee on Military Affairs in charge of the bill and agreed to unanimously by the House, both Republicans and Democrats, to the effect that the payments were to begin 2 months after the passage of the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad the gentleman set me right on the proposition as to the consideration given this particular matter when the bill was before the House, because I happened to be temporarily absent at the time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who was in charge of the bill, accepted the Robsion amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I happened to be on the floor on several other occasions when this particular matter was discussed. As far as the hardship cases are concerned, I am in entire sympathy with doing everything possible for the dependents of soldiers and sailors and for the soldiers and sailors themselves, and that has always been my position, as my record in the House will show. I think the record of most of the Members of the House who have been accused of trying to do this thing for political purposes will show that they have been very sympathetic toward going along with any proposition for the benefit of the soldiers, sailors, and marines, and their dependents.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman believe we ought to put this whole matter off until we work out the cases such as he referred to, of the dependents who have three sons in the Army, some of them in distant lands? Can we afford to hold it up until we can pay everybody at the same time?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am just presenting some of the reasons.

In connection with the hardship cases, in a newspaper report a Senator from Michigan is reported as stating this:

The War Department itself has nevertheless adopted a policy tending to alleviate any hardship that a soldier's wife and children might suffer if the monthly deduction of \$22 is withheld from his pay for monthly family-allowance purposes. Under this policy a vol-

untary allotment of \$22 a month may be made by the soldier, if he so desires, which will be available for the wife and children through September 1942, the total of such payments to be deducted from the accrued sum of monthly family allowance initially payable after November 1, 1942.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I hope nobody will object when I ask for a little additional time.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I certainly shall not object.

In the first place, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my amendment does not make it compulsory that these allotments or allowances be paid now, but merely makes it permissive. There are literally thousands of suffering fathers and mothers and wives and children of these soldiers, and they are absolutely in distress. The Navy can make these payments now, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I think the Army can, too. We have enough people on the Federal pay roll, it seems to me, to whip Japan. Surely we can use enough of them to make up these records.

The gentleman says that they can take the \$22 out of the soldier's pay. That is his allotment. Then if you pay that now and then later pay his allowance, you will have to have two transactions and you simply double the work, whereas if they paid them both at the same time in these needy cases they will only have to go through one transaction. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I cannot see why it would take up any more of his time than was taken up by me when I was trying to get through my amendment to raise the base pay of the men in the service to \$50 a month.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And the gentleman did not have much difficulty in getting that through.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes; I had a great deal of difficulty in getting it through, because it got tied up in conference, and I had to have the conferees instructed in the House and then they had to get them to instruct the conferees in the Senate.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The vote was almost unanimous.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman that it was one of the hardest parliamentary battles I have ever gone through with, although the final vote was over 10 to 1, and the vote will be 20 to 1 on this matter if they will bring it to a vote.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That may be true.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I can cite one case, and in order that no one will accuse me of playing politics in this matter, I may say that we have no contest in the general election where I come from, but only in the primary, but in order that you may not even accuse me of appealing to my constituency, let me refer to a letter I received from a little woman here in the District of Columbia day before yesterday. Her husband is in the service and she is in a hospital. She must now leave that hospital and has not a dollar to pay

her bill and nothing to live on when she gets back home, and nothing to look forward to until after November 1, when payments of these allowances will begin.

Therefore I say that we ought to amend this law to make it permissible for the Army and the Navy to pay these allotments and allowances in these emergency cases now and not increase and intensify the suffering of the needy dependents of these boys, and probably lower their morale by postponing these payments. Let us relieve their anxiety all we can by providing for these payments now.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, of course, I am entirely sympathetic toward doing anything to build up the morale of the soldiers and sailors and their dependents, and also the general public, and I was merely reciting some of the reasons why this clause was put in the bill and some of the substantial reasons, as I consider it, stated on the floor of the House earlier today. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. MAY] will be here on next Thursday, and, insofar as I am concerned, the matter will then be entirely in his hands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state with respect to special orders that while he has permitted it today, as well as the other day when we were in session, yet the Chair does not feel it is quite fair or just to those who follow to submit such a request. If there is no objection today from the Delegate from Alaska, the Chair will submit the gentleman's request.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I not only do not object but I join in the request and I hope the gentleman will be given all the time he desires.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield on the point he referred to a moment ago, I have before me now messages from 16 members of the Military Affairs Committee approving this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot yield any more until I have finished my statement, and I expect to be able to finish it in the 5 minutes.

If the Committee on Military Affairs favors the passage of the bill of the gentleman from Mississippi I shall be very happy to go along, but if they believe that the reasons put forth by the War Department are so substantial in their nature that they cannot go along with the proposition, then, of course, it is up to them; and if they do so believe, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be proper for this Congress, in order to avoid any charge of politics insofar as these payments are concerned, to pass an amendment which will postpone the payments until November 4. This would make payments go out after election day so

that no dependent would get a check before election day. Such action by us would absolutely refute the charge that politics entered into the consideration of this measure. Postponing the payments only 3 more days, provided the Military Affairs Committee does not agree to the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, would certainly show we had no political interest to serve, and would cause no considerable hardship generally to dependents.

As I said before, I want to do everything I can, and I recognize the sympathetic appeal that the arguments of the gentleman from Mississippi have, especially when we begin to recite some individual cases of hardship, but, of course, we have got to take into consideration the general morale of the country. So, Mr. Speaker, I took this time mainly for the purpose of bringing to the country at large and to the membership at large some of the reasons which entered into the actions of this House and this Congress and, particularly, with reference to the coming election. I hope I have made my position clear, and I think the gentleman from Mississippi will agree with me that at all times in the past, on every occasion, when any measure has come up which was for the benefit of the soldiers, sailors, marines, or their dependents, I have been wholeheartedly in sympathy with such measure and supported it to the best of my ability. Will the gentleman agree with me on that?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman has been very generous in his attitude toward the veterans, and he will support this amendment when the time comes to vote on it. I am sure of that.

Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] if there is any political reaction because of the postponement of the payment of these allowances and allotments, it will be because the American people feel that these dependents have been treated unjustly by the delay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House on next Thursday for 20 minutes, after all other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the Delegate from Alaska is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE SITUATION OF ALASKA, PARTICULARLY OF THE ALEUTIAN ISLANDS, IN THE WAR

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] for having spoken, even though not at as great length as I would have liked, on the subject of my address to the House today—the situation of Alaska, particularly of the Aleutian Islands, in the war. I know that the gentleman from Arkansas is deeply concerned with what is going on in the Aleutians because some hundreds of his constituents are there serving the Nation in the Army, and at least one of

them has made the supreme sacrifice that "freedom may not perish from the earth."

Those who have made a lifetime study of war as a science and an art agree that one aspect of it is well epitomized in the statement attributed to the late eminent Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, to the effect that the commander always wins who is able to bring the greatest striking power to the point of contact. The principle itself has been followed by successful generals from King Cyrus to Genghis Khan, to Napoleon and to Marshal Foch. No one has stated the principle more lucidly than our own General MacArthur. It is also admitted that the commander who holds with his forces the central position, and thus is able to move his troops on what are called the short, interior lines, always has the advantage of an enemy who must make a roundabout method of approach to the battle front. I sometimes suspect that military strategy has its foundation in hard common sense, and that a common-sense approach to any strategical problem is the one that is likely to be followed by the best military strategist in the world. In thinking of Lincoln, Lowell once observed that profound common sense is the best genius of statesmanship. It is possible that profound common sense is likewise the best genius of military strategy.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable discussion in recent weeks about a proposed second front. There appears to be uncertainty and perhaps disagreement as to the time and place and circumstances involved in the establishment of such a second front. Some of our nonofficial experts have severally advocated that a second front should be set up in Italy, in Norway, or in France.

People seem to forget that we already have, not a second front, but a first front on which war is now being carried on, and that first front is not in distant Europe or in far-off Asia, or Australia, but on the North American Continent, in the Aleutian Islands of Alaska. I respectfully suggest that it is the part of wisdom to bring to that front ample forces to win victory there, on our first fighting front, before we undertake the prodigious effort necessary to set up and establish and carry forward a second battle front some thousands of miles away from our shores in another continent. The first front in the Territory of Alaska demands immediate attention.

Months ago, when it appeared that the Japanese planned an invasion of the Australian Continent, we lost no time in giving to the Australians substantial aid. To the present moment I have heard no criticism of the action thus taken, although 7,000 miles intervene between San Francisco, Calif., and Sydney, Australia; Sydney evidently being the port of debarkation used for the troops and supplies which we send to Australia. From Sydney to Tokyo by air line is about 4,800 miles farther. It, therefore, appears that if we have any idea of carrying the war to Japan through Australia it is perfectly plain that the distances to be traversed are simply enormous, practically equivalent to going one-half way around the earth.

LXXXVIII—429

And yet, for several months past, in not far-off Australia but in a part of our own domain, in the Territory of Alaska, we have permitted the Japanese not only to seize but to retain and develop three of our Aleutian Islands which lie within 2,800 miles of the State of Washington, and not more than 2,200 miles from Tokyo; but up to the present moment we have not sent to that region sufficient power to expel the invader.

To those of us who live in Alaska, it would seem that it is just as important to drive the foe from our territory, a part of our own land, the possession of which will give him access to the North American Continent, as it is to keep the same enemy from occupying any part of a continent some 7,000 miles away.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I desire to commend the Delegate from Alaska for the timely address he is making on this occasion. Being familiar with the efforts which the gentleman has put forth and his diligence for many months in calling this very vital matter to the attention of the officials of the Government the Navy, and the Army and the Air Corps, I wish to say the gentleman has certainly put forth every effort to obtain action in regard to the matter he is discussing today. Living as I do in the State of Washington on the west coast, I think I express the opinion of the people out there when I say that we certainly agree with the Delegate from Alaska in his contention that steps should be taken, and that by this time they are being taken according to more recent developments of the last few days, to drive the Japanese out of American territory, in the Aleutians, which we do consider is a first front. It is reported that we are sending our men and our equipment to 30 different fronts in the world, which may be necessary and advisable. We do not have any fault to find with that, and I do not criticize our military and naval leaders, who are wisely deciding our strategy. But certainly the most important front as far as the immediate safety and security of America is concerned is the American front, and the Aleutians are a part of the American front.

Mr. DIMOND. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. I agree with him wholeheartedly. Like him, I have no criticism of anything that has been done by the administration or by the high command or the general staff, in sending troops to Asia or to Australia or to any other place in the world. It may be valuable. It may be in accordance with the sound plans, but I do suggest that upon the plain implications of common sense it would be well first, or if not first, then coordinately with the carrying out of these other plans, to drive the invader out of the North American Continent.

That part of the Territory of Alaska which is embraced in the Aleutian Islands and the surrounding regions have been the subject of considerable press and radio comment in recent weeks, in fact, ever since June 3, 1942, when the

Japanese raided Dutch Harbor from the air, and thereafter immediately seized and occupied the three westernmost of the Aleutians—Attu, Agattu, and Kiska Islands. The latest official information indicates that the Japanese still hold possession of these islands with upward of 10,000 men and a substantial air force, although we have attacked their installations from time to time by air, and recently on one occasion from the sea, and have inflicted substantial damage upon the enemy with our submarines.

The Aleutian Islands, measuring from False Pass at their easterly extremity to the extreme western end of Attu Island, extend east and west more than 1,000 miles. Lying about 200 miles northwest of Attu and about the same distance from the shores of Kamchatka Peninsula is another group of islands which are geographically a part of the same chain as the Aleutians. They are called Komandorski Islands, of which the largest, Bering Island, is named for the great Danish explorer, Vitus Bering, who, while in the employ of the Empress of Russia, discovered Alaska on July 16, 1741, just a little more than 200 years ago; and later in December of the same year, shipwrecked and in want, died on the shore of Bering Island. The Komandorski Islands now are a part, and for more than 200 years past have been a part, of Russia.

I mention those islands at this time because they are an important segment of the long Aleutian chain stretching between the two continents, North America and Asia, because the Russians have fortified them, and because nearly a year ago, when Russia then, as now, was struggling for her life against the assaults of Germany it seemed only too probable that in her dire extremity the Japanese would think the time propitious to move against Vladivostok and engulf and occupy, if possible, all the eastern coast of Siberia, including Komandorski Islands. I suggested that it would be in the interest of Russia as well as of ourselves if Russia would turn over the Komandorski group, including Bering Island, to us for safekeeping and thus prevent their occupation by Japan. Of course, it was proposed that the transaction should be a purely voluntary one, and was made in view of the fact that at that time our power in the Pacific seemed immense and that of Russia relatively weak. It then seemed that the safety of Russia, as well as of the United States, would be truly served were we then to be permitted to occupy and hold the Komandorski Islands.

It is now evident that my estimate made in August 1941 of the relative military and naval power of Russia and the United States in the north Pacific was completely erroneous, for since that date, although the Komandorski Islands are still, so far as I am aware, in the undisputed possession of the Soviet Russian Government, three of our vital Aleutian Islands, lying 200 miles to the southeast of the Komandorski Islands, have been seized, and for approximately 2 months have been held by the Japanese without serious dispute on our part. Perhaps it would have been better if an offer had

been made that the Russians should take over all of the western Aleutians and thus protect and save them from occupation by the Japanese, rather than we should take over the Komandorski Islands for the same purpose.

From both official and unofficial comment it is evident that there is lack of complete information, amounting in some cases to misinformation, as to the Aleutian Islands, and the importance of their possession in the war now being fought, a war which may be conceivably enlarged in the near future by fighting between the Russians and the Japanese.

Many people seem to be under the impression that the Aleutian Islands lie much farther to the north than is actually the case. An ordinary map, better still a globe, will show that the Aleutians are roughly embraced between the fifty-first and fifty-fifth parallels of north latitude. If we should take the Aleutian Islands, bunch them up, and slip them directly east between the same parallels of latitude, the fifty-first and fifty-fifth, until they arrived over England, we would find that the several Aleutian Islands would be suspended over England, from the shores of the English Channel on the south to Solway Firth and Newcastle in the north; and if we could carry them still farther east between the same parallels of latitude, they would come to rest in the northern half of pre-war Germany between a line passing roughly through Duesseldorf and Leipzig in the south and thence extending north to the boundary line of Denmark; and if we should transport the Aleutian Islands still farther to the east, still keeping them in their present position between the fifty-first and fifty-fifth degrees of north latitude, we would find them lodging in the southern half of Russia, on White Russia, the central black-soil area, and a part of the Ukraine. So we see that all the Aleutian Islands are well within the north temperate zone and that in the northern extremity are they more than 700 miles south of the Arctic Circle.

When we consider in connection with their geographical location the further fact that all this area is warmed by the easterly flowing Kuroshio or Japan current, which originates in the Tropics, engulfs the Japanese islands, and then divides, a part going to the Okhotsk Sea and the greater portion eastward along the Aleutians and the coast of Alaska, we ought to know, with plenty of assurance on the point, that the climate of the Aleutians is mild and that no sea ice has ever been known to form there. On both sides of the Aleutians we have the ocean open for traffic without hindrance every day in the year.

A great deal has been said about the unattractiveness of the climate of the Aleutians, particularly with respect to fog as well as rain and wind. It is true that the Aleutians have what is known as marine climate, that is to say, a damp climate with considerable fog. But the same thing can be truly said of the British Isles and of many other places in the world which are exposed to the sea. One might even say that the coasts of Washington and Oregon have the ad-

vantage or disadvantage, whichever it may be, of having a marine climate. The same condition exists with respect to the coast of British Columbia. It is even more true of Iceland, which we apparently consider an important point in our war strategy.

The most comprehensive statement embraced within reasonable compass which I know of concerning the Aleutians, their climate and strategic importance, is contained in an article appearing in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, issue of June 1941, commencing at page 830, written by Mr. W. L. Goldsborough. To the best of my knowledge, the data contained in this article is accurate and reliable. Let me quote a part of it:

A description of the climatic and living conditions at Dutch Harbor, Unalaska, is contained in the article on Life in the Aleutian Islands, United States Naval Institute Proceedings, July 1937, pages 1001-1008, the author stating, among other things, that in a normal year the temperature varies between 10 and 70° F. The climate of the Aleutians is oceanic, with moderate and fairly uniform humidity. The mean temperature at Dutch Harbor during the midwinter month is given as 32.6°, and that during the midsummer month as 54.8°. A comparison of the monthly pilot charts of the North Pacific (Unimak-Avacha) for a year with the monthly pilot charts of the more familiar North Atlantic (Lands End-Halifax) for the same year showed icebergs in the Atlantic in 5 months and none in the Pacific, more days with fog in the Atlantic than in the Pacific in each of the 8 months from October to May, a higher percentage of time with gales in the Atlantic in every month except September and November, and a higher percentage of hours with calms and light airs in the Pacific in every month except February, in which month the percentage in the two oceans was the same.

While this does not indicate any insupportable or insufferable climate, there is much fog and rain. But the same is true of the north Atlantic area between Halifax and Lands End. It is no better at Scapa Flow in the Orkneys, which for many years before the present war was the great base of the main British Fleet, and we must remember that Scapa Flow lies 300 miles farther north than does any part of the Aleutians.

Mr. Goldsborough refers to another statement or article entitled "Life in the Aleutian Islands," printed in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings in the issue of July 1937, written by Lt. Cmdr. W. M. Lockhart, United States Navy. In this article Commander Lockhart makes the following observation with respect to the climate of Dutch Harbor, which is characteristic of the Aleutians generally:

A large percentage of the days are cloudy, clear days being the exception, but at Dutch Harbor the sun does appear for varying periods at least three-fourths of the total days of the year. Temperatures are moderate and never have been known to go below 5° F. nor above 80° F.

That the climate of the Aleutians is not completely inhospitable for human beings is attested by the fact that when Alaska was discovered by the Russians in 1741, more than two centuries ago, ap-

proximately 25,000 healthy and well-fed native Aleuts inhabited this area. They were oppressed and enslaved by the Russians of that day and were particularly susceptible to the diseases brought to them by the white men and fell easy prey to the ravages of alcohol. As a result, the islands were largely depopulated and in recent years have been used largely as fox farms for both the natives and by white men.

The Aleutian Islands are virtually the summits of a subterranean mountain chain extending from Asia to North America. As a consequence, the surface of most of these islands is rugged and in places steeply mountainous. Nevertheless, considerable areas of relatively level ground are available where airfields can be constructed at comparatively small expense. Doubtless we have undertaken some such construction in the eastern part of the Aleutians, and there is plenty of evidence now to indicate that the Japanese are doing the same thing on Kiska and perhaps on Attu. The islands possess several good harbors, of which the best known are Dutch Harbor and the harbor at Kiska. Dutch Harbor has been developed as a naval base by us in recent years, but some damage was done to the installations by the raid of the Japanese which took place on June 3 and June 4 of this year. Until the Japanese took over Kiska Island, the truly excellent natural harbor at that island was totally undeveloped. With respect to the harbors in the Aleutians, as compared with harbors in other parts of the Pacific, Mr. Goldsborough, in the article referred to, has this to say:

It will be noted that the director anticipates no ice on the winter run north of the Aleutians. Increased facilities, or possibly help from the Navy or the Coast Guard or both, would result in the completion of the Aleutian surveys long before 1946.

Existing charts are good enough, however, to show that in the Aleutians there are three harbors (in the case of Unalaska, groups of harbors) each larger than any in our more southerly Pacific islands east of the Philippines—the Unalaska group, the Bay of Waterfalls (Adak Island), and Kiska Harbor—besides several smaller harbors, one of which, Constantine (Amchitka Island), is entitled to rank in size with Pago Pago. In the following table the first three harbors are in the south and the last four in the Aleutians.

Capacity of mid-Pacific harbors

Harbor	Berths		
	First class	Second class	Third class
Pearl Harbor.....	4	17	60
Pago Pago.....	7	13	34
Guam.....	11	13	30
Constantine Harbor.....	9	13	25
Bay of Waterfalls.....	23	45	65
Kiska Harbor.....	40	84	115
Unalaska group ¹			

¹ Accommodation for the entire fleet.

In the case of Pearl Harbor, the above information as to capacity is not recent, since charts of that area are now treated as confidential and are not open to the public. However, in June 1940, our press reported that the major units of our fleet in the Hawaiian Islands were at Lahaina Roads and not at Pearl Harbor, so that Pearl Harbor capacity may not

have been greatly increased. The entrance to each of the Aleutian harbors is narrow enough (the Unalaska group one-half to 2 miles, Bay of Waterfalls $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles, Constantine 1 mile, Kiska 2 miles) to be readily mined and defended against submarines, while not a single mid-Pacific island under our flag south of the Aleutians has a harbor that answers fleet requirements as to both size and defensibility. Pearl Harbor, Pago Pago, and Guam are much too small to accommodate a large force of warships and its train of lesser vessels, and Lahaina is an open roadstead between the islands of Maui, Molokai, Lanai, and Kahoolawe.

I recall distinctly that one of the smaller islands is known to some who visited that region as the Golf Course, because there is on that island a considerable area that is as level as any floor.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman point that out on the map?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I have brought here a map of this area which gives a truer representation of the Aleutian Islands and the North Pacific generally than can be found on any ordinary map that may be found in an atlas.

This is known, according to the words printed on it as "Transverse polyconic projection" of the North Pacific region. This map gives, on a flat surface, the best and most accurate representation that can be given of the curved surface of the earth in that area. It is not practicable to bring a globe into the House and point out the various features to the Members, and this map or chart is the best substitute. Now here is the island that is called the Golf Course.

You will see from an inspection of this map that the direct and short line between the west coast of the United States and the Empire of Japan goes directly through the Aleutian Islands. If we proceed by the shortest route from the city of Seattle to Yokohama, which is the great port of Japan and very near to Tokyo, one would enter the Bering Sea at the eastern end of the Aleutian Islands and would come out of the Bering Sea just west of the island of Kiska, which has been seized and held by the Japanese.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Is it not a fact that that is an important link in our supply line to Russia? The Aleutian Islands are absolutely on the direct supply line to Russia.

Mr. DIMOND. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but to finish the sentence I was attempting to complete when my time expired, when one reflects upon the fact that Kiska lies a little south of the shortest line between the northern part of the coast of the United States and Tokyo, one can readily understand why the Japanese put their thousands of

men and dozens and dozens of ships and airplanes into this area and seized it with such force that they have been able to hold it up until the present moment although we have done considerable bombing from the air against their installations, and within the last two or three days they have been fiercely assaulted by our Navy vessels. So, whoever is in possession of Kiska—and Kiska has really a fine harbor, one of the finest natural harbors in the world, and as pointed out by Mr. Goldsborough, it is much larger and much more commodious than Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian Islands—is on the direct route between the United States and Japan, and, also, these islands lie on the route we would naturally take if we sought to send any substantial amount of supplies to Russia.

So if the question is asked as to whether these islands have any strategic importance, I can answer only in the words that were uttered by a naval officer, as I am informed, to some newspaper and radio correspondent, "Well, you look at the map and decide for yourselves whether they have any strategic importance." If common sense means anything it means that the seizure and holding of Kiska, Attu, and Agattu Islands by the Japanese are of the highest strategic importance and may be a serious factor in the war which is only now just begun and for which we were so poorly prepared.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Is it not a fact also that those islands being in the possession of Japan is certainly a menace to Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. Oh, unquestionably so, because Kiska Island is less than 600 miles from Dutch Harbor, and an accumulation of power by the enemy at Kiska might, in case of a surprise attack, conceivably endanger or lose us Dutch Harbor. Surprise means almost everything, as witness what happened on December 7 last at Pearl Harbor. It has been said that the Japanese have little power there. The Navy has said that the indications are they have not over 10,000 men, but I have here some newspaper articles written by Keith Wheeler, to which I shall refer later.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Does the gentleman agree with the statement that was made many years ago by the late lamented Gen. Billy Mitchell that whoever possesses Alaska possesses the most strategic point in the world? Does the gentleman think that General Mitchell was right about that?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, not only do I think the late great General Mitchell was correct in that, just as he was about the supremacy of air power, which everybody now is willing to admit, but I have cited him as authority on many, many occasions.

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

Mr. DIMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. As the gentleman knows, I have been following the gentle-

man from Alaska for some time, and I am here today to hear the gentleman's speech. Of course, it is dangerous for a layman to attempt to controvert a position taken by military experts in connection with our fighting forces, but does the gentleman think that with the air forces and the vessels available at this time a successful attack can now be made?

Mr. DIMOND. To answer the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, may I say that I have no doubt that we have somewhere the power necessary to drive the Japanese out of the Aleutians.

Mr. PATRICK. We are involved in the Solomon Islands right now.

Mr. DIMOND. We are involved in many places, but we must have the power available. The President announced some time ago that we have 4,000,000 men under arms. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania not so very long ago—just today in the House—estimated the number to be 4,500,000. The President also announced—and this is the only reason I repeat it—that our production of airplanes for a single month was 4,000. Although, as we all know, we were not prepared at all for the war, or for any war, with this substantial and growing power I respectfully suggest—and that is all I do—that more attention should be given to the threat which is now pointed at us, a threat not only to Alaska but to all the people of the country, in the possession by the Japanese of these Aleutian Islands. When I say this I am not criticizing the Army or the Navy, but I earnestly urge the sound reasons for driving the enemy out of the Aleutians now, before they have a chance to augment and consolidate their forces there.

The high importance of the Aleutians will be disclosed only by the examination of that area on a globe, or on such a map as you now see before you here. While, as I said, there is necessarily some distortion on this map, it is not nearly so great as is the case with most other maps, particularly the mercator projection, which envisions the world as a cylinder and not as a sphere.

From this map, and still better, from a globe, it will be seen that the short air line between the United States and the central part of Russia passes through Alaska and northern Siberia. From Seattle to Dutch Harbor the distance is about 1,900 miles, and from Dutch Harbor to Tokyo, about 2,800 miles; but if one should go from Tokyo to any point on the western part of the United States by way of the Hawaiian Islands, the distance necessary to be traversed would be approximately 6,300 miles, or 1,500 miles farther than the Great Circle route through the Aleutians.

If, in modern warfare, the aim of a successful commander is to use the short, interior line, and thus to bring to bear at the point of contact the superior force, then it must be obvious that Alaska, with its Aleutian Islands, is the most vital, strategic area in this war between the United States and Japan. That must have been the view of the Japanese in 1922 when, at their insistence, there was incorporated in the Treaty of Limitation of Naval Armament, signed on February 6, 1922, a provision that we might put no

fortifications or naval bases anywhere in the Aleutians. They insisted upon that provision in the treaty and we agreed to it. It must have been with some such thought in mind—that is, the outstanding strategic importance of Alaska and the Aleutians in the current war—that impelled the Japanese to run the risk of seizing Kiska, Attu, and Agattu and establishing themselves there.

A glance at the map will show that whoever controls the Aleutians has a strangle hold on Bering Sea and may have a strangle hold on all traffic which is sought to be carried between Alaska and Russia. After all, it is only 54 miles across Bering Strait, and anyone who is familiar with conditions in that northern region must be certain that the day is not far distant that the flow of air-borne traffic between the United States and Canada on one side and Russia and China on the other, will pass through Alaska over or near Bering Strait, and thence west and south into Russia and China.

Long, long ago, the importance of Alaska in any contest between the United States and Japan was seen and forecast by that strange genius, Gen. Homer Lea. In his book entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," in which he prophesied the taking over of the Philippines by Japan, and the exact route of the invading forces, with a startling forecast of almost the exact length of time that would be required to take the city of Manila, General Lea turned his attention for a moment to Alaska and has this to say:

As the control of the South Pacific is determined by a proper naval utilization of Pago Pago, so is the naval dominion of the north Pacific determined by the possession of Alaska, and the strategic positions of the harbors on the peninsula. As far as this Republic is concerned, Alaska is as insular as the Philippines, and sovereignty over it is determined by the same factors (pages 197-199).

It seems somewhat singular that in our desire to give aid to Russia against the German invader we have not sought to route that aid westerly instead of easterly. Up until the present moment, we have sent our ships, under convoy, through the hazardous North Atlantic and the Arctic Ocean to Murmansk. According to reports, the fate of some of those convoys is lamentable indeed. It should be remembered that it is approximately 4,000 miles in direct line from New York City to Murmansk. It is almost the same distance from the city of Nome to Moscow. In this connection it is worthy of note that the Russians have successfully established a summer sea route along the northern coast of Siberia and through Bering Strait. If we drive the Japanese out of the Aleutians, which we should have done weeks ago, and which we ought to do tomorrow at the latest, and thus make Bering Sea an American lake, it would be much safer and almost as speedy to route our supplies during the summer months to Russia through Bering Sea and Bering Strait and along the north coast of Siberia, to one of the great rivers that penetrate into the interior, like the Lena or the Ob. With the development of air power, the

northern part of the northern hemisphere—that whole area surrounding the Arctic Ocean—attains, by the indisputable facts of geography, an importance never even suspected before, when we depended for transportation upon the sea and the land.

The strategists know, indeed, we all realize, that we are not going to beat Japan until we carry the war to Japan itself, and that defensive operations alone can lead to nothing but stalemate or defeat. In view of all these circumstances it is amazing that a more vigorous effort has not been made to eject the Japanese from the Aleutians, particularly from Kiska, where they have the advantage of a good natural harbor and sufficient level land available for an airfield. The nature of the Japanese operations at Kiska and Attu has been revealed to us in a serial article written by Mr. Keith Wheeler, copyright by Chicago Times, Inc., appearing in a number of newspapers, including the Washington Evening Star. The serial article appeared in the Star commencing with the issue of July 19 and continuing for a week or more. From the issues of July 19 and July 20, 1942, I quote the following:

The Japanese are moving into these waters with as heavy a concentration of combat ships, transports, and aircraft as they have assembled anywhere but at Midway. Their cruisers and destroyers and two or more aircraft carriers provided for this show grope about in the eternal fogs, waiting for the time to shoot the works. * * *

Attu, formerly inhabited by one Aleut Indian fox farmer, had suddenly become populous. Many landing boats were drawn up on the beach and tents were pitched on the tundra shore.

By night the bombers noted evidence the Japs planned a permanent occupation. Attu showed signs of construction work and shore-based Nakajima 97 fighters rose from Kiska to meet the American craft. The harbor was empty of ships that night, but next day they came back, appearing in increasing numbers throughout the daylight hours.

By night Kiska's harbor held 5 heavy cruisers, 2 light cruisers, 10 destroyers, 2 submarines, 9 cargo and transport vessels, and a dozen Kawanishi flying boats, seaplane, and land-based observation and fighter aircraft haunted the murky sky. Other ships were sighted arriving from the south. * * *

The fortress bombers, working over the harbor, discovered still more evidence of a permanent establishment when ack-ack fire from the ships got support from gun emplacements on the hills.

It is evident from Mr. Wheeler's article, which must have been passed by the military censor, that the Japanese have moved into the Aleutian Islands to stay. What Mr. Wheeler says fully justifies the first reports that came to me that there were 25,000 Japanese troops in the islands, although the only Navy announcement on the subject indicates that their number does not exceed 10,000. It will be noted that Mr. Wheeler says the Japanese are moving into these waters with as heavy a concentration of combat ships, transports, and aircraft as they have assembled anywhere but at Midway; that they evidently plan a permanent occupation; that signs of construction work were seen at Attu, and that shore-based Nakajima 97 fighters rose from Kiska to meet the American aircraft.

It must be evident that when shore-based combat planes of the Japanese come off Kiska Island to fight the American planes, some sort of landing field must already have been established on Kiska. Further on Mr. Wheeler mentions land-based observation and fighter aircraft of the Japanese in the sky over these islands, and he reports that on one occasion Kiska Harbor held 5 heavy cruisers, 2 light cruisers, 10 destroyers, 2 submarines, 9 cargo and transport vessels, and a dozen Kawanishi flying boats, and—this is equally important—that other ships were sighted arriving from the south. If, as thought by some, this occupation of Kiska, Attu, and Agattu, by the Japanese is only a face-saving gesture, it must be admitted that it is at least a powerful gesture and that up until the present moment, so far as we know, we have not provided enough power to drive the enemy out.

It is said that in the fog and the wind and the rain it is difficult to fly in the Aleutians and to operate there. Every possible change is rung upon that theme. Yet, it appears that it must be equally difficult to fly or to operate in the North Atlantic between Lands End and Halifax. It must be equally difficult to fly and to operate in the Scapa Flow region which was for years the headquarters of the British Fleet. Many, many commentators have pointed out that the Japanese, too, must operate in the Aleutian fogs.

While there can be no doubt as to the prevalence of fog in the Aleutian area, it is clearly not so thick, or so terrible, or so permanent that aircraft is unable to operate. In fact, our aircraft, as well as the Japanese aircraft, do operate there. The tale of the heroism and the valor and the persistence of our flyers in their fighting in that region has never been surpassed in all the world. It is a bright page, indeed, in the history of our military operations, and we can all well be proud of it. The only sad part is that we did not provide a larger and a more suitable force. After all, the PBV's, or Catalina flying boats, are scarcely suited for combat operations.

Our military pilots should be given plenty of training and experience in flying in fog and other adverse weather conditions before being assigned to combat service in the Aleutians. A job which would be relatively easy, so far as the flying is concerned, for pilots like those in civilian transport service in Alaska, might be confusing and almost terrifying to those without such training. Pilots who have been taught to fly in southern California, or in Texas, or in some other midcontinent area where fog is rare and rain seldom falls, and who for the safety of equipment as well as their own safety are required to remain on the ground in unfavorable weather, may find it difficult to fly in any area where fog is prevalent as in the Aleutians. All military and naval pilots should be given an intensive course of training in flying in fog, and rain, and wind in northwestern parts of the United States on the coast or in Alaska before they are ordered to fight and fly in the Aleutian area. The civilian pilots in Alaska have no difficulty in flying

practically every day of the year because they are familiar with the climate and most of them with the terrain. In any event they find no hardship and no difficulty in flying in ordinary fog conditions, particularly where they are over the sea and can thus fly close to the surface of the ocean. What is needed is plenty and plenty of training on the part of the pilots before they are put into the battle line, and training in the kind of weather in which they may be obliged to fight.

Whatever forces are necessary should be used to drive the Japanese from the Aleutians and to send them reeling back at least as far as the islands which have traditionally been theirs. It would be still better to mass a full-scale force against them and take over their base at Paramushiru Island and thus give some sort of guaranty against finding the Japanese eventually at Bering Strait, just 54 miles from the mainland of Alaska. This view ought to be in accord with high strategic considerations because it is in harmony with the plain concepts of common sense.

Another reason thus presents itself, why the Japs should not be permitted to remain in the Aleutians. We all know that a state of neutrality exists between Japan and Russia. Since the leaders of both these nations are realists, it must be sufficiently obvious that peace between them will last only as long as both consider it advantageous to have that peace continue. It must be plain that the Russians are able to restrain their admiration for the Japanese, and that the Japanese feel the same way toward the Russians. Moreover, there must be a bit of uneasiness on the part of the high command of the Japanese in having a potential hostile air base at Vladivostok within 700 miles of Tokyo. Relations between the Japanese and the Russians remind me of the story of a witty and cynical Frenchman whose nephew was to be married. The uncle said, "My boy, you must remember that in every marriage one of the parties is always taken in; you should try to be the other party." In the treaty of peace and neutrality made between Japan and Russia some time ago, it seems highly probable that one of the parties was taken in. Evidently each of them thinks it was the other party who was so taken in. Time will doubtless disclose which one is correct. In any event, according to strategists of high and low degree, and even to people like myself, who claim to possess only common sense, it seems highly likely that the year will not close without an attack upon Siberia by Japan, with a view of engulfing all of the eastern part of that area clear up to Bering Strait, particularly Kamchatka Peninsula, as well as the interior shores of Okhotsk Sea. Strategy of high and low degree, as well as common sense likewise dictate to us that we should not sit idly by and permit Japan to thus make herself our close and next-door neighbor, and that to prevent it, we should exert every power that we possess, not only to drive the Japanese out of eastern Siberia, but from that vantage point to carry the

war by air at least to Japan itself. There ought not be any dispute about the strategy of that action.

As long as Japan lies in our straight path between the United States and Petropavlovsk by holding on to Kiska, Attu, and Agattu Islands, we will have difficulty in bringing to the Russians the relief that they may sorely need. Again, the stubborn facts relative to the geographical aspects of the earth in this region show that we should immediately drive the Japanese out of the Aleutians and thus hold Bering Sea for the use of ourselves and the Russians.

Within the past week some reference has been made to the possibility of the occupation of the Pribilof Islands by the Japanese. A Navy report indicates that no Japanese have been seen on the Pribilofs, but the Navy is evidently unable to give any positive assurance as to whether the Japanese are on the Pribilofs or not.

These islands, only 2 of which, St. Paul and St. George, are large enough to be of any consequence, are commonly called the seal islands. These are the islands to which the fur seals come every spring to bear their young and remain there for the summer, and from which they go away in the fall. More than 2,000,000 seals came to the islands in 1941, and under the management of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the number is steadily increasing. Approximately 60,000 pelts of seals are taken from the islands every year. The value of the output is something more than \$1,000,000 annually. The seals constitute a substantial resource and, of course, should the islands be in the possession of the Japanese for any one season, the seals could be all but exterminated. The furs, as well as the flesh and oil, would be extremely useful to any nation like the Japanese.

The Pribilof Islands lie about 200 miles slightly west of north from Dutch Harbor and a little farther from the mainland of Alaska. It is almost inconceivable that we would calmly submit to having the islands in the possession of an enemy, but it is evident that our own sovereignty is somewhat tenuous because we are not even sure whether the Japanese are there or not. It is truly a singular condition and would seem to indicate the need for a substantial increase in our naval and military power in Alaska.

To carry on any work in Alaska, either of a commercial or a military nature, among the prime requisites are petroleum and petroleum products. While there are a number of potential oil areas in Alaska, none has been developed, except a very small area near Katalla where several shallow wells have been drilled, but the output is insignificant. It would seem the part of wisdom, in view of the strategic consequence of Alaska, to promptly drill and attempt to develop one or more of these potential oil areas. At the present time all oil and gasoline and kindred products must be brought into Alaska from the States, and as a practical matter it must all go by sea. The shortage of shipping is a serious factor in the supply of Alaska with petroleum products. We all know that any

considerable military force in Alaska will vastly increase the amount of oil and gasoline used there.

There is one particular area in Alaska north of the Arctic Circle and bordering on the Arctic coast where petroleum is assumed to exist in considerable quantities, although completely undeveloped. I believe it would be highly advisable to immediately drill that area, and if oil is found there to bring it by pipe line from the point of production to the Pacific coast of Alaska and to the interior of Alaska. I say this the more confidently because according to information at hand plans are under way to supply Alaska with oil from the Fort Norman field on the Mackenzie River in Northwest Territory, Canada, approximately 400 miles north of the northerly boundary line of British Columbia. My information on the subject is largely derived from a statement made in the Canadian Parliament on May 15 by Hon. C. D. Howe, minister of munitions and supply, appearing on page 2696 of the official report of the House of Commons Debates. On this occasion, Mr. Howe made the following statement:

Arrangements have been made to develop further the wells on the lower Mackenzie at Fort Norman. Additional wells are being drilled, the refinery capacity is being increased, and a short pipe line is being installed to bring the oil across to the location of the Alaska highway.

The short pipe line mentioned by Mr. Howe, if it comes to the nearest point on the highway to Alaska now under construction, at or near Whitehorse, will be more than 450 miles long. But the oil which may be piped from the Fort Norman field to the nearest point on the Alaska highway will still be approximately 600 miles from Fairbanks, in the center of Alaska, which is also the head of the Alaska Railroad. I suggest that it would be much more to our advantage to attempt to develop our own field in northern Alaska, or other fields in the southern part of the Territory. Even from the northern Alaska field a pipe line to Fairbanks, Alaska, would be little longer than the one from the Fort Norman oil field to Whitehorse.

The bringing into Alaska of oil from Canada without any attempt to develop our own internal source of supply would be regrettable. However, if it is determined to make use of the Fort Norman oil, then, by all means, the pipe line to supply Alaska should go directly from Fort Norman to Fairbanks, a distance of about 670 miles. Oil in Fairbanks will be in the principal center of distribution for Alaska and can be transported to other places needed over the Alaska Railroad and the Richardson Highway and by the Yukon River to the Bering Sea coast. Although the distance between Fort Norman and Fairbanks is greater than the distance between Fort Norman and the nearest point on the Alaska highway at Whitehorse, the country through which the pipe line would be laid to Fairbanks is much more suitable for pipe-line construction than is the other area between Fort Norman and Whitehorse. The Rocky Mountains become lower as the Arctic coast is approached, and a low and

easy route could readily be found between Fort Norman and Fairbanks, whereas to bring a pipe line from Fort Norman to Whitehorse would involve the crossing of high mountains and result in expensive construction difficult to maintain.

Venturing again into the field of strategy and basing what I have to say upon the promptings of common sense and understanding, I join with practically everyone else in Alaska who is familiar with conditions there in suggesting that there ought to be a really unified command of all our forces in Alaska, whether operating on the land or on the sea or in the air. The advantages which will accrue from a truly unified command ought to be so plainly obvious as to need no supporting argument. A few days ago announcement was made that the command in the Aleutians had been unified. While that action is admirable, so far as it goes, it is, after all, only one of those half measures or quarter measures which may give false confidence without really remedying the evil aimed at.

The Aleutian area is not militarily self-supporting. Whatever forces are used in that region must be brought in from elsewhere, and most of those forces will naturally come in from the Alaska mainland. In order to give real virtue and effect to unified command of forces used in the Aleutians, it is necessary, absolutely necessary, to go much further and provide a unified command for at least all the forces of the Territory of Alaska. Only thus can the Army and Navy and Air Force work and fight to greatest advantage and with greatest striking power.

What is said here is not offered in criticism of any Army or Navy or Air Force officer in Alaska. So far as I am aware, the commanding officers of the services are highly competent, but I know, as everyone knows, that there can be no such high degree of cooperation among the various divided branches of the services as they exist at present as would be the case if we had a completely unified command, with all power over all branches in the services in that command, so that all our forces fighting in that region would work and operate and fight as a unit, and thus bring the success for which we all so ardently hope.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have just made and to include therein some brief excerpts from documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House ad-

joined until Thursday, August 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1845. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting in accordance with section 20 of Public Law 607, Seventy-seventh Congress, a report of the Army of the United States for the 60 days beginning June 1, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1846. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting in compliance with the provisions of section 3 of an act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government, approved August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1219-1221), herewith list of papers, consisting of 199 items; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1847. A letter from the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1848. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers recommended by him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941, approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1850. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1851. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to expedite the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2333, current session, on the bill entitled "To provide revenue, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 512. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript of an article showing that the vote cast by Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, was the deciding factor in the election of Thomas Jefferson as the third President of the United States, be printed as a House document; with amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7482. A bill granting increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; with amendment (Rept. No. 2394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7392) granting an increase of pension to George Bunch, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7481. A bill to provide that the fund for the relief of sick and disabled and destitute seamen belonging to the United States merchant marine service shall also be for the relief of sick, disabled, destitute, or needy dependents of deceased seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to provide that gasoline shall not be rationed in the State of Georgia, and other States working under like handicap; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7482. A bill granting an increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 7483. A bill for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory; 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:

3288. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 109 members of the Epworth Methodist Church and Sunday School of New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., urging legislation which will remove alcoholic liquor and vice from around and in the training camps of the armed forces of our country, and especially the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3289. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. C. C. Webb, of Highland, Kans., and 156 others, requesting eradication of the vice and liquor from our Army camps and their surroundings; if this can be accomplished only by national prohibition, we insist that the President of these United States declare national prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3290. Also, petition of Grace Wilson and 23 other members of the Presbyterian Church of Winchester, Kans., urging the immediate enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3291. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Paterson, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal tax on present or future municipal, county, or State bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.