

Isaac A. Smoot, Salt Lake City, Utah, in place of I. A. Smoot. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

James Walton, Tremonton, Utah, in place of James Walton. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Mabel C. Crockett, Bishop, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lewis C. Jamison, Boones Mill, Va., in place of L. C. Jamison. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Jessie M. Cross, Concord Depot, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Emmett L. Allen, Glenallen, Va., in place of E. L. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Wilbert D. R. Proffitt, Highland Springs, Va., in place of W. D. R. Proffitt. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Emily T. Slaydon, Hollins College, Va., in place of M. E. Cocke, resigned.

Howard O. Rock, Irvington, Va., in place of H. O. Rock. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Walter McC. Greer, Rockymount, Va., in place of W. McC. Greer. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Florence E. Harris, Scottsburg, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ralph P. Mayo, University of Richmond, Va., in place of F. L. Schofield, resigned.

William Nelson Page, Winchester, Va., in place of W. N. Page. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WASHINGTON

LeRoy B. Bronemann, Fall City, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ada B. Steiner, Berkeley Springs, W. Va., in place of A. B. Steiner. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Lucille Jividen, Leon, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rose B. Crabbe, Ranson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maurice C. Carpenter, Reedy, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Charles F. Chenoweth, Hixton, Wis., in place of J. T. Simons, resigned.

Charles D. Cross, Larsen, Wis., in place of C. D. Cross. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

Lawrence E. Astin, Milton Junction, Wis., in place of L. E. Astin. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

Miles Colligan, Wautoma, Wis., in place of Miles Colligan. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 13, 1942:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TO BE THE ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Charles I. Stanton

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

Charles A. Schoene
William R. Tucker
Phillip A. Weber

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SURGEONS

George William Bolin
Claude D. Head, Jr.

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

James F. Maddux
Nunzio J. Carozzo
C. Dudley Miller
William D. Hazlehurst
Carl Enna
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Eugene J. Gillespie

Robert W. Biach
Bertrand E. Bennisson
James N. White
John F. Flynn, Jr.
Eugene Meyer 3d
Herbert Tabor
Robert T. Potter

I. Ray Howard
Robert H. English
Joseph P. Kesler
Edward T. Blomquist
Robert M. Thomas
Harry J. Schweigert
Edward W. Kunckel
Bernard D. Davis
Carlton H. Waters
Clarence J. Kooiker
Buell S. Bindschedler
John B. Spriggs
Roy A. Darke
William H. Errgong
John C. Cutler
Spurgeon M. Wingo
David S. Ruhe
Carruth J. Wagner
George W. Comstock
William L. Hewitt
Marion B. Richmond
Charles W. Parker
William Champlin
Lewis
Chester M. Sidell
Phillip H. Best

Richard G. Henderson
Anthony J. Lund
Oliver H. Lawton
Alfred W. Yeager
H. Charles Franklin
William C. Jenkins, Jr.
Mayo L. Emory
Theodore L. Chamberlin
Henry D. Ecker
Robert V. Holman
John L. Lincoln
Ralph R. Nix
Elsworth L. Gardner
Paul V. Joliet
Joseph L. Bryant
Emery F. Word
Herbert E. Pedersen
Robert N. Lord
Randolph P. Grimm
Richard C. Siders
John C. Grier, Jr.
Elmer L. Hill
Robert M. Foote
James M. Hundley
Walter B. Quisenberry

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 13, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Lord God Almighty, Thou our everlasting portion, teach us the patience of unanswerd prayer. Descend upon our hearts, stoop to our weaknesses that we may serve Thee as we should. To all those to whom hast been committed the responsibility of government grant wisdom, counsel, and understanding. O Spirit of God, subdue all selfishness and ambition for self-praise, making us bold to take up and firm to sustain our righteous cause.

Dear Lord, the present demands the mainspring of faith, compelling our citizens to high ideals, affirming the conviction that all powers of our country must be laid on her altar. If the days be marked with tears and sacrifice, Oh, make us strong and willing to endure with an exulting soul, leading us to the hilltops of victory and peace, aflame with loyalty to the uttermost. Father of boundless mercy, we offer our prayer for all men and women facing peril in battle; for those who are in industry, at furnaces, in factories, and in mines; we would remember them and bear them to the throne of grace. We pray that they may believe in Thee and believing may have hearts for any fate. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on July 9, 1942, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4604. An act for the relief of Doris Mongol Rai;

H. R. 5819. An act directing the Attorney General to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Vivian Chang;

H. R. 6081. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on any commissioned officer of the Army retirement privileges provided in the act of June 13, 1940;

H. R. 7137. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7159. An act authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7349. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the month of July 1942.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7282. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War," approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans" and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7242. An act to authorize temporary appointments in the Army of the United States of officers on duty with the Medical Administrative Corps; and

H. J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by exempting from tax the amount paid for admissions to theaters and other activities operated by the War Department or the Navy Department within posts, camps, reservations, and other areas maintained by the Military or Naval Establishment.

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

S. 2364. An act for the relief of former First Lt. William J. Tepsic, One Hundred and Seventy-sixth Field Artillery.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Federal Trade Commission.
4. National Housing Agency.

5. The National Archives.
6. War Production Board.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 4355. An act for the relief of Bella Cosgrove;
 H. R. 4370. An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair;
 H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Ferd W. Meile;
 H. R. 5295. An act for the relief of the estate of Romano Emilliani;
 H. R. 5385. An act for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.;
 H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin; and
 H. R. 5499. An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of State.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Civil Service Commission.
6. Federal Security Agency.

GREETINGS FROM CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF NICARAGUA

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

SECRETARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D. C.:

The Chamber of Deputies of Nicaragua sends cordial greetings to your Chamber on the anniversary of American independence, expressing solidarity of ideals in the struggle for the liberty of the world.

ENOC AGUADO, *President.*
 ANDRES LARGAESPADA,
 JUAN MODESTO ZAMORA,
Secretaries.

SCRAP RUBBER

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol rubber-salvage drive has been a tremendous success. It gives me a great deal of genuine pleasure to announce to my colleagues that 5,480 pounds of scrap rubber was gathered from the House and Senate Office Buildings and from the Capitol itself. That is going some.

Most of you will recall that when the rubber drive started some 3 weeks ago, I suggested that there might be a substantial amount of valuable rubber reposing around Capitol Hill that would be far more useful against the Axis than lying idle under cuspidors, in committee rooms, doorways, and corridors. My proposal that this rubber be salvaged did not get

very far until after Secretary Ickes purloined a rubber mat at the White House.

Figuring that Mr. Ickes might put his second-story proclivities to good use here at the Capitol, I promptly appealed to him for aid. His response was instantaneous in the form of a letter to our general Speaker and a similar one to Vice President WALLACE. From that moment on the Capitol rubber drive snapped into high gear and now you know the results.

The Members of the House and Senate are to be commended for their fine spirit of cooperation and special mention should be made of the grand job that was done by the superintendents of the various buildings and their willing and energetic corps of assistants.

In addition to the amount of rubber heretofore mentioned, the following amounts of metal were collected and turned over to the proper Government agency:

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Iron and steel..... | Pounds 586,630 |
| Brass, bronze, copper, and lead-covered cable..... | 39,170 |
| Miscellaneous scrap metal..... | 10,640 |
| Cast aluminum..... | 2,830 |

Altogether, about 322 tons of critical war materials. Congratulations to all concerned for a good job well done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. MARTIN F. SMITH, is unavoidably absent on account of illness. In his behalf I ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Fraternal Order of Eagles is meeting in his district. Being a member of that order, I heartily agree in the sentiments therein expressed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short radio address delivered on the Forum of the Air last night by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I wish to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a radio address on synthetic rubber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Times, morning edition of the Kansas City Star, carries a column known as Forty Years Ago. On July 8, 1942, there appeared this interesting item:

The young Winston Churchill, 28 years of age, and just elected from Oldham to Parliament, is pointed out oftener than any other member and is taken seriously by the oldsters, who say that up to this time he has made a better start than either Disraeli or Gladstone.

To have held the center of the stage for 40 years in the oldest and probably one of the greatest legislative bodies in the world is without doubt one of the most striking records ever made in the history of the world. Today Winston Churchill is no longer pointed out, for his face and figure are known and familiar to all the nations of the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business on the Speaker's table is disposed of today and after any other special orders that may have been entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOMEN'S AUXILIARY RESERVE IN THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6807) to establish a Women's Auxiliary in the Navy, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON of Georgia, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. MOTT.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised of the death this morning of Dr. Henry G. Knight, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering. He had served in that position for many years and was one of the eminent scientists of the Nation in that particular field. I am certain those Members of the House who have been fortunate to be brought in contact with him in his long and distinguished service will learn of his unexpected death with profound regret.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the other special orders I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 I asked and received permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the Governor of Indiana. I have a statement from the Public Printer stating that this insertion exceeds the amount allowed under the rule, but since I have used very little space in the RECORD I again ask that this speech may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] be allowed to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FRANK KINGDON

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include therein a letter I received from Mr. Frank Kingdon and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PARITY PAYMENTS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FULMER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article taken from the Daily Pantagraph of Bloomington, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on four subjects and to include therein certain letters and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TAXING GREAT FORTUNES

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Barbara Hutton, married recently to Cary Grant, handsome, popular movie actor and fine American, inherited \$50,000,000. This was tainted money. Girl clerks toiled long hours at low wages in 5- and 10-cent stores operated by the Woolworth interests. It is notorious that girls employed in 5- and 10-cent stores received wages far below the minimum of decency. Barbara Hutton first bought herself a self-styled Georgian prince, Alexis Mdivani. He secured a substantial slice of this fortune and an agreement to receive \$350,000 per year at the time she divorced him. Then she married another nobleman Count Haugwitz-Reventlow. They later arranged a divorce after he also secured a slice of her fortune. The millions of dollars inherited by Barbara Hutton, Doris Duke, and others who earned no part of those vast fortunes represent tears, toil, heartaches, and misery of underpaid workers. There must be a more equitable distribution of wealth in this country. Congress should further exercise its taxing power increasing inheritance taxes against great fortunes. Surely our Government should take for taxes 95 to 100 percent of vast fortunes, typical of which are the millions which went to Doris Duke and Barbara Hutton. Before any consideration is given to a Federal sales tax this Congress should tax to the limit vast fortunes pyramided and passed or from generation to generation by individuals who never earned a dollar—vast fortunes that have so far escaped gift taxes, estate taxes, and income taxes—fortunes such as those of Brenda Frazier Kelly, Doris Duke, and Barbara Hutton Mdivani Haugwitz-Reventlow Grant.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WOMEN OF MICHIGAN WORKING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this last week it was my privilege to spend a few days in my district, which is made up of agricultural and industrial activities, organized and unorganized. I have never before seen in the Northern States in as short a period of time as many women in the fields, early and late, as I saw this past week. The women are getting up in their homes on the farms in my district as early as 4 and 4:30 and 5 o'clock in the morning, doing their chores, their baking, and going into the fields and working altogether from 10 to 15 hours per day.

The draft is on. The July quota was heavy. The August quota will be heavier. Additional men will be taken from the farms and put into the military services. The load on the women will increase. We can well afford to keep all of these

thoughts in mind when we deal with the farm problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

THE CHAOTIC RUBBER SITUATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the nationally famous Kiplinger Washington letter contains the following paragraph:

Rubber is still chaotic, and getting worse. No one Government agency has its arms around all the rubber facts, or control over the remedies. Many agencies dabble and peck at the problem, get in each other's hair, shrug their shoulders, pass the buck * * * and it is becoming a scandal. There will be no light, no sense of direction, and no public confidence until some one man or agency is named by the President as rubber boss. There are inklings that this will be done, but no sure information.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this is a splendid argument for the passage of my bill H. R. 7523, which is still pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and on which no hearings have as yet been held. My bill was introduced on June 18. I think the time has come when something should be done with reference to this matter of rubber. We hear talk of a congressional recess, but before such a recess let us do something to develop the rubber supply and the production of synthetic rubber from farm products. I shall talk on this subject at greater length near the conclusion of today's proceedings and describe a trip a committee of us took last Friday to observe the actual production of synthetic rubber.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial with reference to newspaper postal rates from the Burlington (Vt.) Suburban List.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. GALE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in one instance to extend my own remarks, and in the other to revise and extend the remarks printed at page A2689 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

VOTES FOR THE SERVICE MEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, there is one bill that I hope to see reported out and passed before I get out of this body. It is the Ramsay bill, which will enable soldiers and men in the armed service to vote. If this becomes law and if it is to be of any help, it will have to be passed in a hurry. I wish that we might prevail on the Rules Committee to get the bill out and let it be voted on. It will only take about 2 hours or two hours and a half to get it through, and I think the majority of this body is for it. Let us permit the soldiers the opportunity to cast their vote in the coming elections.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The Rules Committee has already had a hearing on the bill, but the bill has been revised somewhat and there will be another hearing in a day or so.

Mr. PATRICK. I think the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the other special orders on the Speaker's desk today I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

THE CORBITT CO.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 814)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4242, a bill for the relief of the Corbett Co.

It appears that under a War Department contract dated October 18, 1934, for the manufacture and delivery of 20 scout cars, provision was made for the assessment of liquidated damages in the event of delays in delivery beyond the delivery time specified therein, except when the delay was due to unforeseeable causes beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the contractor

but not including delays caused by subcontractors. There was a delay in completion of the contract due partly to delays by the Government in inspection and shipment and partly to the inability of the contractor to secure from its subcontractor timely delivery of the necessary steel armor plate for the manufacture of the equipment involved because of alleged difficulties encountered in the manufacture of the steel. The contractor has been relieved of liquidated damages assessed on account of delays determined to have been caused by the Government in connection with inspection and shipment.

The record shows that it was understood by both parties to the contract that some difficulty might be encountered in the fabrication of the steel armor plate and therefore any such difficulty could not have been considered as unforeseeable in the sense that term is used in the contract. The very essence of the contract to deliver the equipment was the ability to produce it.

The liquidated damages were apparently withheld in accordance with the agreement of the parties and the law applicable thereto. The relief here proposed would accord preferential treatment to one of many contractors for whom no similar relief is provided by law. Also, it would tend to encourage laxity in the performance of contracts and carelessness on the part of bidders in stating the time required by them for performance of contracts, rather than exercise of the degree of care necessary in such matters. I feel that I would not be justified in approving this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 13, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and the accompanying document will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and offer a resolution (H. Res. 518).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1942, on page A2877, A2878, and A2879 of the Appendix thereof, the remarks purporting to be made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOL BLOOM, and containing a letter written by one Ralph Ingersoll attacking draft board No. 44 of New York for performing its official duties in refusing to exempt the said Ralph Ingersoll from the draft on the flimsy pretext set out in said letter; and

Whereas said letter was inserted under permission to insert an editorial and not a letter from the said Ralph Ingersoll; and

Whereas it is stated on page 6271 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1942, that the printing of this insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was estimated to cost

the Government of the United States \$157.50; and

Whereas said letter so inserted in lieu of the editorial for which permission was given contains language and statements that are objectionable and unparliamentary; and

Whereas said statements were not made upon the floor of the House; and

Whereas said statements reflect upon Members of Congress, are false, improper, and out of order, and in violation of the privileges and rules of the House; and if they had been uttered upon the floor of the House they would have been subject to a point of order: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said remarks be stricken from the RECORD and the Public Printer prohibited from issuing copies thereof from the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROCUREMENT BY CONTRACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 4; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"Provided, That the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Maritime Commission may place orders, as provided herein, for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that any requisitioned Federal agency may be in a position to supply, or to render or to obtain by contract."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House amend the title so as to read:

"An act to amend section 7 (a) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement, by contract, upon orders placed by the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, Civil Aeronautics

Administration, and the Maritime Commission."

And the House agree to the same.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSH LEE,
H. H. SCHWARTZ,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 4: These amendments are of a clerical nature and are necessary to conform with amendment No. 3. The Senate recedes on these amendments.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate bill amended existing law relating to interdepartmental procurement so as to authorize any Federal agency to order from another Federal agency supplies, materials, or services to be obtained by the requisitioned Federal agency under contract. This House amendment restricted the Federal agencies authorized to place such orders to the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, and Civil Aeronautics Administration. The provision agreed upon by the conferees follows the House amendment except that the Maritime Commission is added to the agencies authorized to place such orders.

The conference agreement amends the title of the bill to conform with the change made in amendment No. 3.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT CERTAIN DECORATIONS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2404) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit and the Medal for Merit, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2404) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the "Legion of Merit", and the "Medal for Merit", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment insert the following:

"(2) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the 'Medal for Merit', which shall have distinctive appurtenances and devices and only one degree, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services: *Provided*, That awards to civilians of foreign nations shall be only for the performance of an exceptionally meritorious or courageous act or acts in furtherance of the war efforts of the United Nations."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSH LEE,
H. H. SCHWARTZ,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2404) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the "Legion of Merit," and the "Medal for Merit," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment changes a section number. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment changed the name of the decoration to be awarded to the personnel of our armed forces and of the armed forces of friendly nations from "Legion of Merit" to "Medal for Merit." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment struck out the provision of the Senate bill

which provided that the Legion of Merit should be of not more than four degrees. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment struck out the provisions of the Senate bill which authorized the award of decorations to civilians of the United Nations and other friendly foreign nations for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services. The Senate recedes with an amendment which restores the authority to award these decorations but which restricts their award in the case of civilians of foreign nations to persons who have performed exceptionally meritorious or courageous acts in furtherance of the war efforts of the United Nations.

The House recedes from its amendment to the title of the bill.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the adoption of the conference report. Due to my unavoidable absence last week, I was unable to be present at the conference on this bill. However, I do want to offer one or two observations in connection with the subject matter of this bill and the report having to do with medals.

I think it is regrettable that the word "Legion" is included within the terms of one of the medals, and I am certain that if the War Department had understood the grounds for this objection they would not have insisted upon it. To my mind, it smacks too much of a decoration of a former government of France. To me it sounds too much like membership in some society. I think the War Department might still well consider the advisability of refraining from using the word "Legion" in connection with this so-called medal.

Beyond that, I should like to call the attention of the War Department to the matter of the service ribbon which is now being issued by the War Department under regulations, and it is done, as I understand it, without the necessity of congressional authority. The so-called yellow ribbon is given to all members serving prior to a certain date. It seems to me this is highly preferential and quite improper that a man who is inducted into the selective service in one year should receive this ribbon, whereas a man who happens to be inducted into the selective service later is not to receive exactly the same ribbon.

I take this occasion to make these remarks, I hope for the benefit of those having to do with decorations in the War Department.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees have entirely surrendered to the Senate on this bill. They have even repudiated their own committee, which

opposed the reversal of our good policy of 150 years of American democracy. They have accepted the Senate plan for pinning American decorations on civilians. They have opened up the field to the European system of giving ribbons to politicians and party contributors, with all its attendant evils.

The conferees have also receded on the amendment passed unanimously by the House which provided for one medal alone for all members of the armed forces, American or foreign, who, not necessarily in the face of the enemy, have rendered great service to our country worthy of recognition but not in that position of high responsibility, that is a prerequisite for the Distinguished Service Medal.

The conference report now provides for four new medals for this type of service. They have taken the position that what is good enough for the plain American soldier and sailor or marine is not good enough for some foreign general, prince, or potentate. Oh, Mr. Speaker, have we lost all our sense of our fundamental democracy? Because we are associated with European nations in this war, must we ape their faults as well as their virtues? Why do we have to hand out rosettes, palms, and stars according to rank or position in life? Equal reward for equal service is the American way.

It has been argued for this provision that foreigners might not understand this; but if they do not understand American principles, is it not about time that they started to learn them? Is not the dignity of the common man one of the things which we are fighting for? There should be the same medal for all who render this type of service, be he high-born or low-born, be he rich or poor, be he private or general. To me, this bill, as reported by the conferees, seems un-American in its conception. I hope that the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a very brief explanation of why the House conferees receded and agreed to the Senate provision with respect to these decorations. As a matter of fact, there is but one medal, but it is provided that it may be awarded with different colors of ribbon, for instance, on the same medal. This was requested by the Chief of Staff of the Army as essential and necessary in order that we might give decorations to our cobelligerents or citizens of our cobelligerent countries who may merit them. It does not allow any foreigners who have not performed some act of gallantry or heroism in the service of the Allied Nations in this war to accept any such decoration or to have any such decoration conferred upon him.

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

Mr. MAY. Not now. I will yield shortly.

With respect to the administration of this act, it is handled in this way. There is a board in the War Department, and the names of the members are not divulged to the public. This board considers these applications on recommen-

dation of the Chief of Staff. Their names are kept secret for the reason that they do not want it to become a political machine and be subjected to lobbying as to who should or should not have a decoration. After the matter passes that board it goes to another board. After it passes the second board which has scrutinized the matter carefully, it goes to the Secretary of War for approval. There is no chance to play any politics or to cheapen the medal and it is not the purpose or intention of the statute or of the War Department to do so. I therefore move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.
The conference report was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940 WITH RESPECT TO MEDICAL STATEMENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, there is pending on the Consent Calendar the bill (S. 2368) to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. MAY. Yes. This is a bill to repeal what has been known as the Cole amendment, which required a medical statement to be given each soldier when he enters the service and when he leaves the service by the Medical Board of the Army or the examining officer. We conducted rather extensive hearings on the bill and we found that due to present conditions in the Army if they gave out these statements to the soldier or to anyone else or otherwise made them public, it might result in injustice to the soldier himself. We were assured that a complete and adequate record is being kept of every man's service and that these records will be available in the Department as well as in the Veterans' Bureau, if and when the soldier makes application for a pension or other compensation. The idea is not to expose some of our troops, unnecessarily, but to preserve the records for the benefit of all of them.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have received several letters from the Veterans of Foreign Wars opposing this bill. I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], if he were on the floor, would object to the passage of this bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, if that is true I withdraw the request. I do not want to take any advantage of any Member of this House with respect to any matter when such gentleman is not here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his request for the present consideration of the bill.

APPOINTMENTS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2794) authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted in line of duty, during the World War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman from Kentucky to make some explanation of it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under the act of 1926, provision was made for the appointment to the Naval Academy and the Military Academy of 40 sons of veterans of the World War who died from service-connected disability or who died in action prior to July 21, 1921. I think that is the date. During the last 5 years only about 15 of these sons of World War veterans have been permitted to go to the academies, and no more, due to the fact that nearly all of them had reached the age of 22, which barred them from the academy. There will probably be about five or six of them over the next 2 years who would be eligible, and this amendment is merely to protect those five or six sons of soldiers and sailors of the World War.

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

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I served as chairman of the subcommittee which considered this bill. The purpose of it is to transfer to the sons of those veterans who died of service-connected disability the right to participate in the 40 appointments rather than to hold it to just those who are sons of men killed in action.

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

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. PACE. That is quite a different situation from the explanation made by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. KILDAY. That is why I asked for recognition.

Mr. PACE. As I understand it, the previous grant had expired because the sons were beyond the age limit.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. This will change the law, and instead of requiring that the father died in the service, he could have died since 1921, and these 40 will then continue indefinitely.

Mr. KILDAY. It will apply to sons of men who died of service-connected disabilities rather than be limited to the sons of those men who were killed in action.

Mr. PACE. Regardless of when they died.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I think it is a very good bill, and I am entirely in accord with the chairman's statement. I just want to bring out this feature of it, that there is no relaxing of the requirements of the entrance examination into the academy.

Mr. MAY. Certainly not; and I am sure there is nobody on this floor who wants to bar any one of these young men from an opportunity of being admitted to the academy. It does apply to those who died in action as well as those who later died as the result of wounds or disease, but, of course, lapse of time has barred nearly all sons of men who were killed in action.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. In other words, the requirements will be just the same in respect to these as they would to any others.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. And without the adoption of this legislation this year, there would be no one left within the pool who would be eligible to examination for West Point.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926, entitled "An act to establish a department of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, N. Y., and to amend chapter 174 of the act of Congress of April 19, 1910, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes'" (44 Stat. 704), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the number of cadets now authorized by law at the United States Military Academy, and the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy, are each hereby increased by 40 from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, including members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active service by the War Department or Navy Department, who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in line of duty during the World War: *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the cause of death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 18, strike out the words "line of duty" and insert "active service"; and in line 19, after the word "war", insert "(as defined by existing laws providing service-connected compensation benefits for World War veterans and their dependents)."

In line 23, page 2, insert after the word "to" the words "service connection of."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider the

vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of soldiers, sailors, and marines who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted in active service, during the World War."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include a brief statement made by Mr. Boscoe at the third annual employer and employee dinner in Minneapolis, and also the main address by Major Berry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article printed in the Weekly News Letter from the California State Federation of Labor relative to S. 2329.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include parts of a speech on the health of Government employees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars—in one to include a letter and in the other to include a short address by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE RAMSAY BILL

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I do not talk a great deal on the floor these days, but I am sure the majority of you join my regret that the poll-tax issue has been injected into the bill to permit soldiers to vote—the Ramsay bill. The draft with its swift movement of events and demands for action in the lives of our soldiers has taken from them the ordinary time and opportunity for registration and action incidental to vote preparation. Certainly, as I see it, this is a clumsy place to attempt to make the poll tax an issue. Alabama is one of the eight poll-tax States of this country, and yet Alabama waives poll tax as to soldiers in the last World War. This is true of other poll-tax States.

Incidentally, Alabama is what might be called the most radical poll-tax State. In order to vote in our State, one has to pay all back poll taxes ever to accumulate against him, and yet we have in Alabama a statute exempting from poll taxes for soldiers who served in the last World War.

But the reason for stressing the bill is that if we are going to do anything about it we must act in a hurry. We should act on this before the tax bill reaches the floor. I feel sure when it comes up for vote it will pass and can be handled in

2 or 3 hours. How fine it is to see a young American walk out to cast his first vote. A new day has come and an important milestone reached in his life, and yet unless this matter is handled by swift and effective legislation many a young fine American soldier will be deprived of his opportunity while serving his country. In fact, no doubt splendid young men whose lives must be sacrificed, will be prevented from having the only chance of their lives in which to vote the vote of his sentiment.

This war is being fought on other shores. Each State has its own voting code and laws of procedure. Some allow only 5 days for an absentee ballot, some do not provide for absentee ballots, and I am told by the author of the bill that the majority of our States have two separate affidavits that must be signed at different times. In one affidavit the absentee voter must set out the proposition that he cannot be at the place of his voting on election date, and a later affidavit conveying his vote. Some even have a third affidavit. You can easily see how all this keeps the soldier from voting. Is this good Americanism? The receiver is the man who is in to give all he has if necessary to his country, and his country owes it to him to provide for his voice in government—and it may be his only time to have his voice in government. The bill allows the soldier 21 days to get his vote from his place of encampment or war participation to his home ballot box.

I cannot see how Members of Congress can overlook this opportunity to serve the Nation and serve the fighting youth of our land. It is true it would allow soldiers and men in service in poll-tax States who have not paid their poll tax to vote but this is the proper thing to do in this case. I am so thoroughly convinced of this that I do not believe it would elicit any great argument when the bill is up for vote—if we can get it up.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will state to the gentleman that I think he is in error; that the bill will have plenty of opposition when it gets on the floor of the House. I will state to the gentleman further that my State has a poll-tax law, and we are not ready to relinquish it. We have made provision each and every time for the soldiers to vote; so the gentleman's argument in behalf of the soldier does not apply to my native State.

Mr. PATRICK. All right. The point I was making was that I do not think the poll-tax proposition ought to be introduced as an argument in this case at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought he was arguing for the poll-tax bill, which I believe, and most everyone else who is well versed in jurisdictional procedure believes, is clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. PATRICK. The effort on my part was to avoid the poll-tax discussion creeping into this measure at all. I am advocating the Ramsay bill, to allow soldiers to vote wherever they are.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the gentleman then.

Mr. PATRICK. I was referring to the fact that the poll-tax issue had been injected into it, and I think this is no place for it; that the conditions of the bill are such that it ought to be presented in full, without any reference to the poll-tax issue being injected.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. How many States are there in the Union which the Ramsay bill would assist in permitting the soldiers to vote?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not know. I have not looked that up.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, we were told before the Rules Committee when a hearing was asked on the bill, that all but six States in the Union have made provision so that soldiers may vote. Any State desiring that soldiers from that State may vote in this election may so provide by State law. I know that in Michigan we have the absent voters' law, which will permit the soldiers to vote, which is really more liberal than the Ramsay bill. Therefore in Michigan the Ramsay bill would have no effect.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman for that very fine contribution. However, in States where it is more liberal it would do no harm, and in States where it is not sufficient or adequate it would take care of the situation. Every State has its own way of doing that. If we can get the Ramsay bill passed it will be helpful to each State. I think it can be done without interfering with the principle of State rights, about which we hear so much. In States where it is not adequate, where the law has not been sufficiently attained, this bill may take care of it. Where it is more liberal, certainly the whole is greater than any of its parts, and yet the sum of what the bill seeks to attain will expand in such States beyond what the State government has done and no injury will obtain.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In view of the fact that the finest young men in our country are in the armed forces and the most intelligent young men are in our armed forces, following your study of the Ramsay bill, can the gentleman conceive of any possible argument against the enactment of this bill into law? I cannot, and I wondered if there could be any possible argument against it.

Mr. PATRICK. I may not have gone into it as thoroughly as I should have, but I have not found any argument that appealed to me as logical or any that I thought would inspire the average Congressman to vote against this bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young] that this is a matter for the States. Congress has nothing to do with it. I notice the ones who are attacking the election laws are centering on Mississippi. We have already provided for those men to vote. You start this kind of a program, and you will have men

here interfering with the election laws of every State from now on, the very thing against which they have all preached for years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNE). The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] has expired.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNE). The Chair desires to state there are four other special orders, but the Chair will submit the gentleman's request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the author of the bill, after having made a study of it, assured me today that if we do not pass this measure in some form it will mean that over 90 percent of those in the armed service of this great democratic Nation will this time be deprived of a voice in the Nation's business. I think the rights of these men in service, citizenship rights, are especially entitled to respect and attention at this time. They are willing to pay everything to the country and the country should do this simple thing. My interest in this is certainly only as a service to the Nation. The matter of voting is already a sped arrow insofar as I am concerned. But my duty to be a Congressman for country stands so long as I am still a Member of this body—and it is out of my sense of this obligation I am before you this afternoon. I respectfully ask all who will to prevail upon the Rules Committee to issue a rule and let the bill come up and be voted on as soon as it can properly be done. If this Nation can pass a law to draft a man to send him across the earth's broadest ocean to fight and die for its and its people, surely that Nation can also hold his vote open so it may be cast and counted. This would seem to fall in the category of things self-evident. I do not like the idea of our patriots losing their exercise of franchise through no fault of their own. To pass speedily this law and preserve this right is only to do the sort of thing that has made America great and must continue to make her great.

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

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the able gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Earlier today the gentleman from Alabama took the floor for a 1-minute address on this same subject. At that time he had a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I was unable to hear what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] said about consideration of this bill in the Rules Committee. I wonder if the gentleman heard the answer sufficiently to inform the House?

Mr. PATRICK. His statement was made just as the gavel fell, and until I read it I cannot be too sure.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I think it is incontrovertible that machinery must be set up to allow these boys to exercise the right of franchise. I am just wondering if the gentleman will not agree with me on the proposition that for those States which have already made arrangements to allow their soldiers to vote, any legislation we may enact could not have universal application. How are we going to avoid having a rather confused and tangled situation administering such a law?

Mr. PATRICK. Let me expand on this a little further. The men at the various camps come from many States. From the standpoint of State of origin the encampments look like a patchwork quilt. I do not believe this will ever be brought into workable status unless there is a national law passed so that a method will be laid down whereby the boys in the camp can vote under a uniform system, for the voters in the camps come from Alabama, Maine, California, and all the other States. The men are not grouped in camps by States. There should therefore be one universal law applicable to all. I feel that this legislation should be passed in such form that it will afford a clear channel for action as much as possible and get rid of the encumbering things that necessarily result from such a diversity of State laws on the one subject which produce conflagration rather than serenity of action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LET US MAKE RUBBER FROM THE FARMERS' SURPLUS GRAIN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is lamentable, indeed, that we have so much lip service in our country respecting the production of synthetic rubber and that we do not have any coordinated and definite action by those in power to start actual production of this needed commodity.

The surplus grain and farm products in this country can well be absorbed in the making of rubber which is so essential during this war. We need rubber—that is a fact which has been conclusively demonstrated. The President has given out statements at his recent press conferences to the effect that the rubber tires on the people's automobiles might ultimately be seized in order to meet the demand of the Army and Navy for more rubber for war purposes. Even at the present moment, a Nation-wide drive is in progress to collect old rubber of every kind and character for our essential uses in this war. Therefore, we are led to believe that there is certainly a very great need for rubber. The peril appears to be imminent from a military standpoint, because this critical material is used extensively for war purposes. We must win this war—and we must have rubber with which to aid in our victory.

The question naturally arises—where, then, does the responsibility rest for this very great shortage of rubber? We had an ample supply of rubber during the years of peace; the apparent shortage of that commodity has only recently devel-

oped. However, it is generally known that the source of our rubber supply in time of peace has been largely destroyed since we were attacked by Japan, and since we became involved in this war. Therefore, since that time we have been forced to rely upon our own available production of those essential commodities from which rubber may be developed. The Gillette committee, in the Senate, has conducted a far-flung investigation on this subject. Hearings have been held at which the outstanding experts have been heard, and a very complete and thorough examination was made of every phase of this highly important subject. This committee has rendered a signal and outstanding service to the people and the Nation, and much important information has resulted from those intensive and interesting hearings on this controversial subject.

Mr. Speaker, some may ask why reference is made to this subject as a controversial one. It is a pleasure for me to answer that potential question, because the people of this country want to know about the subject of synthetic rubber and the possibilities of making it in sufficient quantities for use in war as well as the domestic use thereof. The people want to know whether there is a possibility of securing rubber tires for their automobiles, their busses, and their trucks with which they can carry on the normal business in our country. The defense workers in the various plants throughout the Nation want to know whether they can obtain tires for their cars and thereby continue with their work in the prosecution of this war. Our farmers throughout the Nation, many of whom rely exclusively upon their own automobiles for transportation to the stores and the markets and in the daily conduct of their business, want to know whether they will be able to secure tires for their automobiles and thus be able to carry on their business in a normal way, or whether they will be deprived of the use of their cars because of the scarcity of rubber.

Since we have a scarcity of rubber in this country our main reliance, therefore, must be on synthetic rubber developed from chemical sources. In the days gone by, one of the very important sources from which synthetic rubber has been developed was alcohol, and the important source of this alcohol, in those countries that have been compelled to resort to synthetic rubber, has been from farm products such as potatoes, wheat, and corn. In the United States of America, and in my own State of Indiana, other equally important and useful sources for alcohol is found in sweetpotatoes, molasses, and sorghum. At this point, may I say that very recent experiments have developed the fact that these raw materials may be turned into synthetic rubber without first converting the same into alcohol. This is a short cut to a common end and purpose, and this would operate as a timesaver in this production.

In Russia—that nation which has made such a gallant stand against Germany—we find that she has faced the sad plight of a great scarcity of rubber. She solved that problem. She solved it

whereby she produced her synthetic rubber from farm products. She thereby consumed her surplus from the Russian farms in the production of synthetic rubber. This was entirely successful. In Poland, before she was invaded by Germany, great quantities of synthetic rubber was produced from potatoes and cereals. Poland found this production of synthetic rubber to meet every requirement. In the German Empire—and I hesitate to cite her as an example—extensive production of synthetic rubber has been carried on from farm products for many years. There are thousands of small synthetic rubber plants in that country located in farm areas for such production. The production of synthetic rubber has been highly successful from farm products.

It is a very sad commentary when we behold that our own country has turned her back upon this safe, efficient, and conclusively proven method of producing synthetic rubber from farm products—a great surplus of which are now at hand—and is embarking upon an uncharted course and upon an untried and new experimental process of using petroleum as the base for synthetic rubber. The petroleum men are now urging that they have discovered the proper method of producing synthetic rubber, and that method embraces the use of petroleum as the base therefor. They condemn the use of farm products—such as potatoes, wheat, corn, sweetpotatoes, molasses, and sorghum—for that purpose. The petroleum men desire to create a new market for their product. We heard these same petroleum men, more than 6 months ago, shouting to the people of this Nation, "We have found it." They shouted loud, but that was all. Not one piece of synthetic rubber has been produced which has been put to use on any gun, tank, truck, bus, or automobile—and which is in use today. They have given excellent lip service; yet, their accomplishments are in the making. They may never materialize, although huge sums of money have been expended by those agencies of government, dealing with this subject, to build, construct, and develop plants for the production of synthetic rubber using petroleum as a base. Much time is being lost—the rubber situation may become desperate before anything substantial is accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, in order to make synthetic rubber with petroleum as a base large quantities of critical materials, which are very scarce, must be used. Steel is one of those essential materials. There is a scarcity of steel. We need all of our steel for ships, planes, tanks, and guns. We need all of our steel for the production of munitions of war. May I urge, here, that the production of synthetic rubber from petroleum is a highly expensive operation; new plants must be constructed from the ground up to meet the requirements. The Government has already authorized the construction of many of these new plants—may I say without any sanction by the Congress—which will cost the people approximately half a billion dollars and practically all of which plants are yet in the blue-print

stage. Yet those departments of Government are rushing forward with that program—to use petroleum for the production of synthetic rubber, instead of using the products from our farms.

May I ask one question, and I would like for some Member to rise in his place and answer me: "Who is responsible for urging that petroleum be used as the base for producing synthetic rubber, instead of using farm products for that purpose?" I find I am compelled to answer my own question. The Rubber Reserve Company and the War Production Board are the agencies that are responsible for this policy which is untried, problematical and experimental, and which results in casting aside a safe and tried method and substituting another experiment which is highly expensive and which may be abortive of any substantial results. It is another slap at the farmers of this Nation. Who and what are those responsible agencies of government? The Rubber Reserve Company is an agency under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is merely the lengthened shadow of Jesse Jones. This same Jesse Jones, it will be remembered, is the one man who is largely responsible for failing to accumulate an adequate stock of natural rubber, which left us almost empty-handed when the war came—he is the same man who didn't get enough quinine for essential use, and which left our boys in the camps and at Bataan, and elsewhere, without that highly important medicine available—and he is the one man who entered into a lengthy controversy with Turkey over the price of a huge shipment of opium, for our medicinal purposes and for use by Army surgeons in the camps and at the battle front when the war came, and Germany, our enemy, who desired opium as a drug and medicine for her war purposes, stepped in and took possession of the entire lot. Now that same man "fiddles while Rome burns," and refuses to develop synthetic rubber from farm products which could be done in much less time, and at much less expense, than the development from petroleum can be accomplished. The War Production Board and the Rubber Reserve Company have been very hostile against the use of farm products in making synthetic rubber. They have decided in favor of petroleum. They have decided against the farmers of this Nation. Yet, the farm products have been tried in making synthetic rubber—there is no experiment involved—that production has been successful. The production of synthetic rubber from petroleum is entirely experimental.

Mr. Speaker, we are advised by those in authority and who are experts on the subject that synthetic rubber produced from farm products does not require large quantities of new materials. It has been estimated that we can produce at least 200,000 tons of this rubber annually—and this might develop into as much as 300,000 tons—from existing distilleries and refineries. Additional buildings for additional tonnage would require but a small amount of critical material, and these would be completed promptly. By the use of farm products for this

needed production of synthetic rubber the surplus of those commodities would be entirely used and the problem of agriculture would be largely solved in this Nation. That would be a sound business policy for our Government, and it would be very helpful to our farmers.

We need rubber today. I urge that those in power change step, and act. This Nation wants action; it wants sound and constructive action. We have the surplus farm products for this needed production of rubber. Let us use those farm products for that purpose. Let us win this war. Let us use the petroleum in our planes, tanks, and great machines of production throughout our Nation; but let us consume the surplus of grain and farm products for making synthetic rubber. Let each take its proper place in this emergency.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague and friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened with interest to the thought-provoking statement of the gentleman from Indiana. I take this occasion to express the hope that I trust the gentleman from Indiana and other Members now on the floor of the House will find it possible on Wednesday morning at 9:45 a. m. to be present in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building with members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining and see there the actual manufacture of the two principal types of synthetic rubber. Dr. William Hall recently told our committee grains should be used to make rubber. We are attempting to add information on this all-important subject.

I will make an announcement formally on tomorrow, but I simply mention it at this time because the gentleman is discussing this absorbing subject. I trust the membership now present will find it possible to be present Wednesday morning.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for his statement. It will be a happy privilege to attend the meeting and witness the making of rubber in the caucus room in the House Office Building.

In conclusion, let me say that we are a united people. We must win this war. Let us face the future with clear vision, with considered thought, and with sound judgment, marching together toward the ultimate goal of victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial from the San Marino Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, following what the gentleman from Indiana has stated, may I say that in the last 2 weeks I have tried my best to talk to everybody I can find in Washington who knows or professes to know anything about the rubber situation. I am not prepared to make a speech on the subject yet, but I do want to say that, all other things being equal, even if it costs somewhat more money to manufacture this synthetic rubber out of farm commodities, it should be done by that means to the greatest possible extent, and I am also ready to say that there should be more imagination used and more willingness to push hard and fast along the line of manufacturing this synthetic rubber from farm commodities than has been undertaken yet. Little can be lost in this crisis by permitting people to try it on a scale that is larger than has been tried up to now.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today in order to inform the House that a business organization known as the Consumers' Cooperative Association, of Kansas City, Mo., has with its own money, its own cooperative people's money, undertaken the formation of a subsidiary for the manufacture of alcohol and from that alcohol the manufacture of synthetic rubber in the Middle West. I want to ask the Members of the House, in the remaining minutes which I have, to think. I do not want anything today, I do not want to advocate any legislation on the part of the House, but I want to ask the Members, first, if they will not agree that when this war has at last been ended the major problem of the American democracy will be this: We will have, on the one hand, some huge monopolistic, very powerful industrial enterprises, some of which will have been strengthened by the war. We will have, on the other hand, a huge governmental structure, a good deal more of it necessary for the successful prosecution of the war than some people admit, but, nevertheless, a huge governmental structure of bureaus and agencies. American democracy's future will depend largely upon whether we can avoid having to go into the future with no prospects except the prospect of a great conflict between these two huge, gigantic forces.

It seems to me there ought to be a method whereby common people, ordinary folks with small resources, can find a way, without governmental help or interference, to meet their economic and industrial problems. I have requested these few minutes in order to say there is such a way, that such a way is now being used by some eight or ten million American families. It has proven successful, it has proven that it can meet monopoly on its own ground, meet it and make it play fair in the markets of the Nation, and it can be successful without one dime or one drop of Government subsidy, help, or legislative assistance. It can and has given hope, better standards of living, lessons in fundamental self-government and self-reliance, a new

spirit and a measure of real control over their own economic destiny. I refer to the cooperative method of doing business.

There are three and a half million American people today who are members of credit unions throughout the United States; there are nearly a million farmers who are members of rural cooperatives, who operate their own distribution systems, and who very soon will own them outright, free and clear of any indebtedness to the Rural Electrification Administration. There are 1,200,000 families in this country who are members of consumers' cooperative stores. If this number were 10 times as large as it is, these cooperators could do a better and certainly far more democratic job of price control than any Government agency can do. They have done it in other countries, and those who fear bureaucratic controls should think of this. There are probably in excess of two and a half million farmers who today market their crops by means of cooperative organizations, whereby they have something to say about the prices that they receive. This Consumers' Cooperative Association of Kansas City is a case in point. In addition to this synthetic-rubber plant project, this cooperative has also purchased a very large cannery in the State of Nebraska which can turn out 290,000 cases of food products in a year. The point I make is that because the interest of any cooperative is inevitably the interest of all the people, because it must be that, therefore the farmers who have peas, tomatoes, and other crops to be canned may be assured that they will get a fair price and that the margin between what the farmer receives for his crop that goes to the cannery and what the consumers pay for the final product will be the minimum margin possible. Here is a road that can lead far toward a solution of our farm problem.

Every cooperative I know is doing all it can to help America win this war. Cooperators love their country deeply, partly at least because they have found a road to real liberty—economic as well as political—liberty that depends on loyalty and understanding rather than governmental help or subsidy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, all I am asking today is that the Members of the House think about this matter and think about whether it is not very important and very hopeful that people, because they are loyal, because they are ready to pool their small resources together, can enter into a business enterprise in just the same way as a few big people with a lot of money can enter into a business, and by means of this cooperative method can work toward a basic long-time solution of the problems of monopoly and unemployment and also the problem of big government. The cooperative movement is de-

servicing of our encouragement and our interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER—"WE SAW IT MADE"

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time today to discuss an inspection trip which a number of us made to Philadelphia last Friday, during which we saw synthetic rubber actually being produced. It was demonstrated to us on this trip that we are not discussing a theoretical process but that synthetic rubber can be produced today in America if certain administrative officials will give the green light to a process which is reasonable, workable, and rational.

However, since securing the time—and this is the reason I asked for another 5 minutes—my attention has been called to a rather startling article which appeared in this morning's newspaper, and I take this opportunity of calling it to the attention of the House and especially to the attention of the members of the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, because these charges are serious enough so that they should either be substantiated or refuted, and that should be done at once. I read you the article:

Huge profits charged in rubber drive. House prober says four firms stand to make millions.

This is a signed article by one John M. Fisher, appearing in this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald. I quote:

Four big scrap-rubber firms stand to make millions in profits out of the Nation-wide scrap-rubber drive which ended last Friday night, Elliott E. Simpson, counsel for the subcommittee of the House Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee investigating the rubber situation, charged last night.

He said that four companies have been appointed "agents" for the Government's Rubber Reserve Company. The profits to these companies, through commissions and other charges, "will be vast, amounting to millions upon millions of dollars, for, eventually, millions of tons of scrap rubber and finished goods will pass through their hands," said Simpson, an independent New York rubber dealer for many years.

SCALE OF "COMMISSIONS"

These four so-called agents, he continued, stand to profit at the expense of millions of Americans who contributed their waste rubber gratis—for a penny a pound, at the most—and also at the expense of the country's supply of scrap rubber and finished rubber goods.

Then I call the attention of the House to the amazing statement which follows thereafter:

"These four 'agents' are being granted 'commissions' of \$1.50 on every ton of scrap rubber which is collected for the Rubber Reserve,

whether or not they were instrumental in collecting the scrap," said Simpson in a statement.

Remember, whether they had anything to do with the scrap or not, whether they ever touched it or saw it, by some strange arrangement, according to the charges in this news story, these four selected agents are to receive \$1.50 a ton for all the scrap rubber collected.

"On top of that they are being paid a considerable sum for sorting the scrap once it's in their warehouses. But the greatest bonanza of all will come after the scrap is sorted, after such items as crepe soles—worth \$462 a ton—are separated from run-of-the-mill grades."

My purpose in calling this to the attention of the House is simply this. These charges are either false or they are correct. The payment of such an amount is either justifiable or unjustifiable. Since a committee of this House has had its chief counsel quoted, it seems to me that this House and this country are entitled to an explanation by that committee as to whether or not an injustice has been done millions of Americans in this scrap-rubber campaign. Such charges, if they are erroneous, should not stand unchallenged, and the country should be assured that they are without foundation. Such charges, if they are with foundation, should certainly bring about corrective and remedial measures without delay.

We have had enough charges and countercharges in connection with the scrap-rubber campaign and the scrap-aluminum campaign. Since another giant scrap collecting campaign is about to be launched, we should give the country the assurance that these things are on the up and up. Newspaper articles like this either damage the public morale or they call attention to a very serious condition of affairs which should be corrected. I hope that before another 24 hours has passed some member of that House committee will appear here in the Well and tell the country the truth about the matter brought out by these charges. I know nothing about the validity of these charges but I do know they present to us a problem which should be solved.

I wish to digress for just a moment more to say that in connection with all these salvage programs it is tremendously important that the public be taken into the confidence of governmental officials and that no bureaucratic agency or department be permitted to play favorites in any way with a program as fundamental to America's war success as salvaging the raw materials we need to pour into the hopper out of which we expect to produce the materials for the arsenal of democracy.

On my desk at the present time there are some complaints from certain radio stations in America who tell me that in the salvaging program which is about to be launched a large volume of radio advertising is being contracted for, but that in the distribution of the radio time some radio stations are being discriminated against and eliminated altogether from

the advertising fund and other stations of similar importance are being awarded contracts, although all radio stations are being urged to contribute equally of the free time so important to the success of the drive.

If these charges are correct, it seems to me some Government agency should step in and see to it that all the radio stations and all the newspapers of similar size and importance are treated on the same basis, and that no prejudice, no favoritism, and no politics enter into the distribution of paid advertising on an important national salvaging campaign. But as I say, Mr. Speaker, all this is something quite apart from what I sought the time today to discuss.

AMERICA CAN HAVE RUBBER IF IT WILL

We have heard a lot of discussion this afternoon about rubber. We heard a very important and stimulating address by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] on the subject, and we heard it mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. Other speakers have commented upon it. But I want to tell you about a trip that was made to Philadelphia last Friday by a committee of 11 Senators and Representatives, of whom I was one, who went up there and personally inspected the Publicker Alcohol plant in Philadelphia, and saw with our own eyes synthetic rubber being produced right in the Publicker Alcohol plant.

I have on my desk over in room 1010 in the New House Office Building, if there are still skeptics who do not believe that there are farm products that can be converted into butadiene, a piece of that rubber which was made on Friday of last week before this committee of Members of the Senate and the House. The committee members who made that trip, if you care to secure further substantiation of these remarks, are Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa; Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska; Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma; Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania; Congressman JOHNSON of Illinois; Congressman CLEVENGER, of Ohio; Congressman GILLIE, of Indiana; Congressman HOPE, of Kansas; Congressman DWORSHAK, of Idaho; Congressman WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma; and Congressman MUNDT, of South Dakota.

We saw at the Publicker plant giant contraptions shoveling corn, shelled corn, out of freight cars, going into one end of the process and at the other end of the process we saw the rubber-producing butadiene which, in turn, had been extracted from the corn taken into Philadelphia from the farms of Illinois and Indiana and Iowa and South Dakota and other great corn-producing sections of the country.

We also saw freight cars filled with wheat and saw this butadiene being extracted from wheat, which, in turn, can be fabricated into synthetic rubber.

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

Mr. MUNDT. In just a moment I will be pleased to yield.

The Publicker plant in Philadelphia has a capacity for 100,000 bushels of grain

per day, which can be fabricated into synthetic rubber. At the present time it is already equipped to handle 50,000 bushels of grain per day and needs only small strategic material quotas and allowances from the War Production Board in order to complete the process and start manufacturing synthetic rubber.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement. I would like to make one or two inquiries. I would like to inquire as to the size of this plant and the number of employees involved, as well as to the extent of the machinery required in this production.

Mr. MUNDT. The Publicker Alcohol Plant is the largest commercial alcohol plant in the world, five times larger than its closest competitor, which is the Hiram Walker Co., and which has just one-fifth of its capacity. I do not know the total number of employees, because they have several plants, but in the particular plant which we inspected they employ a large number of men, although many of the processes are largely automatic.

Mr. HARE. The matter I wanted to arrive at is whether or not in the establishment of additional plants they are going to use farm crops, such as potatoes, corn, sorghum cane, sugarcane, and other crops, and whether or not it would be a good idea to have smaller plants established in the areas particularly qualified from growing these crops, for the reason that they could make contracts with the farmers for growing these crops with assurance of having an ample yield and production, in the first place, and, in the second place, it would assist in the solution of our transportation problem with respect to the raw materials which would not have to be carried very far to the plant. In the third place, there would not be such a strain on the labor market.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman has listed 3 of a series of very effective reasons, which probably could be expanded to 8 or 10 if we had the time, that these plants should be located in the farming areas. That is exactly the program that the Members of the Senate and House who made the investigation had in mind. If the gentleman has not been advised, he will be happy to learn that on Friday the first one of these alcohol plants was authorized to be located at Muscatine, Iowa, which is in an area such as the gentleman refers to, and there is not any question but what good administration of such plants calls for the location of them out in the areas in the South and in the West where agricultural products are produced. The Publicker officials themselves are informed on that and recognize that to be wise planning and good economy.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman has as yet told the House what the capacity of that plant is that he saw at Philadelphia?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I mentioned the fact that it already has a capacity to

handle 100,000 bushels of grain per day.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. And that will produce how much rubber?

Mr. MUNDT. That will produce approximately 500,000 pounds of rubber per day.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. And I hope that is sufficiently large to indicate to some of these bureaucrats down here in Washington that that is sufficient to constitute a sort of plant that would cause them to realize that they should be allowed the materials necessary to expand this activity to the point where the people will no longer be made to walk because of the necessity of saving rubber.

Mr. MUNDT. This demonstration in Philadelphia has already got far beyond any conception of an experimental plant, because they have demonstrated that they can produce synthetic rubber in substantial quantities if they are given the allotment of the critical materials.

I am sure that this is intensely gratifying to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], since he is one of the Members of Congress who has pioneered in the matter of farm chemurgy and especially the developments of a program for using farm products in the fabrication of synthetic rubber. Over 2 years ago, it was my pleasure to serve with a committee headed by the gentleman to explore and expand the whole field of farm chemurgy. It is indeed gratifying now to see some of the work of this committee producing results and to know that the conversion of farm products into industrial uses can contribute so vitally to the winning of this war.

And may I say right here that it was brought out on this trip that synthetic rubber can be produced from farm products in one-third of the time and with approximately one-tenth of the critical materials needed for production of synthetic rubber from any other materials, any place in the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I would like to offer a contribution here with I picked up this morning before the Gillette committee over in the Senate, investigating this rubber question. Many Members have read the advertisement during the past week of the famous Houdry process, which is a matter of controversy as to the method of making rubber from petroleum, and the controversy is entirely within the petroleum ranks, and has nothing to do with alcohol. Mr. Houdry, who is the inventor of this process, a distinguished Frenchman, but now an American citizen, an eminent chemist and scientist, made this statement this morning:

I know very little about recent developments of the alcohol process for butadiene—

Of course we all understand that butadiene is the raw material that we make from either petroleum or alcohol to be used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. To continue with his statement:

and, therefore, I am not in position to pass judgment on that question. I understand, however, that our great Russian friends are making synthetic rubber, starting from al-

cohol. I also understand their synthetic rubber is excellent, and their process is in large-scale production; the use of which apparently contributed largely to the Russian military successes last winter.

For the skeptical, therefore, who still doubt the production of synthetic rubber from agricultural products, that is the answer. Further, if the gentleman will yield, I have here also a statement from Clarence H. Thayer, also made this morning before the Gillette committee over on the Senate side. Mr. Thayer is an engineer and a consultant of the Houdry Process Corporation and chief engineer for the Sun Oil Co. The Sun Oil Co. uses some of the patents of the Houdry Corporation. Mr. Thayer said:

Personally, it is my opinion that a program based upon the use of alcohol as the raw material for the production of butadiene offers greater and more positive assurance of success than does the program currently approved by Rubber Reserve, based on butylene as the charging stock in the five-step process.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is indeed important supporting evidence to show that America can have rubber from farm products if this administration will simply take off the brakes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Dakota be extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman who has made a great study of this rubber proposition, happened to read the article by the Vice President in the magazine section of the New York Times yesterday, in which the Vice President said that he sees a danger to the future hopes of the world, if we adopt an isolationism which calls for the development of rubber from grain products. His argument is that we should develop the production of rubber from the trees in South America rather than the development of rubber from grain alcohol. Has the gentleman had occasion to see that statement?

Mr. MUNDT. I did not happen to see that article, but I am not highly impressed with the validity of the argument which he presents. I think we should consider this strictly from the standpoint of our American needs, the production of synthetic rubber from the standpoint of military needs first, and of civilian needs second. In fact, the whole farming process today is also more or less dependent upon the utilization of rubber.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I follow the gentleman, and I feel that he is on the right track in working for the development of rubber from grain alcohol, but as a practical problem, I think the gentleman and others will find it necessary to direct their argument to the Vice President.

Mr. MUNDT. I think there is not any question but that the Vice President and

certain other administration officials are definitely antagonistic or, to speak more charitably, indifferent, to the possibility of developing synthetic rubber from farm products. It is being done today, and it can be done, and I think the blackest spot in the whole approach of the administration to our rubber problem is in its negligence in developing synthetic rubber from farm products.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Would not the gentleman say that the Vice President's position as to growing sugar within continental United States would be very much the same as his position about growing rubber?

Mr. MUNDT. Well, I did not come here to quarrel with the Vice President of the United States. I have not seen his comments. But let me say, if the Vice President of the United States says that we cannot raise our own sugar, then I think he is 155-percent wrong. If he says we cannot produce our own synthetic rubber from farm products, I know he is 1,000-percent wrong.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I may say that he has made such a statement, and that it was a business that would require some subsidy, because certain breech-clout tropical labor could produce it cheaper than we could produce it in America.

Mr. MUNDT. The Vice President of the United States is an expert on the question of subsidies, I know, but I do not believe it is necessary to subsidize the production of synthetic rubber from farm products, because officials of the Publicker plant in Philadelphia and other private operators are eager to go ahead now, financing entirely their own construction, and simply requesting one-tenth of the strategic materials which Jesse Jones and governmental officials are indicating should be given to the petroleum interests instead, for the production of rubber.

This amazing statement seems to be without question insofar as its rectitude is concerned: Of the 1,000,000 tons of rubber which it is recognized that we need to produce quickly in this country, somebody in the executive department has authorized 800,000 tons of it to go to petroleum and other sources, utilizing ten times the amount of critical materials needed by agricultural plants, which even now have not been authorized to proceed in the production of synthetic rubber. And it will take three times as long to get rubber from petroleum as it will take to get it from farm products.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for calling attention to the Vice President's article is that his objection to the synthetic rubber program from grain alcohol is that it will take critical materials and that it will create the establishment of plants which will create a vested interest, which will call for protection after the war is over.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, may I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I intended to yield to the gentleman. That is the reason I requested the additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. In the matter of vested interests, it is not the purpose of the farm bloc or those of us who are making the fight to get synthetic rubber made from farm products to permit the oil industry, or any other vested interest, to control these alcohol plants out in the farm area. That is one thing we propose to stop rather than encourage.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sure no one has done more to make synthetic rubber than has Mr. Jones. Mr. Donald Nelson said a few nights ago that he would take personal responsibility in this rubber situation. He said that when all the facts could be told people would believe he had done the right thing. If he has done the wrong thing, he will take the blame for it. He is the one in charge of rubber production, and I think we ought to leave it to him.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not in the business of crystal gazing, but if I were I would venture the prediction that tomorrow when Donald Nelson appears before the Gillette committee in the Senate you will find him changing his point of view and recognizing the validity of the position we have been contending for all the time in support of synthetic rubber made from butadiene produced from alcohol distilled from farm products; that is, I believe he will now concede that agricultural products can produce synthetic rubber more quickly than all the other processes. A member of Donald Nelson's staff accompanied us on the trip to Philadelphia, and I believe what he saw there proved a real eye opener to him.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think he has taken that position.

Mr. MUNDT. I am predicting that he will take it tomorrow morning before the Gillette committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has he not said that if it can be demonstrated, he is willing to accept it?

Mr. MUNDT. He has started the process of backing up, and I think he is going to run rapidly in the other direction tomorrow. I have confidence enough in Mr. Nelson to believe he has simply been suffering from some bad advice from selfish sources and that tomorrow's testimony will indicate he has begun to see a big light.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As one of the group who accompanied you and the 10 other Members of the House and Senate to Philadelphia, I am thoroughly convinced that rubber can be made from agricultural products and with not more

than 10 percent of the outlay for strategic materials.

Mr. MUNDT. And you saw it made over there in Philadelphia last Friday, did you not?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; I saw it made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will not the gentleman concede that adherence to the policy referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and complete reliance upon foreign imports of rubber were responsible for the inability of this country to accumulate an adequate stock pile of rubber prior to the outbreak of the war?

Mr. MUNDT. It is certainly and obviously true that the administration failed ingloriously in the job of building up adequate stocks of raw rubber in the days preceding Pearl Harbor.

May I say, since I have been given this extra minute, that fundamentally my reason for taking the floor today is to appeal for your support of the bill I introduced on June 18, H. R. 7253, setting up a rubber administration to bring order out of chaos, and to eliminate the evasion, confusion, controversy, contradiction, chit-chat, and cat-calling which has been going on for months instead of producing synthetic rubber. The time for alibis is over; the time for action is here. I sincerely hope that Congress will take action on this matter before yielding to any impulse to begin an extensive recess. I shall have more to say on this subject within a few days but the House has been very generous in the time allotted me this afternoon and I shall not detain you longer now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Vice President WALLACE appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written by President Roosevelt to Rev. W. H. Shullenberger, of Indiana.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of strategic minerals.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'TOOLE, for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2364. An act for the relief of former First Lt. William J. Tepsic, One Hundred and Seventy-sixth Field Artillery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 14, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, July 14, 1942, at 10:30 a. m. in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 5031, H. R. 5144, H. R. 5167, and H. R. 5236.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, July 14, 1942.

Business to be considered: Continuation of the hearings on H. R. 7002—Definition of skimmed milk.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, July 15, and Thursday, July 16, 1942, on H. R. 6165, H. R. 6858, and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1795. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1796. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1797. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940, to restrict or regulate the de-

livery of checks drawn against funds of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, to addresses outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1798. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on investigation conducted pursuant to Public, No. 135, Seventy-seventh Congress, will be ready presently for submission to the Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1799. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize increase in wages for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for services rendered from September 31, 1941, inclusive; to the Committee on the Territories.

1800. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to July 1, 1942, under the appropriation compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7188. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 2331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7191. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands not in Federal ownership within the Olympic National Park, Wash., for national forest lands in the State of Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 2332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7369. A bill to provide that during the present war and 6 months thereafter the District of Columbia 8-hour law shall not apply to any female employee who is subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, or whose employer is subject to the provisions of part I or part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7370. A bill to authorize during time of war waiver of compliance with, or modification or suspension of, the operation of certain provisions of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 7371. A bill for the purpose of conserving gasoline and oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7372. A bill to protect and enhance the social-security benefits to all persons inducted into the military service and to provide a cushion for post-war conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7373. A bill to provide that during the present war and for 6 months thereafter postal officers and employees shall receive an increase in compensation at the rate of \$300 per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7374. A bill to amend section 603, title VI, Public Law, 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 8, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 7375. A bill to provide for increase in compensation of members of the armed forces commensurate with increases in compensation authorized by the National War Labor Board for workers in the steel industry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the chairman of the War Manpower Commission to take certain steps to speed up the utilization in suitable employment of the abilities and aptitudes of all employable handicapped persons; to the Committee on Labor.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate concurrent resolution relative to national rationing of important and essential war materials; 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. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7376. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7377. A bill for the relief of Virginia Lane; 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:

3206. By Mr. BENNETT: Petition of 281 citizens of Deepwater, Henry County, Mo., and vicinity, urging passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3207. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of Jesse Blalock, moderator, and G. L. Hamrick, clerk, and various members of Pleasant Ridge Baptist Church, Route No. 4, Shelby, N. C., petitioning passage of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3208. Also, petition of M. R. Jenkins and other citizens of Belmont, Gaston County, N. C., petitioning passage of Senate bill 860 or House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3209. Also, petition of Rev. E. O. Gore, pastor, Oak View Baptist Church, Kings Mountain, N. C., and various members of the church petitioning passage of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3210. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of M. Lucile Spalding, of Washon, Wash., and 140 residents of the Sixth Congressional District of Washington, pointing out that in 1917 Congress initiated legislation restricting the liquor and vice traffic as to men in camps, and forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and Navy by agents of such traffic; asserting that our noble young defenders have no defense from the temptations of alcohol and prostitution; alleging that this is a wicked and dangerous condition, jeopardizing the war program; urging

the reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and praying for the passage by Congress of Senate bill 860 designed to accomplish that objective; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3211. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Rev. E. A. Moore and 50 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging the passage of legislation that will provide the largest possible protection for the men of our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3212. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the New Jersey State Senate, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide that all rationing, including the rationing of gasoline, be made national in scope; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3213. Also, memorial of the New Jersey State Senate, memorializing and requesting the Federal Congress not to enact House bill 6885; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3214. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Margaret A. Bowdoin and 49 other citizens of Rogue River, Oreg., supporting Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3215. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of local 64, International Union of Operating Engineers, regarding postal employees (H. R. 6486); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3216. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of 100 citizens of Smyrna, Ga., most of whom are members of the Smyrna Baptist Church, supporting Senate bill 860, and recommending improvement in conditions around military camps which affect morale of service men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, July 13, 1942)

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

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O great and merciful God, our eternal Father, we come in reverence. We trust our approach to Thy holy presence is incited by our needs and encouraged by Thy outstretched hand rather than by the mere habit of coming.

New mercies this day call forth new expressions of thanksgiving and praise. These we express from our hearts. Our needs, personal and national, drive us to the source of help—Thy wisdom, power, and mercy. Out of the innermost realms of our lives we call for a visitation of Thy life-giving spirit, that our otherwise sordid natures may know singleness of aim, purity of motive, and wisdom of mind in every endeavor.

Lord give blessing to the Members of this legislative body. May each one be in divine favor this day. Bless all who in offices and committees have responsibilities of trust in these legislative halls. Remember the families of Thy servants that they too may be under Thy constant care. We pray ardently for Thy servant, the President. Grant that he and all his counselors may have divine guidance in these trying hours, that this Nation

may be an instrument in Thy hand for the well-being of all mankind. Correct us, we pray, in all points of life and service which may be in disagreement with Thy purposes and plans. Envelop the lives of our sons and brothers who this day are engaged in patriotic service on land or sea, in sky or ocean, in behalf of our freedom and of the well-being of the world.

Grant peace through righteousness and justice in all lives and among all nations. For this immediate day and hour in deliberation and conduct of affairs we humbly pray the blessing of Almighty God. In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, July 13, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROCUREMENT BY CONTRACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "Provided, That the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Maritime Commission may place orders, as provided herein, for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that any requisitioned Federal agency may be in a position to supply or to render or to obtain by contract"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House amend the title so as to read:

"An act to amend section 7 (a) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, upon orders placed by the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Maritime Commission."

And the House agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSH LEE,
H. H. SCHWARTZ,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS, ETC., BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2404) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the "Legion of Merit," and the "Medal for Merit," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment insert the following:

"(2) That there is hereby created a decoration to be known as the 'Medal for Merit', which shall have distinctive appurtenances and devices and only one degree, and which the President, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, may award to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United Nations and of other friendly foreign nations as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services: *Provided*, That awards to civilians of foreign nations shall be only for the performance of an exceptionally meritorious or courageous act or acts in furtherance of the war efforts of the United Nations."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSH LEE,
H. H. SCHWARTZ,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

INVESTIGATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting in connection with investigations conducted pursuant to Public Law No. 135, Seventy-seventh Congress, and also a comprehensive analysis and summary of the project prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and stating that such report will be ready presently for submission to the Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED UNDER THE APPROPRIATION "COMPENSATION OF SPECIAL ATTORNEYS, ETC."

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to July 1, 1942, under