

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri.  
Calvin Hawley Oakes, of South Carolina.  
John B. Ocheltree, of Nevada.  
Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho.  
Harold D. Robison, of Utah.  
Gerald Warner, of Massachusetts.  
Kenneth J. Yearn, of the District of Columbia.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7:

William C. Affeld, Jr., of Minnesota.  
Reginald Bragonier, Jr., of Maryland.  
John K. Emmerson, of Colorado.  
T. Muldrup Forsyth, of Virginia.  
Walter W. Hoffmann, of California.  
Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California.  
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.  
H. Gordon Minnigerode, of the District of Columbia.

Harold E. Montamat, of New Jersey.  
Edward E. Rice, of Wisconsin.  
John S. Service, of Ohio.  
Wales W. Signor, of Michigan.  
Oray Taft, Jr., of California.  
Robert M. Taylor, of Washington.  
William E. Yuni, of Washington.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified, to Foreign Service officer of class 8:

W. Stratton Anderson, Jr., of Illinois.  
William Barnes, of Massachusetts.  
Aaron S. Brown, of Michigan.  
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.  
William E. Cole, Jr., of New York.  
Herbert P. Fales, of California.  
Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota.  
Jule L. Goetzmann, of Illinois.  
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.  
Francis C. Jordan, of North Carolina.  
G. Wallace La Rue, of Missouri.  
Perry Laukhuff, of Ohio.  
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.  
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.  
John Frémont Melby, of Illinois.  
Herbert V. Olds, of Massachusetts.  
Elfin O'Saughnessy, of New York.  
Paul Paddock, of Iowa.  
David T. Ray, of California.  
G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California.  
Milton C. Rewinkel, of Minnesota.  
Walter Smith, of Illinois.  
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.  
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.  
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.  
Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin.  
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.  
William Witman 2d, of Pennsylvania.

#### APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named lieutenant colonels (temporary) to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Samuel W. Freeny  
George D. Hamilton  
Donald Spicer

Lt. Col. (temporary) James M. McHugh to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1942.

Lt. Col. (temporary) Samuel B. Griffith II, to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

The below-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

John J. Heil James V. Bradley, Jr.  
Frank P. Pyzick James R. Hester  
Harry C. Lang Francis H. Williams

The below-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1942:

John A. White  
George R. Weeks

First Lt. Charles S. Todd to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940.

Capt. (temporary) Howard L. Davis to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

Capt. (temporary) John F. Carey to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of June 1942.

The below-named first lieutenants (temporary) to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of June 1942:

Hugh A. Tistadt, Jr. John S. Fantone  
William F. Harris Richard M. Huienza  
Ralph C. Mann, Jr. Willard B. Holdredge  
James D. McBrayer, Jr. William F. Hogaboom  
Jack Hawkins Carter B. Simpson  
Charles H. Bennett

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942:

James K. Eagan, a citizen of Wisconsin.  
James P. Rathbun, a citizen of New York.  
Albert G. Carr, a citizen of North Carolina.  
Thomas R. Shepard, a citizen of Ohio.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942:

Ernest G. Atkin, Jr., a citizen of Iowa.  
Raymond G. Coyne, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Frank E. Garretson, a citizen of Washington.

Earl J. Cook, a citizen of Nebraska.  
John H. Ellis, a citizen of Ohio.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of September 1942:

First Sgt. Robert A. Thompson  
Platoon Sgt. James K. Linnan  
Platoon Sgt. George A. Lavis

## SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1942

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 17, 1942)

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

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

Our Father God, into the calm and confidence of Thy presence we would bring our drained and driven souls that the benediction of Thy peace may fall upon our restless lives. May this little shrine of daily devotion, built by our fathers on this high hill of the Nation, open for us vistas of green pastures and still waters, where our jaded souls may be restored. In this difficult and desperate era, be Thou our pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, as patiently and obediently we follow the kindly light. May we close our national ranks in a new unity, as deadly peril threatens the birthright of our liberties.

Save us from living on a small scale in a great day, from toying with the tiny when we ought to be lured by the titanic. In this hour of destiny, oh be swift, our souls, to answer Thee; be jubilant, our feet! Hasten the coming of that radiant kingdom when each man's rule shall be all men's good and universal peace shall lie like a shaft of light across the lands and like a lane of beams across the seas. In Thy name, we ask it. Amen.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Miller, one of the President's secretaries, appeared at the door.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to receiving messages from the President of the United States? The Chair hears none, and the messages will be received.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will state his inquiry.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Chair hold that a message from the President of the United States is not business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not business.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, November 17, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Andrews	Guffey	Russell
Bankhead	Herring	Schwartz
Barbour	Hill	Shipstead
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Shott
Bilbo	La Follette	Smith
Bulow	Langer	Spencer
Bunker	Lee	Stewart
Burton	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Maloney	Truman
Chandler	Maybank	Tunnell
Chavez	Mead	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	Vandenberg
Connally	Murdoch	Van Nuys
Danaher	Nelson	Wagner
Davis	Norris	Walsh
Doxey	Nye	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Mahoney	White
George	Overton	Wiley
Gerry	Pepper	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	
Green	Reed	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] have been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are conducting hearings in Western States for the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in Western States on behalf of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON],

the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is attending hearings in West Virginia on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. McNARY. The Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is attending hearings in West Virginia on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Swanson, one of the clerks of the House of Representatives, appeared at the door.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to receiving a message from the House of Representatives? The Chair hears none, and the message will be received.

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

S. 2122. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925;

S. 2503. An act to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia;

S. 2515. An act to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the Act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board;

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; and

H. R. 7629. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

#### REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Under the permission subsequently granted during the course of today's proceedings, the following routine business was transacted:

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

LXXXVIII—564

#### To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 1942.

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

#### REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE — SELECTIVE SERVICE IN PEACETIME

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying report referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Director, Selective Service System, for the period from September 16, 1940, to December 8, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 1942.

#### SENATOR FROM DELAWARE—CREDENTIALS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without changing the parliamentary situation as to the pending matter I may be permitted to present the credentials of the Senator-elect from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TUNNELL presented the credentials of CLAYTON DOUGLASS BUCK, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

#### PETITION

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. HUGHES) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., praying for the prompt enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2889. A bill to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1699).

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

S. 2891. A bill to amend paragraph 8, section 127a, of the National Defense Act so as to authorize certain service to be counted in determining precedence among officers

when dates of rank are the same; without amendment (Rept. No. 1700).

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

S. 2852. A bill to authorize the President to confer decorations and medals upon units of, or persons serving with, the military forces of cobelligerent nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1701); and

S. 2885. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for officers and warrant officers commissioned or appointed in the Army of the United States or any component thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1702).

#### BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WAGNER introduced a bill (S. 2900) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### HERALD TRIBUNE FORUM ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the radio address delivered by the President in connection with the Herald Tribune Forum, November 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR TYDINGS ON THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator TYDINGS on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION—LETTERS FROM JESSE H. JONES AND DREW PEARSON

[Mr. BUNKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters dealing with the Defense Plants Corporation, as printed in the Washington Merry-Go-Round column of the Washington Post of November 19, 1942, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the point of order made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] that House bill 1024 is unconstitutional be sustained by the Senate?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before taking up the line and thread of my argument as to the constitutionality of the bill sought to be brought before the Senate, and the point of order made by my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to an editorial in the Washington Post of November 15 under the title "Senatorial Antics."

The editorial staff of the Post has given to the country some very able editorials, much food for thought. I appreciate that the Washington Post is a Republican publication, and naturally one would expect it to take advantage of anything happening under the Democratic administration which it considered to the advantage of the party to which it subscribes. I presume that is proper and legitimate, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to one point in the

editorial, and in order to do that I shall read the first paragraph, after which I propose to answer the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as to why my colleague was defeated in the recent senatorial primary in Mississippi. To do so it becomes necessary to give to the Senate and to the country an idea of the type of speech that was made by his opponent, Mr. Eastland, in which the Senate was made the issue, not Senator DOXEY, but Senators, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], whom I see attentively listening to what I am saying.

I read from the editorial:

The Senate punched a gaping hole in its reservoir of good will yesterday. Senator BILBO's filibuster had previously sloshed a good deal of water over the sides of that same reservoir. Today it is leaking in much the same way that it leaked several months ago when Congressmen voted pensions for themselves. And the precious fluid that is running out is the faith of the American people in their chief instrument of representative government.

In other words, that is an attack not only upon Democratic Senators but upon Republican Senators who make up this body, because the attack is made on the whole body—"and the precious fluid that is running out is the faith of the American people in their chief instrument of representative government," to wit, the United States Senate.

This editorial writer charges that a few months ago the Senators voted themselves a pension. I thought the American people had been advised and informed that that was known to be the greatest political lie that was ever circulated, disseminated, and published to the American people. The Members of the United States Congress did not vote themselves a pension, and any statement to the contrary is absolutely untrue.

Twenty-two years ago the Congress passed a law setting up a retirement fund; and in order to provide money for the retirement fund for those who became disabled in the service of the Government, or reached old age, and were necessarily retired, each and every employee was assessed a certain part of his salary at the end of each month, the proceeds going into a great fund called the retirement fund, which drew 4 percent interest. Whatever sum was necessary in order to make the fund adequate to meet the demands of those who were retiring and those who were disabled was supplemented from time to time by appropriation by the Congress.

Considering the number of people who subscribed to the retirement fund, the annual contribution of the Congress to the fund was very small indeed. It was in the nature of old-age security compensation provided for those who had given 30 years of their lives to the service of the Government and had become too old to render good service, and were retired, but who through the 30 years had contributed their money to help establish the retirement fund.

Mr. President, after 22 years, and after a million or more employees have participated in the fund, the Ramspeck bill was introduced in the House, which ex-

tended the benefits of the retirement fund to about 250,000 additional Government employees. It raised the amount of the assessment from 3½ to 5 percent of their salaries. The bill included in its provisions elective Federal officers as well as appointive Federal officers. I have never been able to understand why there should be a line of distinction drawn between a man who receives appointment to a Federal office upon the recommendation of some Senator or Representative and thus begins working for the Government, or one who takes the civil service route, and a person elected by the people to office, and thus placed in the employment of the Government. If an appointed officer or employee is entitled to participate in the retirement fund, why should not a person elected to office by the people be entitled to participate in the retirement fund? At any rate Members of Congress were included in the provisions of the Ramspeck bill. It passed the House without a dissenting vote, and came to the Senate, and after some discussion and amendment it was approved by the Senate by about a 2 to 1 vote, and was signed by the President of the United States.

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

Mr. BILBO. I would rather not yield. I cannot yield now. Let me complete the initial part of my morning address, and then I will yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, this was not a pension in any sense of the word. It was only extending to elective officers, including Members of Congress, the right to contribute \$500 to the retirement fund, and after they had reached a certain age they were to be permitted to draw a small stipend as a security compensation in their old age, after having given the greater number of the years of their lives to the service of their country. It is true that such officers were elected and not appointed, but I think they are as much entitled to the privilege of participating in the retirement fund as bureaucrats and other employees of the Government are entitled to this graciousness on the part of the Government. It is in no sense a pension. Any one who says it is a pension is either misinformed or is viciously misrepresenting the facts for a purpose.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] wishes to present the commission of his colleague [Mr. NELSON] to the Senate. If I yield for that purpose I wish to know if I would lose the floor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present the certification of the Minnesota Canvassing Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Mississippi yielding for this purpose?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. With the understanding that by so yielding the parliamentary situation is not changed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

#### SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA—CREDENTIALS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the credentials of ARTHUR E. NELSON, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from that State for the term ending January 2, 1943, which were read and ordered to be placed on file. (The oath of office was administered to Mr. NELSON and he took his seat in the Senate on the 18th instant.)

#### ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before beginning my answer to the explanation made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as to why my distinguished colleague [Mr. DOXEY] was defeated, I wish to insert two matters in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Delaying Action—Filibustering for State Rights," by Mark Sullivan, published in the Washington (D. C.) Post of November 18, 1942. I invite Senators' especial attention to the article, and suggest that they read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the Appendix.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, if one wants an illustration of what will result from the passage of the pending legislation and how even inunicipal affairs will be regulated from Washington under the strained construction of war powers, it can be found by reading an article entitled "Democracy and the Poll Tax" by Mrs. Nellie Nugent Somerville.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article "Democracy and the Poll Tax," by Mrs. Nellie Nugent Somerville, a distinguished woman lawyer of my State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the Appendix.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, last Tuesday the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], made the following statement:

A few days ago the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] made the statement, and rather boasted of the fact, that the enactment of the proposed legislation would not enfranchise a single colored voter in his State; and that probably is true. It is probably true as to all the eight States where the poll-tax payment is required. But, although the Senator said that the enactment of the proposed legislation would not result in the enfranchisement of a single colored voter in Mississippi, it would enfranchise 200,000 white voters in Mississippi. In other words, under the poll-tax requirement now 200,000 white citizens of that State are denied the right to vote, although the landlords and the landowners, for whom many of these people may work for a dollar and a dollar and a half a day, can refuse or fail to pay the taxes upon their property until it is sold at the courthouse door for taxes, and can still vote, but the man who works on the farm owned by the owner who lets it be sold for taxes at the courthouse door cannot vote unless he pays a

dollar and a half for the privilege. And that is called democracy.

A primary was held in Mississippi recently in which the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] was interested, and we all regret that the able and courteous and fair and sincere Senator was not renominated. It has been complained that one of the reasons why he was not renominated was that many of the great landowners in his State, if not most of them, opposed his renomination. I do not know anything about that, but it was claimed at the time that they opposed his renomination. If it be true that there are 200,000 white citizens of Mississippi who are denied the right to vote because the payment of a poll tax involves a price that may represent a pair of shoes to a barefooted child, and therefore cannot be paid, are we able to say that if they had been enfranchised, the result of the primary in Mississippi might not have been different and that the Senator from Mississippi might not have been returned? I do not know. Certainly if the great landed gentry were opposed to the Senator, and the hired hands on the farm who could not pay the poll tax were allowed to vote, I suppose it is a fair presumption that their suffrages would have been cast in behalf of a man who in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States has been a spokesman of the downtrodden, average men, and those who are regarded as underprivileged. I honor the Senator for being such a spokesman.

When that statement was made by the Senator from Kentucky I announced that in my own time I would briefly review the reasons why my distinguished and able colleague [Mr. DOXEY] was defeated in the primaries. In the first place, out of 350,000 voters in Mississippi only 130,000 participated in the recent primary in Mississippi, in which Mr. EASTLAND defeated Mr. DOXEY by a vote of 17,999. There were many factors which entered into the campaign. While I regret to call the attention of the Senate to some of the things that took place in the campaign, I think I owe it to my colleague to give the real reasons why he was defeated, because a man who has a record of 14 years of faithful, loyal, patriotic service to his State in the House, and a year's service in the Senate, does not deserve such a defeat at the hands of the Democrats of Mississippi, especially when his opponent was a man who had never rendered any public service to the State or to the Nation. He was a member of the Mississippi Legislature for 4 years during my term as Governor, and so far as accomplishment by way of constructive, remedial, and helpful legislation is concerned, he was not the author of any such legislation, and did not attend the sessions more than half the time. I call Senators, his colleagues at that time, as witnesses to the fact that during the 88 days he was in the Senate of the United States he was not the author of any constructive, remedial, or helpful legislation for the people of his State or of his Nation.

Eight or nine months before Senator DOXEY returned to Mississippi to make his campaign, this young gentleman, by the use of unlimited money, thoroughly campaigned the State and propagandized the people of the State on the idea that during his 88 days in the Senate he was responsible for legislation to increase the

price of cottonseed and cotton to the farmers of the State. It will be remembered that immediately after he left the Senate the price of cottonseed did increase. It was a very easy matter to reason with the unsophisticated and ill-informed that he was the cause of it. Having been in Washington 88 days, after he left the price of cottonseed and cotton advanced. Therefore he claimed the credit for it, and there was the proof of the fact that he had done it. We all know that there was nothing in the contention. It was an entirely fraudulent claim.

Senators should bear in mind that Mississippi was suffering from the same elements, politically speaking, from which the rest of the country was suffering when the election was held on the 3d of November. The people were disturbed. They were disappointed at the progress of the war. They were propagandized with a great amount of literature which placed the blame on the Congress and on the President for the way in which the war was being conducted. At that time we were being rationed on rubber tires and threatened with a gasoline-rationing program.

I believe that the most inexcusable, unreasonable regulation of the bureaucrats in control of the war effort in Washington, under the powers granted by the Congress, is the threatened rationing of gasoline in sections of the country where there is more gasoline than can be stored. My State has 348 oil wells. We are producing nearly 3,000,000 barrels of oil a day. To talk to our people about gasoline rationing is absurd from their viewpoint. The rest of the country feels the same way about it.

There may have been some excuse for rationing gasoline on the eastern seaboard, because of the question of transportation and the difficulty of obtaining adequate amounts of gasoline to supply all the civilian needs and the war needs at the same time, and because of the submarine menace to our tankers and the limited facilities of the railroads, with no pipe lines to bring gasoline from the oil fields of the South and the West. We have enough gasoline to supply the entire world. There was some justification for rationing on the Atlantic seaboard, but for the life of me I can find no justification for rationing the rest of the country.

It is said that the purpose is to conserve rubber. I do not have much patience with that argument, for the reason that I have been in the Senate and know what has been happening in the inner circles on the question of rubber. Monkey wrenches have been thrown into the machinery by the big boys who want to continue in control of the rubber situation of the Nation during the war and after the war. Otherwise we should have been producing all the synthetic rubber necessary to meet civilian needs at this time.

Mr. Henderson, the gentleman in charge of rationing and price fixing, saw fit to turn over to the executive departments of the States, the Governors of the States, whether Democratic or Republican, this very juicy piece of pa-

tronage, which meant a great army of employees to carry out the manifold functions of the price-fixing program. The Governor of our State was making a heroic fight against Senator DOXEY, and he had charge of all this patronage, along with the draft activities and other gubernatorial patronage.

These were all thrown in as elements contributing to the defeat of my distinguished colleague [Mr. DOXEY]. The people were disturbed, dissatisfied, and perturbed, and they were looking for someone to vote against, someone to crucify, someone to blame for everything that was going "haywire" at that time. Having been a member of the New Deal, and a Member of Congress for 14 years both in the House and in the Senate, Senator DOXEY was the first victim the voters of Mississippi had a chance to crucify.

The distinguished gentleman who made the race against him played upon every discordant note in the State. He appealed to every dissatisfied element. His most vicious attack against Senator DOXEY was his attempt to destroy the confidence of the people of Mississippi in their Senator. Never in all my experience, or in all the history of the country, has any man who has occupied a seat on the floor of the Senate for 88 days gone before the people of the State and denounced the body of which he was a member and denounced his colleagues in such a vicious attack.

To substantiate that statement I had a court reporter take down the first speech made by Mr. EASTLAND in his campaign, in the city of Forest, Miss., on the courthouse lawn, on Saturday afternoon, June 20, 1942, at 3:10 o'clock. The speech was certified as to its correctness by Mr. L. K. Ramsey, 506½ East Pearl Street, Jackson, Miss. There can be no question about what was said about the United States Senate by the opponent of Senator DOXEY. Of course, whatever he said about the Senate would reflect upon Senator DOXEY, upon me, and also upon all other Senators.

In order that Senators may know exactly what was said, I shall read from the transcript of his speech. Senatorial stock is very low in Mississippi after the successful campaign of abuse, denunciation, accusation, crimination, and re-criminations resorted to by Mr. EASTLAND. I read from the speech:

We are even discriminated against in old-age pensions, my friends. The aged of Mississippi receive only \$4.50 per month from the Federal Government, because under the present law the Federal Government will only match what each State can pay. The aged of California receive \$18.50 per month; the aged of New York receive \$13.50. The old folks of Mississippi are just as good as the aged of any other section of this country. [Applause.] I favor the payment of a fair and full old-age pension that will give them the comforts of life, out of the Federal Treasury, and pay the same amount to the citizens of every other State. [Applause.] That amount can be supplemented by whatever each State is able and is willing to pay.

Those are his sentiments on the subject of old-age pensions.

I continue to read from the speech:

Picture in your eye a fat, sleek politician, making \$10,000 a year, who has just voted himself a pension in addition to that \$10,000, where he gets several things on the side that I am going to discuss in a few minutes.

That is the hand-out and graft which Senators are alleged to receive on the side.

When he voted himself a pension he didn't provide there that before he could collect a pension that the State must match whatever the Federal Government paid him. I favor the same system for the aged of Mississippi, the same system that the politicians used when they voted themselves a pension.

In other words, before any campaign to refute this pension campaign lie was put on in Mississippi, for 6 months the people had been led to believe that Senators had actually voted themselves a pension. As a matter of fact, as I stated a while ago in answer to the editorial from the Washington Post, they were given the right to participate in the retirement fund by paying \$500 a year.

I now come to the real juice of the speech:

I told you that they—

Meaning Senators—

got some things on the side, and when I went to Washington all I could hear them talking about, when they were discussing politics, some of them called it their "perquisites," and some of them called it their "prerequisites." They were talking politics and I didn't know what they meant, and so I got a dictionary and looked that word up, and found that the "perquisite" was an emolument for which they did not have to account—that it was a tip—and I got to thinking what those tips were that you were paying for. I found that one of the perquisites, they pay themselves mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile to and from Washington, the same as it was in the days of Andrew Jackson. Congress will adjourn one day and reconvene the next and they do not go home, but they take your money just the same.

If any Senators are guilty of that practice, it is just too bad.

I continue to read:

I found that they were running a big house, with plush carpets on the floor, and a marble swimming pool, and that they had electric baths, and a big yellow Negro in there to rub those old boys up so they could look pretty and pass a beauty contest. [Laughter.] Then upstairs there was a free barber shop, with some Negroes in there to doctor them up. They would guarantee to bring back hair on the bald head. I got to wondering what all that cost, and I found out that that was confidential information, that the man who paid the tax bill wasn't entitled to know. And then I found that the different committees gave you all the stationery you wanted, but they voted themselves \$200 a year as another tip to buy the stationery, and put that money right down in their pockets.

When any man who served in the Senate for 88 days goes back to a confiding people and tells them on the stump that the Members of the Senate actually voted themselves \$200 each for a stationery bill, but, instead of buying stationery with it, put the money in their pockets as a piece of graft, could we expect the people of the State to vote for any man who is a Member of the Senate? That is the

argument which that gentleman used when it came to the defeat of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY]. In other words, he accused the junior Senator from Mississippi of having \$200 of graft money in his pocket; he accused me of having \$200 of graft money in my pocket. He accused each and every other Senator of putting \$200 in his pocket; and yet he sought to obtain a seat among such gentlemen of questionable integrity and honesty.

I resume the reading:

I thought that when a man died that his perquisites were bound to cease, but I went to the funeral of a Senator, and found his funeral expenses were all paid, and that his family received \$10,000, free of taxes, out of the Federal Treasury.

I suppose he presumed he would not die during his sought term.

Then I realized why it was that they didn't want them to get sick, so that they would have to go to all that expense when they die.

And I found out that they furnished you, so the Senator wouldn't have to work, a secretary to the tune of \$3,900 a year—

Mind you, Mr. President, he said that in order that Senators would not have to work, each of them has a secretary receiving a salary of \$3,900 a year—

and so that secretary wouldn't have to work, they gave him an assistant secretary at \$2,400 a year; and so the assistant secretary could loaf around and talk politics, they got an assistant-assistant secretary at \$2,250 a year—

Now the secretaries do not have to work—

and so the assistant-assistant secretary wouldn't have to work, they had three little girls in the office at \$1,800 a year, apiece, who did all the work for the assistant-assistant secretary for the assistant secretary for the secretary and for the Senator.

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

Mr. BILBO. Yes, if I may do so without losing the floor. I shall yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I ask the Senator if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What department was that in?

Mr. BILBO. The Senator's department.

Mr. McKELLAR. My department?

Mr. BILBO. Yes; in the Senator's department. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Was it connected with a warrant of arrest?

Mr. BILBO. Evidently he entertained the same opinion that the Senator from Kentucky entertained—that the Senator from Tennessee was not working. [Laughter.]

I resume the reading:

And then that wasn't enough. During the month of February, at the very darkest hour in history, they voted themselves an "executive assistant," to the tune of \$4,500 a year. They had run out of names, so they just called the last one an "executive assistant."

Of course, that is something that never did happen; but he held it out to the people as something that did happen.

What man is it, making \$10,000 a year, that is entitled to a pension from his Government? You have got to lay aside for a

rainy day, if you don't want to starve. Many earn a much less income than that. A man who can't save money on \$10,000 a year has got no business being in Congress.

And you know, that was the smartest thing I ever saw. Those boys got them up a pension bill. It passed the Senate, and in the Senate they didn't want to call the roll, but Senator BYRD got up and just raised sand, and they called the roll, and got one of them on the record—one of them running against me in this race; and it went through the House of Representatives without a roll call. Nobody knew anything about it, and the newspapers got ahold of it. Then what happened?

They walked up and says, "We didn't know there was such a bill; we didn't even know there was a pension for us in that bill." And then, when they got behind them, some of them said, "We didn't vote for it," and some of them said, "We didn't vote for it and didn't vote agin it." And some of them said, "I don't remember whether I was on the floor at that time, or not." When I go back to Washington, you know what I am going to do? I am going to find that son-of-a-gun that's got that pension grease, the very first thing. That's the slickest stuff I ever saw, to grease a bill and put it through, and none of them know anything about it. And you notice, those old boys passed their pension in 3 days, but it took them 5 months to raise the soldier's pay.

That is the type and character of campaign thunder which was used by an ex-Member of this body in seeking the defeat of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

(At this point Mr. BILBO yielded to Mr. TUNNELL to present the credentials of the Senator-elect from Delaware, which will be found at another point in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

(Mr. BILBO also yielded to Mr. TYNDINGS, who addressed the Senate briefly on the question of the deferment of Government employees from the military service. Mr. TYNDINGS' remarks appear following Mr. BILBO's speech of today.)

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President when I granted the floor to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYNDINGS] I was discussing the reasons and the methods resorted to in order to accomplish the defeat of my distinguished and able colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], in the recent Democratic primary in Mississippi. I was discussing this matter in answer to the reasoning presented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Remember, this was Senator EASTLAND's first speech in the campaign. After this original speech, in the campaign. After this original speech, after the formal opening of the campaign, he enlarged and elaborated upon his attacks on the Senate, and had much to say about the fact that there were provided for the Senate various mineral waters, that Senators as a body were too lazy to walk from the office building to the Senate Chamber, and that they had had dug for themselves an underground electric-railway tunnel so that they might ride instead of walking to the Senate Chamber to perform their duties as Senators; and they named that the "Doxey Electric Underground Railway," in the campaign.

After playing up to the elements in the State opposed to the present administration, the New Deal, every dissatisfied man and woman in the State, and play-

ing on their prejudice, he reinforced that with this wholesale attack on the Senate in every speech in the campaign, asserting that Senators were not performing their duties, that they were lazy, that they themselves did not work or look after their business, that their three secretaries did not work, and that what little work was done was performed by three girls in the office. He continued to enumerate the various lines of hand-outs, or graft, or "racketeering," in which the Senate was participating. After many months of attack along this line, there was built up in the State such a strong sentiment against the United States Senate and Senators that the people were ready to vote against any man who belonged to the Senate at that time.

In addition to all the things I have enumerated as being the causes of my colleague's defeat, the indications are that there was an unlimited amount of funds used to carry on the campaign, and to manipulate it to the successful conclusion in favor of Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, that is a matter which belongs under the jurisdiction of the committee of the Senate whose business it is to investigate the use of excessive funds in a campaign. I do not know whether they are looking into that matter or not, but it is safe to state that if it had not been for the use of excessive amounts of money in the campaign my colleague would have been elected, despite all the attacks and charges made.

The statement made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that if the anti-poll-tax bill had been in force as a law at the time, and the 200,000 white people in Mississippi who did not vote because of failure to pay the poll tax had participated, my colleague would have been elected, is not true, because I think there would have been the same situation to deal with if all those people had been voting as existed when a small percentage of them were voting.

I repeat, Mr. President, for 5 years I have been fighting in my State for the elimination of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in the Democratic primaries of the State, and I am as strong an advocate of the abolition of the poll tax in party primary voting as is any other man in the country.

I have just received, as no doubt other Members of the Senate have, a mimeographed letter addressed to the Senate from the Honorable Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, written from Washington, D. C., 718 Jackson Place N.W., dated November 16. I wish to read his letter into the Record, and then make some observations about it. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR: The Nation today stands aghast and enraged at the tactics of the small bloc in the Senate which is seeking to frustrate majority rule in this Nation.

These tactics have been regarded as reprehensible when used in times of peace as a measure of obstruction to democratic functioning. In this period of national crisis, however, the opening of our polling places to every qualified citizen in the Nation by the elimination of poll-tax restrictions which disfranchise large numbers of American citizens is a measure essential to our war effort. It is a step which this Nation must take if our national morale and our democratic

structure are to stand firm against the attacks of our Axis enemies.

In a very real sense that small bloc which now seeks to stand in the way of the will of the Nation is carrying into our very midst the aggressions of our Fascist foes. A failure to defeat their tactics will constitute a failure to support the heroic forward movement of our armed forces in Africa and other parts of the world today.

The people of America look to every Member of the Senate to spare no effort to bring about a speedy effectuation of the desires of the American people.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,  
President.

Being an advocate of the abolition of the poll tax in my home State, I wish to say that after a thorough study of the constitutional inhibitions against the sort of legislation now proposed, I feel that today I am as much a soldier fighting the enemies of our American dual system of government as is any marine on Guadalcanal who is fighting on the outside enemies who desire to destroy the great American scheme of representative democratic government.

The abolition of the poll tax is not the issue involved. The real issue is the protection of our dual scheme of government, for as surely as that the sun shines in the heavens day by day, if this bill is permitted to become a law and is approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, it will be the entering wedge, it will be the authority to the Congress of the United States to step not only into the eight States which today have the poll tax but into North Dakota, South Dakota, and all the other States, and regulate the qualifications of the electors for Senators and for Representatives in the American Congress.

When the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] had the floor a few days ago, I asked him the direct question, granting that the payment of the poll tax is a qualification—and there can be no doubt about this construction of the Constitution—if by the bill proposed the Congress steps into a State and strikes down one of the qualifications of a voter, then by the same logic, the same rule of law, the Congress can step into a State and strike down other qualifications, or it can prescribe additional qualifications. In other words, the whole field of legislation relating to the qualifying of an elector will be turned over to the American Congress, instead of reposing in the States, as now obtains under the constitutional provision adopted in 1787. To my mind, that is as clear as a bell. To my mind, there can be no question about it.

In the colloquy referred to I asked the Senator from Kentucky if the Congress had the power to strike down poll tax qualifications, would it not also have the power to strike down registration qualifications, and the Senator was forced to admit that that was true, that it would be a natural consequence. Some of the States insist that a person must live in the State 2 years before he can participate in an election. Other States require that a person must live in the State 1 year before participating in an election. Other States provide a period of 6 months. Some require a shorter time of residence than 6 months. Some

States provide that a citizen must live in a voting precinct, or ward, or town, or city, for a year as a voting requirement; some provide a period of 6 months, some 3 months, some 30 days, and others only 2 days.

Mr. President, if those on the banks of the Potomac River who seek control of the affairs of the people of this Nation should succeed in having the proposed legislation passed, and the flood gates are opened to them to go into the States and regulate and control and establish the qualifications of voters, then the next step they would take would be to go into a State and say that a person should be permitted to vote if he is a bona fide citizen of the United States, and that there shall be no requirement with respect to residence in any particular spot in the United States for any length of time. Thereby they will do away with the requirements in various States that a person must be a resident of a State for 2 years, 1 year, 6 months, 90 days, 60 days, or 30 days, in order to vote in the State. Then it would be logical to say that if a person is a bona fide citizen of the United States he should be permitted to vote for Senators and Representatives wherever he might be, because he would be voting to elect men to the Senate and to the House to control and regulate the affairs of the United States, not of the State, or the county, or the city, or the precinct; therefore he should be permitted to vote, no matter where he might be, or how long he had lived in his place of residence, just so long as he was a bona fide citizen of the United States. We cannot escape that logic, Mr. President. We cannot escape such a position being taken.

It may develop in the days to come that because of the fact that some Members of Congress are having trouble with a particular political organization or religious sect, they may decide they do not want persons to vote who entertain such political or such religious views. Therefore they may attempt to reach over into the States and say that anyone who subscribes to a certain theory of government, or who subscribes to certain religious tenets, is not a good citizen, and ought not to be permitted to have a part in electing Members of the Congress. They could attempt to place an additional inhibition on the voters and eliminate a group of people from the body of the voters. There is no end to the devilment that can be brought about in the days to come if the precedent is thoroughly established by the passage of the proposed legislation, and affirmation thereof by the Supreme Court of the United States. While it is a trite saying, it is, verily, verily, opening Pandora's Box and giving freedom to centralized government to interfere with what has heretofore been considered to be the functions of State government.

Mr. President, I have no criticism of Mr. Murray. No doubt he wrote the letter in good faith, but I doubt seriously whether Mr. Murray, with his many duties in looking after his rather active organization, the C. I. O., has ever taken the time to investigate the Constitution of the United States and see just what

it provides. Mr. Murray is asking United States Senators, as I see it, to violate their oaths to uphold and to protect the Constitution of the United States, when he insists that they vote for this measure as a war measure. In times like these the snakes of government begin to crawl, and murder is almost committed in the name of the war effort. There are now some bureaucrats in the Government who have been given temporary authority to regulate the internal affairs of the people. They are thinking of doing things, and perhaps they have already done some things, which are unthinkable in a free country, even in time of war. But they justify their actions by the patriotic statement that it is in furtherance of the war effort.

Here we have Mr. Murray insisting that we shall strike down the fundamental laws and provisions and inhibitions of the Constitution of the United States as a war effort. He says that a small bloc in the Senate is seeking to frustrate majority rule in this Nation. No doubt the majority of the people of the United States are against the poll tax as a qualification for voting. That is evidenced by the fact that most States have done away with it, and that there are only eight States that have not gotten so far along in their concept of their duty to their citizens in the matter of their exercising the right to vote.

Mr. Murray says we are seeking to frustrate the majority rule in this Nation. That may be true insofar as the poll tax is concerned, but Mr. Murray forgets that the majority of the people of the United States have abrogated the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and have done it in the constitutional way. It has been done through the act of the State legislatures, as the founding fathers provided it should be done, but because the job is not yet complete Mr. Murray joins in with the Hitler crowd that wants to do by force anything which pleases their whim. They are dissatisfied with the progress the States are making in meeting their idea with respect to who shall be a qualified elector, and because they think they have the power, and the force, and the majority, they propose to force their idea down the throats of the people of these eight States who have not yet seen fit to remove this prerequisite for being qualified voters in their respective States. I am afraid my friend Murray has not stopped to analyze what his statement means.

He says in his letter:

These tactics—

Of filibuster in the United States Senate—

have been regarded as reprehensible when used in times of peace.

Mr. President, I will say from my study of constitutional law, and of my country as it has made progress over a period of 150 years, and from my study of the legislative history of the Congress, that I am unable to call to mind any single outstanding piece of legislation in the 150 years that was defeated through a filibuster which should not have been defeated. I have not been able to find that

in any such case a mistake was made by filibustering. Time has proved that such a course was a wise one to pursue. Time has proved that that was the best thing to be done for the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, by exercising the right which belongs to representatives of the sovereign States in the Senate, a right which is not accorded to the Members of the House at the other end of the Capitol, we have been able from time to time throughout our 150 years to block and to prevent the enactment of legislation which would have been disastrous to our American scheme of government, just as we hope that what we are doing now in all good faith and good conscience will be a contribution to constitutional government in the United States.

Mr. Murray further says that every citizen in the Nation should be permitted to vote. The statement that every citizen should be permitted to vote is a rather broad statement. Nearly a million people reside in the District of Columbia. Throughout the years the Congress has never been persuaded that it would be right or proper to accord the right to vote to the people who live in this little spot of the United States, which has been set aside and dedicated as the place where the affairs of this great Government shall be conducted. Those who live around the Capitol of the United States, within the District of Columbia, which is the home of the Government, have not been accorded the right to vote. It was not the idea of the founding fathers, I am sure, to accord the right to vote to the people who had to live in this little piece of territory, where the seat of the National Government is established. Otherwise such provision would have been made in the Constitution itself.

Mr. President, without announcing my final decision on the question of according the right to vote to the people who live in the District of Columbia, I want to repeat what I said to my friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] the other day, that some Senators who have been here for years, and are urging this proposed legislation upon the eight States that have not seen fit as yet to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, have not, so far as I have heard or know, taken any step toward, according to the citizens of the District of Columbia, the privilege or the right to vote in the election of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives.

Mr. Murray says:

It is a step which this Nation must take if our national morale and our democratic structure are to stand firm against the attacks of our Axis enemies.

I believe that if the bill should be enacted into law, the people back home in the eight States would feel that they had been outraged and that the Constitution had been raped in an attempt by force in time of war to take away from them their inherent rights. I believe that the enactment of the bill would do more to break down unity and sympathetic cooperation among the people and go further toward the destruction of the morale of the people, at least in those

eight States, than anything the Congress could do. I believe the question has been exaggerated on the part of my friend Murray and others. The Axis Powers are not interested in a legislative fight of this character. They are not interested in whether or not the people of my State, before being permitted to vote, must pay a poll tax which goes to the education of the children, both black and white. That is not a break-down of democracy. If it is a break-down of democracy and of our democratic form of government, then for a quarter of a century after the establishment of the Republic we did not have any republican form of government, or any democracy, because for many years after the adoption of the Constitution in 1787 all the States provided property qualifications for voters. The founding fathers knew that the States were imposing such property qualifications. Some of the States had the poll tax, others a money qualification, others the ownership of land, and so forth. Our friends who are urging the proposed legislation say that it is the only way by which we can have a democracy. We did business at the old stand for, lo, these many years, when all the States had property qualifications or poll-tax qualifications for voters. For at least 100 years of this Republic a great majority of the States had such qualifications for voters.

According to the argument of my friend Murray and other sponsors of the proposed legislation, we have been doing business for more than half the time in this Republic without a republican form of government, without a democracy. So there is nothing in his argument. He is merely trying to push his case and take advantage of the war situation. He says that a failure to pass this proposed legislation would indicate a lack of support of the heroic soldiers who are now fighting the battles of this Nation on all the battlefronts of the world. I have received many telegrams and letters from the boys in the service congratulating me and urging me to go with this fight and protect the sovereignty of my State of Mississippi, and protect our form of government. If the boys who are in the service understood this issue as we understand it, as the beginning of the end of the dual system of government in this country, they would feel more like laying down their guns and coming back home than going on to fight the enemies on the outside who are seeking to destroy all that is priceless and precious in the American way of life and the American form of government.

So my friend Murray is all wrong in his contention. I am not censuring him. I do not say that there is anything willful or vicious about his attitude; but I must say that he has failed, from my viewpoint, even to read the Constitution, because a casual reading of it would show that the proposed legislation would be the beginning of the end of the American way of life and the American scheme of government. I am sure that it would be the end of the American way of life, because if the people of this Nation are to be ruled and controlled in their home States in all their everyday-life affairs, eco-

nomic and otherwise, by a group of bureaucrats in Washington, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Socialists are in power, the American way will be at an end. That is what this bill would mean if it should become a law.

A few days ago, my friend the Senator from Kentucky said that some of the opponents of the proposed legislation had asserted that the sponsors of the pending bill had contended that the present Supreme Court would approve the legislation. I, for one, did not say that. I said that I had a suspicion that some of the sponsors of the proposed legislation as well as some of those who are behind the movement to force such legislation upon the eight States having poll-tax laws, entertained the hope that the Supreme Court, as now composed, would look with favor upon this rape of the Constitution. I further said that I believed they were wrong in their view and that their hopes would be blasted, because I have more faith in the Supreme Court of the United States than to believe that this piece of proposed legislation would be determined by it to be constitutional.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD an open letter which was written to the editor of the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., in reference to the present contest and my part in it. The letter is dated Arlington, Va., November 15. It read as follows:

EDITOR, THE EVENING STAR,  
Washington.

DEAR SIR: I can imagine nothing more unfair than the criticism by certain people of Senator BILBO's opposition to consideration of the poll-tax bill. Senator BILBO did not force this hateful issue upon the country in the time of its distress.

I wish indelibly to stamp that statement upon the mind of every Senator and newspaperman in the gallery, as well as upon everyone else in the world.

Senator BILBO did not force this hateful issue upon the country in the time of its distress.

No; I did not bring it into the Senate in this time of distress, when we are in the midst of a war, when we should have unity. However, I did not stop there. I went to the sponsors of the pending bill and begged them not to bring it before the Senate. I said to them, "You have no chance on earth to pass it. There are enough Senators who believe it is unconstitutional, and who are willing to fight to uphold what they believe to be constitutional, to keep the matter under discussion until the 3d day of January, when the new Congress will convene." I then went so far as to suggest to my distinguished leader that he order his Christmas tree put up in the Senate Chamber, because it would be the only Christmas tree he would see in 1942 if he should persist in his effort to bring this matter up for consideration.

I read further from the letter:

Senator BILBO did not force this hateful issue upon the country in the time of its distress.

I want the world to know that I should be free of any censure or criticism on the part of any man or woman in America for my fight on this bill, because I have

tried to keep it out of this Chamber and prevent it from coming up for consideration.

Let me say in this connection that as long as I have the floor I shall be willing at any time to discontinue my discussion and help pass any measure which is necessary for the prosecution of the war. No one can rightfully charge that the part I am playing in this filibuster is instrumental in holding up, stopping, or retarding the passage of any legislation to help win the war. I shall, of course, discontinue only with the understanding that when such legislation shall have been passed I shall be restored to my status quo on the floor, with the pending measure in the same parliamentary position as it occupied when I stopped.

I continue to read from the letter:

It was brought to the front by the people who hate the South and are determined to ruin it, to pick up where Thaddeus Stevens left off, and crush everything which the South holds dear in its social organization. Communists, racial fanatics, unassimilated Europeans who have an academic dislike for the South—which they are utterly incapable of understanding—all are attempting to take advantage of war to destroy the southern people. The poll-tax offensive is merely a task-force operation intended to weaken the southern defensive position, to "soften it" for the final assault, which, if successful, will also bring in ruins the most intelligent and responsible elements of the northern population.

I am a woman, and, being a woman, am unable to understand how any Representative or Senator can find it in his heart to support this menacing hostility to the homes of the thousands of men from Georgia, Texas, Mississippi, Virginia, North Carolina, and other Southern States who are fighting, and many of whom are dying for the entire country, North and South. Whether or not they live in poll-tax States, southerners—and northerners—should realize the evil intent of this measure and stand shoulder to shoulder against it.

Respectfully yours,

ANNIE BELLE MINGLEDORFF.

I admit that some of the statements the lady made may be a little extreme; but the Members of the Senate who do not live in the section of the United States where three-fourths of the Negro population are now living know not what they are seeking to do; because, if the purpose of the legislation could be fulfilled, they would admit the Negro population to full voting privileges.

If the South is let alone, if we are allowed to work out our own salvation, if we are allowed to solve our race-relation problems in our own way, there will not be any trouble in this country, there will not be any trouble in the South. However, just so surely as we live, if Senators undertake to force this issue, if they undertake by the proposed legislation, because they have the power, in a Hitler-like way to attempt to compel the coming of the day when there will be full voting by the Negro race in the South before we get the Negroes ready for suffrage, there will be some truth in that old saying, "Hell is going to break loose in Georgia."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the Senator's solution of the problem?

Mr. BILBO. If the Senator wants to know my solution, let me say that I have already introduced a bill, which is now pending in committee, and I spent half a day trying to present it to the Senate and to the country. I have sent out over 100,000 copies of my speech and of the bill. My solution to the race problem—and I believe it is the only solution—is a physical separation by the repatriation in western Africa, the richest country on earth, of the entire Negro race. It might be a surprise to the Senator to know that about 4,000,000 American Negroes signed a petition to the President and to the Congress asking that the bill be passed, and that they be given an opportunity to resettle themselves in their fatherland in western Africa. Four million American Negroes have signed that petition.

If the Congress proceeds with this kind of monkey business and tries to force this issue on the eight poll-tax States of the South, the Members of Congress who take such action will be here pleading for the passage of my bill to resettle every American Negro in Africa because we will be headed for serious trouble.

There will not be any trouble in North Dakota; there will not be any trouble in South Dakota; there will not be any trouble in Vermont, where there are only 41 Negroes. But in the States in which Negroes comprise from 25 to 49 percent of the population, when we coddle them and plant in their minds hopes and aspirations for things which they are not able to obtain, and with a number of radical leaders organizing them and arousing them to take steps to secure the objectives of their false hopes, the condition which will obtain as a result will be such that I can only say God pity the South and God pity the Nation.

A distinguished Senator from the North, a very dear and close friend of mine, said to me yesterday, "I do not know of any outstanding Negro who is insisting upon social equality." Well, my friend was simply misinformed. If Senators will read the speeches and writings of Walter White, who is at the head of the N. A. A. C. P.—the most outstanding Negro organization in America—they will find that social equality is his dream, his ultimate end, what he is fighting for. If they will read the writings and speeches of Ford, the head of the other organization—the Pullman-car organization—they will find that he says, "We want social equality and all that goes with it, or we want nothing." That is their position. Of course, the less radical members of the race are not so insistent; but I am talking about the heads of the Negro movement in America.

In round numbers there are in the United States 12,800,000 Negroes, out of a total population of 130,000,000. Of course, they are outnumbered. No Member of the Senate is a better friend of the Negro than am I. I have tried to

be the Negro's real friend. I have tried to be his helpful friend; but some of the intelligentsia of the Negro movement do not think I am the Negro's friend. I know that I am their friend. I am their friend when I am trying to stop this movement which will mean bloodshed and destruction to their race.

A few weeks ago I was sitting in my office when two well-dressed, good-looking Negroes walked in. I greeted them and gave them seats. One of them said to me, "Before I begin the conversation I must tell you who I am." He handed me his card. He is one of a firm of seven lawyers in Chicago, an outstanding lawyer in the city of Chicago. He said "I am the son-in-law of Booker T. Washington, of Alabama."

The other Negro, who was also an educated Negro, said, "I have come here to talk to you because we consider you the only real friend the Negro has in this city. You have tried to do something for the Negro, and you have been his friend both since you have been in the Senate and during the 8 years when you were governor of your State. You have been his friend in trying to do something that ultimately will help him and his race. I have come here to talk to you about the seeds that are being sown in the minds of the Negroes in Chicago, where I live, and throughout this country. The politicians, the manipulators, the heads of certain Negro and political organizations that are trying to secure the vote of the Negro, to coddle the Negro, to put false hopes in him, make false promises to him, are the ones who are planting in their minds and hearts ambitions, desires, and dreams which cannot come true with the social situation which exists in the South today. When the war is over, if they served as soldiers, they will come back and demand that recognition; and when the demand is made the clash will take place."

Let us work out our salvation. We are helping the Negroes; we are educating the Negroes. The Negro is receiving economic consideration, and the white man is the friend of the Negro.

Now I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to an article by John Temple Graves.

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

Mr. BILBO. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us more about the bill which he introduced? Would he mind doing so?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to do so. Upon receipt of petitions signed by nearly 2,000,000 persons to introduce the legislation, with the assistance of some of the best Negro talent in America, both in the North and in the South, and of other friends who are interested in the real salvation of the Negro race, the bill was prepared. Let me say in a general way that the bill provides—I shall not go into the minute terms of it—that the Government shall finance—or let me say grubstake; I suppose the Senator knows the meaning of that word—the Negro as he is being transported to his future home in West Africa, primarily Liberia. The bill provides that the Department of State shall negotiate with Great Brit-

ain and France to secure four additional provinces which adjoin Liberia so as to create a greater Liberia. Senators must know that in 1847 the Republic of Liberia was established on land which was turned over to the Negroes who then lived in Liberia, upon condition that every other lot of land in Liberia should be held in trust for the settlement of the American Negro in the days to come. With that understanding, the American Colonization Society, which was established in 1817, and was headed in the early days by Presidents of the United States and other outstanding citizens—I believe that President Monroe was the first of our Presidents to be associated with the organization, and the capital of Liberia is named "Monrovia" for him—arranged that the Negroes who had settled in Liberia, and who had asked for independence, in order to establish a republic of their own, would have those lands conveyed to them on the one condition that half the land—every other lot—should be held in trust, and be dedicated for use in the settlement of the American Negroes in Liberia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BILBO. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are there any white folks in Liberia, or are all the persons in Liberia Negroes? In the land to which the Senator's bill proposes that the Negroes be sent, do only Negroes live?

Mr. BILBO. That is a fact. There are a few white people who are merchants and are engaged in business, but the constitution of Liberia, which is similar to the Constitution of the United States, provides that no white man can own land in Liberia. Any white man there is merely a sojourner, a boarder. The constitution of Liberia provides further that no white man can vote in Liberia. So they have a president, they have a vice president, they have senators, they have representatives in their Congress, who are Negroes. They have a perfect scheme of government. There is a population of from a million and a half to two million in Liberia. The land is there waiting.

I went so far as to have my Negro friends send a commission of Negroes to Liberia to ascertain from the president, whose name is Barclay, whether the resettlement of the American Negroes would be acceptable to the Republic of Liberia. The commission brought back the message that Liberia would be glad to receive Negroes from America with outstretched arms. They want the American Negroes to come there, because a great many of the American Negroes are educated and have become engineers, doctors, newspapermen, and so forth. Liberia needs an influx of such Negroes in order to continue the development and education of the Liberian Negroes. A great many of the Liberian young boys are brought to the United States and educated in Howard University here. They come to see me. We have discussed the question of the resettling of the Negro in his native fatherland.

Of the adjoining colonies to Liberia, which will be necessary before we can

ever hope to resettle the great percentage of the American Negroes in Africa, one belongs to France and the other to Great Britain. I had hoped that in the war settlements provision could be made so that these adjoining territories would be available for the establishment of a greater Liberia, a great Negro republic, to which American Negroes educated and trained in the American way of life could go to their fatherland and could render great service in the further development of the Negroes in that part of Africa, many of whom are uncivilized.

A very dear friend of mine, Dr. H. H. Jones, who was born and reared in my home State and educated at Chicago University, was fired with an ambition to do something for his own race, and so he went to Liberia.

He landed at Monrovia, but he did not, as a great many Negroes do, stop at the seacoast. He made his way into the hinterland of Liberia, and attached himself to a tribe of Negroes that had not yet been civilized. He spent his life civilizing that tribe, and today he has hospitals and churches there, and the members of that tribe have been educated and are now strong factors in the life of Liberia.

There is work to do in Africa for every Negro in America; but so long as they live in America, whether it is in the North or in the South, the Negro is going to be discriminated against. I resent that. The only way to keep the Negro from being discriminated against politically, socially, economically, and in every other way, is to resettle him in a country all his own.

If we insist on letting the two races live here side by side, with the consequent clashes and differences, the result will be in the years to come, as proven by the history of the world for 20,000 years, a complete commingling of the two races in this country; we will have no white race and no black race, but will have a mongrel race. If anyone has no objection to his posterity, his kinfolk, in the many years to come being mongrels instead of red-blooded Americans, then, very well; let the Negro stay here; but I assure you, Mr. President, that will take place.

There are today over 25,000 Negroes who are crossing the color line, passing for whites, marrying white women, and marrying white men in the United States, and that number is increasing every year.

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

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. In the Senator's bill, how does he define a Negro and which ones would he have transported to Africa?

Mr. BILBO. One drop of Negro blood makes a Negro—anyone of African descent.

I started to advert to a recent article by John Temple Graves, of Charlottesville, Va., who has been the outstanding friend of the Negro in the South for many years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I am puzzled about the Senator's bill. How would the Negroes who would be transported to Africa be selected?

Mr. BILBO. It would be voluntary. It is not proposed to send anybody, but merely those who wish to go. We as a nation have no more right to send a Negro to Africa than we have to send a white man. The Negro is as much a citizen of this country as I am. It would be purely a voluntary movement; there would be nothing compulsory about it. The Negro wants to go of his own accord. He knows it is for his best interests. He wants to be in a country where his opportunities will be unlimited, where he will not be discriminated against, and where he can go the limit. It would all be voluntary. Some of the Negroes in trying to arouse prejudice against me have said I want to compel the Negro to go, that I want to force him to go. I have never given expression to such a thought in my life. My purpose is to provide a way, pay the expenses, build them homes, open up farms, equip them, grubstake them for a year until they get their feet on the ground while they are being repatriated in their fatherland. The Negro himself wants to go. I have a petition signed by 4,000,000 Negroes who want to go. A few of the intelligentsia, like Walter White and Ford, do not want to go. They are living on the fat of the land; they are on the top; they are riding the waves. But I am pleading for the great rank and file of the 12,800,000 Negroes in this country who have to suffer discrimination, who are discriminated against, who are not having a fair show in this country, and will not have until finally, they merge their blood into the veins of the whites, and we are all mongrels and there are no whites and no Negroes at all. That is just what is coming, or history belies itself. It has been tried in India, in Egypt, but wherever it has been tried that has been the result. Because, however, it is so far ahead, 1,000, 2,000, or 3,000 years, I have been unable to get the people of the present generation interested in solving this question as all authorities say it can be solved, and the only way it can be solved—by physical separation.

Mr. President, I did not mean to go into that line of thought. I wanted to call attention to the article of John Temple Graves.

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

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator's bill carry any appropriation and, if so, how much, and how will the money be used?

Mr. BILBO. I estimate that it will take about 40 years to resettle the Negro. It is not proposed that the old Negro shall go but the young generation so as to build up a new country, a new republic, a republic of their own. The bill provides for adequate appropriations to take care of whatever expenses the Commission provided for in the bill may incur. It is thoroughly safeguarded, and the funds will be provided by the Congress of the United States. I estimate

it will take between fifteen and twenty billion dollars over a period of 40 years to do the job. That would be the best money ever spent; it would be the best investment both for the white race and for the black race. Any Negro who has any race consciousness about him resents the intermingling and the miscegenation between the whites and the blacks as much as the white man himself does, and any white man who has any race consciousness should resent it also.

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

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I am from the North, and I should like to have the ideas of the Senator on the question of race riots and what causes them. The Senator has prophesied that there will be trouble in the future unless something is done. What causes race riots, and how, in the Senator's judgment, are they to be avoided?

Mr. BILBO. In the South we draw the color line. We have no mixing between the races in social life in the South. For the time being, we will forget the political side of it; but on the social side as the Negro tries to force himself into the social life of the South, the present generation of white men will rebel; and we will have clashes; we will have bloodshed, riots, and everything that is bad.

All those who are sponsoring this bill, among them Negroes, all those who are trying to do something for the Negro, as they think, all those who want to get the Negro behind it, as they force this situation in the eight States before the people get ready for it will raise false hopes in the minds of the Negroes. There will be difficulty, and there is more trouble now than is dreamed of in the South, that is kept out of the press. Because of its possible effect on the war program, I would not tell what is already taking place.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, the Senator was Governor of Mississippi for 8 years.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Will he please tell us what he found the situation to be when he was Governor, and also tell us to what committee his bill has been referred, and whether hearings have been held on it?

Mr. BILBO. No hearings have been held. I was Governor of the State for 8 years, and I did everything I could to help promote Negro education. I rebuilt colleges for the Negro; I sponsored educational movements for the Negro—agricultural, industrial, and of other kinds. I tried to stop all lynchings, called out the National Guard where it was possible to stop a lynching. I was a real friend to the Negro, and we had no trouble. Every Negro in the South knew he had a friend in the Governor's office, and when he came to my office I saw him.

I remember a gentleman walked into my office a few months ago and said,

"While you were Governor of Mississippi you made me angry enough to kill you." I said, "What did I do?" He said, "I rushed into your office one day when I wanted to see you. Your office was full, and over by the door sat an old Negro mammy with a bandanna handkerchief over her head. Your secretary walked out and ushered the Negro woman into your private office to see you, ahead of me." He said, "I could have shot you." I said, "Do you know why she got in first? It was because she came first, and she was as much a citizen of Mississippi as was any white man, and she was entitled to see her Governor. Her little affairs, possibly about her nephew, or grandson, who was in trouble, were as dear to her as those of any other citizen to him." I gave the Negro exact justice while I was Governor.

Mr. LANGER. Where is the Senator's bill at the present time, and why have not hearings been held on it?

Mr. BILBO. Because I have not asked for hearings. I have been carrying on a campaign. There is an organization throughout the United States, and nearly 4,000,000 Negroes have signed the petition, but during a war is not the time to bring the question up. If I am here when the war is over—and God willing and the people willing I shall be—I propose to carry on the fight, and I think I shall have more help than in the beginning, because people will realize the need of physical separation of the races, and there will be peace in the country. Do not forget that whatever affects one State affects all States in this Republic. We are all one great family, and every member should be protected.

What I resent about the bill under discussion is that it is an attempt by the majority of the members of this family to cram down the throats of other members of the family something which they are not ready to accept. The other States have had 150 years in which to fix their laws as they wanted to fix them in order to meet their conditions.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. If the bill shall pass, how will it affect Mississippi?

Mr. BILBO. I think quite a number of Negroes will take advantage of the opportunity to be resettled in their fatherland, which is one of the richest countries on earth.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator misunderstood me. I am referring to the bill we will discuss when we get around to it, the bill which was reported by a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary. How would the enactment of that bill affect Mississippi?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to answer that question. So far as the repeal of the poll tax is concerned, it would not enable a single, solitary Negro to vote in Mississippi in addition to those now qualified. That is not why I am fighting the bill. I am fighting the bill because I know that if it is possible to pass this bill and remove the qualification of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, it will be possible to pass a bill to remove some

other qualifications we have in Mississippi.

If the Senator will pardon me, I can illustrate my point by the story of the animal convention, which, no doubt, my colleagues have heard. When all the animals met, a polecat came walking down the aisle, and all the other animals ran away. They got together the second time, and the skunk walked up the second time, and they all went away except the opossum. The skunk said, "Why do all the animals leave when I walk in? I have a beautiful tail, I have a perfect form, I am a good-looking animal. I have not done anything against the animal kingdom. Why do they leave?" The opossum said, "It is not how you look, it is not what you have done that makes all the other animals leave when you appear on the scene. It is what they are afraid you will do." [Laughter.] I am fighting this bill in the fear of what will be done if it should be enacted and should be affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. I think the Senator has not yet answered the last question I asked. If the anti-poll-tax bill shall be enacted, just how will it affect the State of Mississippi? What does the Senator anticipate will happen there?

Mr. BILBO. For the time being nothing will happen, but at the next session the same group which thinks that removing the poll tax will permit the Negro to vote will be back here in an effort to remove the registration qualification, the educational qualification of the Negroes. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], admitted that that was the next step. If that is done, we will have no way of preventing the Negro from voting, because then the educated and uneducated, the qualified and unqualified, every human being, will be voting, and when that is done, there will be trouble in the land; and I do not mean trouble to me. Then, as the Negroes get their political power, they will demand social rights, economic rights, and other rights.

Let us take the State of Pennsylvania, for example. I am sorry my colleague from Pennsylvania is not present. The Republicans for years and years voted the Negroes in Pennsylvania. The Republicans fed the Negro on promises; they would not pass legislation which the Negro wanted. Finally the Democrats said, "Let us get in and we will give it to you." So the Democrats went into power, with the Governor and the legislature, and they gave the Negro all he asked. What did he ask? He asked that he be permitted to register and sleep and live in the white man's hotel, to be served in the white man's barber shop, to swim in the white man's swimming pool, to share everything the white man had. That is the law there.

There is a bill pending here now, introduced by the Senator from New Jersey, to give the Negroes in the District of Columbia the very things they have been given in Pennsylvania. When the Negro has the power to vote, he has something with which to bring pressure to bear to get these things done. When-

ever that is started in the South, hell will break loose in Mississippi, and in Georgia, as well.

Mr. LANGER. How does the Senator answer the argument that since we call upon the Negroes to fight, why should they not vote?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator will permit me to answer, how does the Senator from North Dakota answer the argument that we are calling upon boys 18 years old to fight, but do not let them vote?

Mr. BILBO. We are taking them 18, 19, and 20 years old, and not only that, we are taking hundreds of thousands of men in this country, some from North Dakota, some from South Dakota, from Pennsylvania, and from every State in the Union, to the battlefield, and they are fighting for the preservation of the American scheme of government and all that is precious to the American people, yet they cannot vote; they have never voted; they are not qualified. They do not care to exercise the right to vote. They have never voted in their lives. From the woodlands of the North the lumberjack has been taken and put in the front lines and made to fight but he never voted in his life. Army men do not vote, as a rule. The colonels and captains and generals never take any part in elections. They never vote. And I do not suppose the Negro is any better than they are. I know he is not any better than the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old boys we are putting on the battlefield. There is nothing in the laws of my State to keep a Negro from paying his poll tax and voting.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it would be well for me to point out for the RECORD that Army men who live on Government reservations, such as the Aberdeen Proving Grounds, and the Edgewood Arsenal, in my own county, and many similar reservations in other parts of the country, are not considered to be living on the soil of the State, per se, in which the reservation is located, and therefore they cannot register and cannot vote, because the land on which they live is under the direct supervision of the Federal rather than the State Government, in most respects.

As a corollary to what the Senator is saying it seems to me it would be well if the advocates of the bill would propose to enfranchise men who stand ready at all times to give up their lives for their country before they go into these extraneous fields.

Mr. BILBO. In other words, the Army men who live on Government reservations are in the same fix as the Washingtonians.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is, aside from the merits of the bill, that if the Federal Government can by law tell the State who shall or shall not vote, and who shall or shall not pay a poll tax, then the Federal Government, by the same analogy could compel the States to permit those who live on military reservations to vote. Certainly it seems to me

that the logic is inescapable that if the Federal Government can tell a State who can vote in one category it can tell a State who can vote in other categories, no matter what conditions a State has provided as a requisite for voting.

Mr. BILBO. Most certainly. I think it was perfectly horrible, because it was so evidently unconstitutional, of the Senate to pass the bill the other day which gave the soldiers the right to vote without registration or without payment of a poll tax. By doing so Congress struck down the provisions of the constitutions of the States with respect to registration and other qualifications. In other words, in the name of the war effort Congress practically raped the Constitution.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the State of Maryland, which I in part represent in this body, we have a law called A Declaration of Intentions Act. If a man comes into Maryland from another State he cannot vote, even though he lived in Maryland for 20 years, unless he declares his intention to become a citizen of the State of Maryland a year before the particular election in which he offers himself as a voter. The reason for that was, as there is reason for most laws, that many years ago it was customary in a very close congressional district known as the Fifth Maryland Congressional District, to transport large trainloads of voters into southern Maryland on election day, and there were sent into the district in that way enough voters who did not live there but who took advantage of the voting hospitality of Maryland, to throw the election contrary to the will of the majority of the voters of the district. So the State, in order to avoid a recurrence of that in the future, now requires that when a man comes from another State into the State of Maryland and wants to become a citizen and to vote, he must formally go to the election board, or to the clerk of the court, and make an affidavit that he desires to become a citizen of the State. If he does not do that he cannot vote, even if he spends his whole life in Maryland. I am not arguing that that is a good thing or a bad thing. I am simply pointing it out as an existing fact. But the logic of this bill is that if the poll tax can be abolished by Federal fiat, for that is what it amounts to, then the Declaration of Intentions Act in Maryland can be abolished by having enacted a congressional law to that effect.

Mr. BILBO. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, that procedure could be carried all up and down the whole category. I do not doubt very much that then we could say here that no municipality in America shall have as a qualification for voting, the payment of taxes. Most of the cities of Maryland as a matter of tradition have a legal provision that only those citizens can vote in municipal elections who own a certain amount of property, usually it is \$200 worth, and all the people in my own city of Havre de Grace who vote must pay taxes on at least \$200 worth of property in order to have a voice in the

city elections. I do not see why that municipal provision is not an infringement of the sublime right to vote, if the poll-tax provision is an infringement of the right to vote, and why, if it is, cannot there be enacted a Federal law which would provide that no municipality in America, as a prerequisite to voting, shall require that the voter own or pay taxes on a certain amount of property.

So when we get away from the field of local responsibility, as I prefer to call it, rather than the outmoded and sometimes insulting label of "State rights" as it is spoken of—when we get away from the field of local responsibility into the larger field of national responsibility, we find there are very good reasons for the line of demarcation between the two, and nothing could so quickly cause the decay of this Government as to try to have the Congress of the United States act as a State legislature on the one hand and a Maryland city council on the other hand for every State and municipal government from Maine to California, and from Florida to Washington.

Mr. BILBO. If we pass the pending bill, I might paraphrase the lines:

Little city, don't you cry,  
Washington will attend to you bye and bye.

Mr. President, again I wish to advert to the address by John Temple Graves. He is a man who has given his life to the welfare and progress of the Negro in the South, and he has gone so far that a great many southern people have denounced him as being a negrophillist, as being a Negro lover, and have said some ugly things about him. But the attempts on the part of a few groups in this country—and during the present administration, I will say—to plant false ideals and hopes and aspirations and ambitions in the mind of the Negro have been so disastrous that I want to put into the RECORD certain words written by Mr. Graves to show the Senate how he has been disillusioned to a large extent.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the Senator's ideas in respect to what the Senator from Maryland said as to the action by the Virginia Legislature, which is cited in the majority report, in barring a large number of persons from voting.

Mr. BILBO. I shall make a note of it and shall be glad to discuss that point when I come to it.

I read from the words of Mr. Graves:

The simple and tragic truth of the race situation in the Southern States, where three-fourths of the country's Negroes live, is that in a time of total war northern agitators of the black man are giving new leases of life to southern agitators of the white man.

That is, the northern agitator for the black man gets busy, that gives ground for the southern agitator to get busy with the white man. I never rode into office on the Negro issue in my life. I never played on the prejudices of the people against the Negro. During my

political career the Negroes outnumbered the white men in my State.

The whole story is in that. Its tragedy goes especially hard with those southerners who have loved and fought for the Roosevelt administration through three terms and who have admired the First Lady for her industrious and undoubted humanitarianism.

The issue of race segregation, which the South considers a thing apart from the general issue of advancement for the Negro, had already been raised, hatefully and dishonestly, by Talmadge when the war came. It was not a genuine issue then. Talmadge could have been beaten on it. But it became genuine when Negro leaders outside the South, with the apparent backing of Mrs. Roosevelt and the possible support of the administration, made the war an occasion for the most intensive campaign ever launched against any and every differential, minor or major, between white man and black. If these leaders had been willing to confine their fire to discriminations against the Negro in war-production plants and in training schools, the Talmadges and all they represent in demagoguery, fanaticism, Ku Kluxery, and psychopathic hate and fear would not have been given new leases. They have chosen, however, to go crazy with their championings, scouring the land for trouble, entering loud complaint even against the calling of Negro babies "pickaninnies," and making plain beyond question an intent to use the war for settling overnight the whole, long-complicated, infinitely delicate racial problem. Their argument has its appeal, true. They say that America must prove the democracy for which it is asking its people to fight abroad by making it complete at home.

That is the argument made by some of the sponsors of the bill.

In the circumstances, however, they might as logically say that because America's house is on fire, America must take the occasion for renovating the kitchen or putting Venetian blinds in the parlor. So little are they concerned by the fact that their all-embrasive crusade means a domestic war while their country is making supreme war abroad that they have invited their followers to think in terms of a double V-for-victory—victory in battle with Hitler and victory in battle at home. Victory, unhappily, doesn't work that way. The battle at home begins to threaten the battle against the man with the little black moustache. He happens to be the greatest race-hater in history, the Jim Crow of all the ages. He has called the Negro "lower than the ape" and will treat him so if he gets a chance.

Any Negro who has any sense knows that he is fighting for his very existence when he is fighting against the control and domination of the world by Hitler and the Japs. He would not have a ghost of a chance. He has some chance now. He is receiving some consideration now; and when this war is over, the way will be open for him to fulfill all his dreams by resettlement in Africa. But with Hitler and Tojo in control the Negro would fare a great deal worse than the Jews fared in Germany.

These Negro leaders who insist on appeasement as their price of full participation in the war say that southern white liberals who are opposing them in what these liberals think are the interests of the Negro and the Nation do not properly estimate the current feeling among the Negro population. An answer is that these leaders themselves and their

backers in high political place have brought the feeling to its intensities. A more compelling answer is that there is another feeling which is being agitated to white heat too: that is the feeling of white majorities in the South—where most of the Negroes live. Listen, for grim example, to Horace C. Wilkinson, Birmingham lawyer-politician, who had retired from a career of talented gad-flying until the present race excitements brought him back for a speech to the Kiwanis Club of Bessemer last July 22. Mr. Wilkinson began by quoting a Birmingham bus driver who had pointed to a group of Negroes and told him, "Right there, mister, is where our next war will break out, and it may start before this one is over." Following a courtroom method which practice has made perfect in him, Mr. Wilkinson told his audience: "I regard that as an overstatement of the situation, but I was impressed with the man's sincerity when he detailed numerous recent instances of insolent, impudent conduct on the part of Negro passengers that necessitated 'calling the law,' as he expressed it. I learned that there seems to be a disposition on the part of many Negroes to disregard and resist the Jim Crow law and that in many instances it has been necessary to stop and hold busses and streetcars until officers could be summoned to make unruly Negroes occupy the part of the car reserved for them or remove them because they refused to do so."

Nothing gives the Negro who has the wrong viewpoint on relationships more pleasure than to rush in and take a seat in the white compartment of a railroad car, hotel, or depot. He will do it if he has an opportunity, although adequate and equal provisions have been made for him on the train, on the streetcar, at the depot, and in the hotel.

"Montgomery is having similar experiences." The speaker then launched into a long list of "atrocities." He told of a telephone call to the Louisville & Nashville Railway office in Birmingham from a conductor in Anniston who was holding his train because "a Negro was determined to ride in the white car, the law to the contrary notwithstanding." He told of white men at the Republic Steel works who are complaining about Negroes being given jobs that have always been filled by white men—they want the situation relieved by law, but they want it relieved. He described a scene in a Dothan liquor store where Negroes had grown tired of waiting in line and decided to take matters in their own hands and practically took over the store. He recalled the Montevallo incident, when a number of young ladies attending the State College there were insulted by Negroes throwing kisses to them as they waited at the railroad station for a train to carry them home.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has just addressed a couple of questions to me. I do not know how the people in North Dakota would feel. I do not know whether or not they would resent Negroes throwing kisses at white girls in any community in that State; but an affront of that kind in the South means trouble. Our feeling of resentment, our prejudice—I will admit that it is prejudice, whether right or wrong—our race consciousness, and our determination to draw the color line will not tolerate Negroes throwing kisses to white girls anywhere in the South. Whether my northern friends like that sentiment or viewpoint is absolutely immaterial to

me; but it exists in the South, and properly so.

He mentioned "race trouble narrowly averted at Tuskegee when there was a clash between the white civil authorities and the Negro military police in the white business section of the city," and how, when the Negroes had been disarmed, officials at Tuskegee demanded that their pistols be restored. "The situation is regarded as extremely serious by many of the most substantial people. One man in whom I have utmost confidence told me that practically every responsible male citizen in the town was a special officer of some kind." Mr. Wilkinson then spoke of a legal action "filed by a group of Negroes in the circuit court of Jefferson County undertaking to force the American Legion in Alabama to charter Negro posts." He quoted Wendell Willkie's address to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at its Los Angeles convention and declared that Willkie had "advocated a program that, in my judgment, would inevitably result in two things; namely, the destruction of segregation and the amalgamation of the races. \* \* \* As I see it, the difference between Mr. Willkie and the national leadership in the opposing party is the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum." He noted the local morning paper with an account of a demand for a racial show-down made on the President of the United States by A. Phillip Randolph, international president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and cited Randolph for making much of two lynchings and of the execution of Odell Waller, a Negro sharecropper in Virginia, for cold-blooded murder.

There has been more done in Washington by Executive orders and other orders to plant false hopes in the Negro race than has been done in any other part of the country so far as I know. The situation has been so pronounced that Walter Davenport, in a recent edition of Collier's, has written an article under the title "The Negro Lifts His Head." In connection with the article he displays pictures of white girls being forced to dine with Negro girls in the various department cafeterias in Washington. The situation is considered to be a great victory for the Negro race. By Executive orders, all the barriers in the cafeterias in the Government departments in the city of Washington have been broken down and Negro girls are now dining side by side with white girls.

In the article to which I have referred a picture is displayed showing a white man seeking a job from a Negro employment or personnel officer in a department of the Government. Also, there are pictures showing the familiarity which exists in some of Mrs. Roosevelt's West Virginia schemes of colonization. Officials in Washington have gone so far as actually to remove partitions in the cafeterias which had been erected to separate the eating places of the blacks from those of the whites. Since the removal of the partitions members of both races eat together. Once there were separate lockers for the members of each race. The lockers are now used in common. The Negro asserts that no greater accomplishment in behalf of his race has taken place in the District of Columbia than that which has been brought about by compelling white girls to serve as stenographers to Negro divisional heads

in the various departments. The Negro believes he is making some progress in the world. He has reached such a point of intimacy and social equality with the white race that he has a white girl as a stenographer. The rulings of bureaucrats in Washington have forced hundreds of southern girls to leave Washington rather than serve as stenographers to Negro subbosses in the various departments of the Government.

With our ideas in the South of social relations between the races, and the drawing of the color line for the protection of both races—because both races are more or less race conscious—we resent such a condition. It may be tolerated in the District of Columbia. It may be tolerated under the shadow of the Capitol. It may be tolerated here under the influence of an administration which is a party to it; but if an attempt is made to enforce such a condition south of the Mason and Dixon's line hell will break out in Georgia, or in any other Southern State where such enforcement is attempted. Our ideas of social relationships between the races will not tolerate such practices.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to learn from the majority leader his views on this question.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from North Dakota has my consent to "feel out" the distinguished majority leader as much as he wishes. I suggest however, that he should wait until the Senator from Kentucky gets the floor.

I continue to read from the statement by John Temple Graves:

Then, like the preacher who gives 55 minutes to luscious descriptions of sin and closes with a 5-minute appeal against sinning, Mr. Wilkinson said: "These instances, like boils on the body, are indicative of a condition that needs attention. They are not mentioned for the purpose of arousing feeling against the Negro race but for the purpose of showing you that the time has arrived for discussion that will provoke serious consideration of the situation in Alabama and the South and bring forth suggestions for a solution of the problem within the law and under the Constitution of the United States. \* \* \* About 10 percent of the population of this country are Negroes. The whites being in the majority, it is their right and responsibility to work out the problem within the law and by a law that all whites and blacks must obey. It must be done that way. Extra-legal methods, however necessary or effective they may have been in days of yore, are not to be resorted to now."

Mr. Wilkinson's speech has been quoted and passed about all over the South. Its pieties against extra-legalism were not among the popular parts. I have outlined it here without prejudice to questions of fact and of right-and-wrong. Its significance is in the feelings it represents and those it arouses. Set these against the ones that are being aroused among the colored people and you have your trinitrotoluol.

Alabama's United States Senator BANKHEAD found his State in such a fever of racial trouble and anticipation of trouble when he came home last summer that he wrote a letter to General Marshall, Chief of Staff, sug-

gesting: "If you feel obliged to have Negro soldiers in the South as a result of social or political pressure, can't you place southern Negro soldiers there and assign the other Negro soldiers in the North, where their presence is not likely to lead to race wars?"

Mr. MCKELLAR rose.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator desires to ask a question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to ask a question. First I should like to read a short editorial, if the Senator will permit me to do so, and then I should like to ask the Senator if the views expressed in it are in accord with his views.

Mr. BILBO. I shall be pleased to answer the Senator's question; that is all that I can yield for.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Well, the editorial is a part of my question.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. MCKELLAR. In the Evening Star of this afternoon, November 19, 1942, in the second column on the editorial page, appears the following editorial:

#### POLL-TAX CONTROVERSY

As the Senate battle over the bill to abolish the poll tax in national elections increases in bitterness and scope, the wonder grows as to why this particular time was chosen to force a showdown on such a highly controversial issue.

The objections which have been raised against this tax are varied and confused. To some extent, no doubt, it tends to restrict voting. Yet the tax itself in the eight States where it remains in effect is small—\$1 or \$1.50. In terms of dollars and cents, it is perhaps the least onerous of all the taxes imposed by the States. Furthermore, it is a matter of common knowledge that many people in the poll-tax States, although well able to pay the tax, do not vote because they are unwilling to take the trouble to pay it, or to register, or even to go to the polls. These people are not debarred from voting by the poll tax. In all States there are many persons who simply do not care enough about the privilege of voting to comply with any preliminary requirement. A good example of this was given in New York City (where there is no poll tax) earlier this month, when the voters stayed away from the polls in large numbers because they were unwilling to take the trouble to register, despite urgent appeals from the President and State officials that they do so.

Similarly, there is little substance to the charge that the poll tax discriminates against Negroes. In the States where it remains in effect it applies to all alike, and it is no more discriminatory, and far less burdensome to the poorer classes, than the automobile taxes or the State sales taxes, to mention two of many.

But, even if full weight be given to the contentions that the tax is antisocial and undemocratic, the fact remains that the States themselves gradually have been getting away from it. At one time a poll tax, or an equivalent, was in force in practically all of the older States. Slowly, but by voluntary action, it was abandoned in one State after another, until finally it remained only in the Southern States. But even there the trend has been against the tax. In recent years Louisiana and Florida have dropped it, and it is on the way out in Tennessee.

This being the case, it is surprising that Majority Leader Barkley has selected this particular time, when the war puts a premium on harmony in the Senate, to force an issue which, in the opinion of some Senators, involves a very grave constitutional threat to the integrity of the States. Even if he is successful ultimately in overriding the Sena-

tors from the poll-tax States, it is apt to be discovered that very little has been gained and a great deal lost.

My question is, Does the Senator from Mississippi agree 100 percent with the views expressed by the writer of the editorial?—an editorial which I think is a splendid statement of the case, and to be found in this afternoon's edition of the well-known Washington Star.

Mr. BILBO. I appreciate the Senator's interruption and contribution. I think the views expressed in the editorial are very pertinent, wise, and timely. I could not do otherwise than endorse it.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the statement by Mr. Graves:

A fact as sure as science is that the white majorities of the South are unwavering and total in their determination not to have race segregation abolished.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am reading from a statement by a man who has been denounced for being a friend of the Negro in the south, who has been laboring in their behalf, and who has been fighting their battles.

I read further:

And southern liberals, who in other days have befriended and championed the Negro to the point of getting themselves mentioned adversely in Klan circles, are too well aware of this to believe that anything but harm to the Negro, the South, and the Nation at war can come of current agitations. "The southern Negro," said Mark Ethridge, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, in his now famous statement as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Labor Practices at the hearings in Birmingham last July, "cannot afford to drive from his side, in his march to a greater fulfillment of his rights, the southern white men of good will who have been his chief asset and his chief aid."

That is the statement of Mr. Ethridge in reference to the Negro.

I read further:

Mr. Ethridge said this in prelude to his historic declaration that "there is no power in the world—not even in all the mechanized armies of the earth, Allied and Axis—which could now force the southern white people to the abandonment of the principle of social segregation.

That is true; we would die first.

It is a cruel disillusionment, bearing the germs of strife and perhaps tragedy, for any of their (the Negroes') leaders to tell them that they can, expect it, or that they can exact it as the price of their participation in the war.

I am not unaware of the fact that in 19 States and the District of Columbia intermarriage is permitted between the members of the black and white races; but so far as the South is concerned we are not ready for miscegenation or intermarriage between the races.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to a prominent and well-educated Negro from Chicago who came to see me the other day. He said that if the American people knew just what was being discussed on the streets in the Black Belt in Chicago—things that have been placed in the Negroes' minds by the Negrophilists and Negro columnists and politicians—they would be roused to do something about it. He was in Washington trying to do

something about it, trying to help remove such false ambitions and hopes from the minds of the Negroes who are not yet prepared for such things and who are not going to be accorded those rights—either in the South or in more than a very few places in the North.

I read further from the statement:

Mr. Ethridge was speaking of a fact. He was passing no judgment, simply stating a truth without recognition of which there can be no practical approach now to the very real problems and needs of the Negro in the South. A New Dealer, a favorite of President Roosevelt for many posts and missions, a publicist criticized in some southern quarters for his championings of the Negro, and a member of the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee, he found it necessary as a man accustomed to getting things accomplished to make this statement of fact.

The writer there refers to Mr. Ethridge.

The article continues:

Much as the statement disappointed some of his liberal friends in other parts of the country and angry as it made the national Negro leaders, it disappointed and angered even more the reactionaries in the South who are looking to gathering racial tensions as a shining chance for discrediting not only the New Deal but the whole liberal position.

Let me digress at this point to make an observation. The scattered Republicans of the South and those who are not pleased with the legislation provided by the New Deal are taking advantage of what is happening here in the pressure for the passage of the bill, and of all these other things, to play upon the feelings of the people of the South, to arouse them and prejudice them against the New Deal, against President Roosevelt, and against all that has been done by the New Deal for the underprivileged of America. Yet when we call their hand and ask them to name any particular legislation of the New Deal, any acts of the New Deal, they are more or less confounded; because it is hard for them to name anything that they dare publicly condemn; but they condemn all of it as a whole, using this coddling and playing to the Negro as an excuse to fight the President and the New Deal.

The race issue is one on which, when once it is hotly enough raised, anybody can beat anybody below the Potomac. To have southern liberals like Mark Ethridge and Virginius Dabney taking forthright stands against agitation for settlement of the whole Negro problem overnight in the face of an enemy across the sea, even as they lead in demands for the Negro's full participation in the industrial and military tasks of the war, has been confusing to the Talmadges of Dixie, to the Fascists, to the Klansmen who are itching so to ride, and to those gentlemen who took it upon themselves recently to use the club on a great Negro singer in Rome, Ga., who had nothing but peace and good will in his heart.

That is the point I have been trying to make all afternoon. As a friend of the Negro, I say that these radicals, off-brands, pinks, organizations, unions, politicians that are trying to force this legislation before we are ripe for it, to force this issue before we have been developed to the point where we are ready for this kind of philosophy, are only furnishing ammunition to the radicals of

the South who want to play upon the Negro's prejudice, who want to use this measure for political purposes, who want to use it to defeat the Democratic Party, who want to use it to bring the President of the United States into disfavor and break down the New Deal and all it has done for the unprivileged in America. I want it understood that I am not yet apologizing for anything the New Deal has accomplished. It has made some mistakes, as we all make mistakes, but, on the whole, it is the first time in a century or more that the people, the underprivileged people, have had a break in the affairs and administration of their Government and the laws that are passed by the Congress.

The no-compromise leadership among the Negroes will have none of this fact-facing on segregation, however.

Now, listen:

At the thirty-third annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Los Angeles last July, Assistant Secretary Roy Wilkins is quoted as vowing there would be no faltering in the all-or-nothing policy: "The issues are clear; the stakes are great; the path is straight; the tensions are tremendous; the pressure crushing. This is our answer to the Ethridges of Kentucky, the Dabneys of Virginia, the Graves of Alabama. This is the watchword that must go forward. We cannot give up the trust." And A. Philip Randolph declared: "It is better to die fighting than to live begging."

That is the real attitude of the Negro leaders as a result of all this "politicking" and coddling of the Negro by negrophilists.

What is it that makes them so determined, these leaders who, in most instances, are perfectly honest in their conviction not only that their race has suffered much and is entitled to much, but also that this is the great time? There is, of course, their quite correct estimate of the difference between the democratic battle cries with which this Nation has gone to war and the want of democracy in many of our practices, especially toward the Negro. There is their correct understanding, too, that the Roosevelt administration, both for political reasons and for genuinely humanitarian ones, is inclined to back any and every proposal now for advancement of the Negro. More basically, there are the not-to-be-disputed facts of suppression, injustice, cheating, and denials practiced against Negroes by whites all over this land, with resultant low standards of living and low chances of improving the standard. There was a very real need of the famous Executive Order No. 8802 against discriminations in wartime industrial jobs. There was need of it not only as a measure for fullest employment of American manpower, but also to protect the Negro against economic hardships resulting from discriminations on the part of both management and labor in war industries, especially in the North.

The issuance of Executive Order No. 8802 is a story worth telling. In the summer of 1941, because of Nation-wide discriminations in war industry jobs and training schools, A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters called for a Negro march on Washington. With the support of Secretary Walter White, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he arranged for busses and special trains to bring an estimated 50,000 Negroes to the Capital. This proposed dramatization turned out to be too dramatic. Mrs. Roosevelt asked that the march be called off, and was refused.

When President Roosevelt made the same request he too was refused, until he agreed to issue the order banning discrimination against Negroes in war industries and setting up the Fair Employment Practice Committee, two of whose seven members were to be Negroes.

At this point let me make an observation. This statement proves my contention that the white man understands the Negro in the South and treats him fairly—we have a few scallawags, but I am talking about the great majority—while in the North, where we find for political purposes, the sponsors and advocates of the Negro cause, it becomes necessary for the President to issue the famous Order 8802 in order to break down and do away with discrimination in the industrial plants of the North.

Someone sent Walter White copies of my syndicated southern column criticizing him for the proposed march. "On numerous occasions," he wrote me on July 14, 1941, "we have pleaded with the President to break his silence and to speak out against this discrimination which not only was doing an injustice to the Negro but was definitely jeopardizing our national security through reduction of our productivity by approximately 10 percent.

**Mr. CONNALLY.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement about the pending business, and I ask unanimous consent that it not disturb the legislative procedure or interfere with the Senator from Mississippi having the floor.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair).** Is there objection? **Mr. McNARY.** Mr. President, what is the nature of the request?

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The request is that the Senator from Mississippi yield in order that the Senator from Texas may make a statement without interfering with the present status of business.

**Mr. McNARY.** I thank the Chair.

**Mr. CONNALLY.** Mr. President, these proceedings have been going along for several days. Those of us who have been opposing the bill and opposing taking it up for consideration have been denounced by some of the press and by some of those who are proposing the bill as being obstructionists, as seeking delay, and as interfering with the processes of parliamentary government, and things of that kind.

I want to say, Mr. President, that many of us who are opposed to this bill are just as anxious to dispose of it, and probably more so, than are those who are proposing it. So, speaking for the group that is opposed to this measure, I now propose to the majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky, this proposition:

Those of us who are opposing the motion to take up the bill, to consider the bill, will agree to withdraw our opposition to its being brought before the Senate for consideration, with the understanding, however, that those who are proposing the bill shall prepare and take such steps as are necessary to bring about a vote on cloture on Saturday of this week at 1 o'clock; and with the further proviso that if cloture is refused the bill shall be laid aside for this session

of the Congress and not be further considered.

**Mr. President,** I am prompted to make this statement through no desire for any parliamentary or other advantage. I make it in behalf of our group in vindication of the course we have pursued up to this time.

I may say, Mr. President, that, so far as the outbreaks of certain critics are concerned, they will have no effect whatever upon those of us in the minority who are resisting this bill. We have a sufficient number of Senators who are prepared to discuss the measure, we have the parliamentary advantage that the bill has never yet been brought before the Senate, and we can resist through every parliamentary advantage known to the law and known in any of the books purporting to be the law, until the expiration of this session of Congress.

But we do not desire to have the Senate attacked and criticized any more than is necessary. We want to refute the contention of those who say that we are not ready to meet this issue. We are ready to meet it under the proposal I make, that the Senate, under its powers as to cloture, take a vote on cloture next Saturday at 1 o'clock.

It may be said that some of the absent Senators should be notified. Mr. President, they have been notified. They have been notified through the press of the unusual procedures which have been adopted here within the last few days to obtain a quorum. The majority leader announced in one of our sessions that he would instruct the officials of the Senate to notify all absent Senators that they must return to Washington and be here prepared to act on this measure, and to act on all the incidental questions pertaining thereto. There is not a Senator in the United States today who cannot get here by Saturday at 1 o'clock, if he wants to come. The airways are open, the trains are open, the busses are open. So we make that proposal at this time. I make it in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** Mr. President, it is not necessarily proper to propose a unanimous-consent request in view of the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Texas, representing the opponents of the bill, now comes forward with a suggestion that they will withdraw opposition to making the bill the unfinished business provided immediately I file a motion for cloture and a vote on the motion at 1 o'clock on Saturday.

I do not know just why Saturday is selected as the day upon which the proposed vote on cloture should be had. I do not wish to rehash any history about what happened last Saturday, but all Senators know of the difficulty we had in securing a quorum last Saturday.

I realize that the prolongation of this filibuster—which it is—is not conducive to the high esteem in which the public should hold the Senate of the United States. It is a regrettable fact, for which the Senate itself is responsible, and has been for 150 years, that all the rules of the Senate, if there are any, and all the

precedents, with very rare exceptions, work into the hands of those who seek to obstruct legislation, and there is not a single rule which can be used by those who seek to promote legislation in the face of determined opposition.

I think that is a legislative and parliamentary situation which does not exist in any other legislative body in the world. The Senate has the power to correct the condition, but it has never done so. The only instrument in the rules designed to prevent what has transpired and what is transpiring is the so-called rule on cloture, which has been interpreted to apply only to a measure, and parliamentary presiding officers have interpreted the term "measure" to mean either a bill or a resolution. I do not complain of that interpretation, it is probably correct; but ever that plays into the hands of those who wish to prevent legislation, because it allows unlimited debate on any motion except a motion to table.

**Mr. President,** I have stated the situation in the Senate due to the Senate's own unwillingness to reform and modernize its own rules, but we have to face that situation whenever there is a determined and organized effort to prevent legislation.

I am willing to grant, for I always try to be frank with the Senate and with the country, that I have received many telegrams and letters asking why I make no effort to apply cloture to the motion to take the bill up or to the point of order now pending, which has been submitted to the Senate. The country does not know, but it should know, that cloture cannot be applied or sought, under the interpretations of the rule, on a motion to proceed to consider a bill. It cannot be applied on the pending question, which is a point of order submitted to the Senate. It cannot be applied until a bill has been made the unfinished business, or has been laid before the Senate on a motion carried by the Senate to proceed to its consideration. So that there is no way by which any Member of the Senate can begin to inaugurate a movement for cloture on the pending question, and when the point of order shall have been disposed of, it will be impossible for any one to file a petition for the closing of debate on the motion itself.

**Mr. President,** that is due to an unfortunate oversight on the part of the Senate when it adopted the so-called cloture rule, but it is the rule, and we have to abide by it; we have to be governed by it; we are subject to it.

I make this statement because it seems to me the supporters of the bill throughout the country are entitled to understand that until the bill itself shall be taken up for consideration by the Senate, no cloture rule which would close debate can be applied or sought.

Inasmuch as the point of order made by the Senator from Mississippi and submitted to the Senate is debatable, it is conceivable that if a sufficient number of Senators desire to do so, they can talk on the point of order until the Senate shall adjourn automatically on the 3d of January. My motion to take the bill up

would never be reached if a sufficient number of Senators were willing to organize to discuss the matter until the point of order should be disposed of, or until the session should expire by operation of law.

Even when the point of order shall have been disposed of, then the motion will come up for discussion, and if a sufficient number of Senators desire to do so, and organize for that purpose, they can discuss the motion to take the bill up until the 3d day of January. That is undoubtedly true. Whether they would do that I am not saying, but they could do it; they have the power to do it.

I make this explanation because there are many people in the country who do not understand why we cannot shut off debate now on the point of order which is before the Senate, and on the motion to take the bill up.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas openly in the Senate suggests to me that if we who are for the bill will agree to vote on cloture on Saturday at 1 o'clock the opponents of the bill will withdraw their opposition to making the bill the unfinished business. I am as anxious as is anyone, and I imagine I am more anxious, with justice to everyone in the Senate and out of the Senate, to bring this controversy to a conclusion.

In my judgment the longer it continues before the Senate reaches a point where it can act on the bill and disposes of it, the greater will be the injury done to the dignity and the reputation of the Senate of the United States, and the esteem in which it is held. That is unfortunate at this time, when we are all making a strenuous and tragic effort to maintain parliamentary government in the world, to restore it where it has been abolished, and to maintain it in this country.

I grant that it is the duty of all Senators to be present. That was the position I took last Saturday, which has resulted in so much unfortunate unpleasantness among Members of the Senate, which I regret more than anyone, but which I cannot help.

Granting that Senators should be here, granting that they should have been here last Saturday, granting that they should have been here every day, I think it is fair to those who are not here to give them an opportunity to be present when the question of cloture is voted upon.

Many Senators on both sides of the pending question, and both sides of the aisle, have not returned to the city since the election. I do not know how they would vote on cloture. Whether they would vote for it or against it I do not know. But in an important matter such as the one we are discussing, there should be as full an expression of the Members of the Senate as is possible on a motion for cloture.

I have said privately and I have said publicly here, and I repeat, I feel, and I have felt, that it is my duty to exert whatever parliamentary rights I have to bring this matter to a vote, to the extent of offering a motion for cloture, which I should do if the bill were laid before the

Senate. If we cannot obtain cloture, we cannot pass this bill. I know that. Every other Senator knows it. We cannot pass the bill unless we can close debate under what we call cloture. Whether we can obtain cloture at any time is doubtful, to say the least. But, Mr. President, I do not believe I ought to be required on short notice, on Thursday afternoon at 3:30 o'clock, to agree that if the opposition to taking up the bill is withdrawn today, and the bill is made the unfinished business today, we shall vote on cloture at 1 o'clock on Saturday, because that gives those who are absent for any reason less than 48 hours in which to return to Washington.

I do not want to be charged with taking a position which will delay consideration of this matter or final determination of it. I am actuated by my sense of fairness to the Members of the Senate who, for whatever reason, are not now in the Senate and in the city of Washington. They have taken note of the debate here. They have read in the newspapers that there is under way a filibuster, frankly avowed, and that it will be a good while before there will be a vote on anything. They may have been actuated by that situation in not returning to Washington. I think they ought to have an opportunity to be notified that on a day certain, at an hour certain, the motion for closing debate will be voted upon. Then it is for them to determine on that basis whether they shall return to Washington or remain at their homes in their States. If they do not see fit to return, knowing the situation, and having the time to get here after it has been determined that a vote will be had on cloture at a certain hour on a certain day, that is their responsibility.

We certainly would have a quorum here on any day on which we might vote. No one could complain on account of the absence of a quorum. Insofar as I am concerned, and so far as I can speak for those who support the bill, we will abide by the vote on the question of cloture; but I think the Senate ought to have a fair opportunity to pass upon it, and I think Senators who are not here ought to have more than 45 hours, as it is now, to get back to Washington before a vote on cloture is taken.

Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Texas that, so far as I am concerned—and I will undertake to speak for those who support the bill—whether the opposition to the motion to take up the bill is withdrawn today, or tomorrow, or on Saturday, I would agree, insofar as I can agree, that the motion for cloture be filed early enough that a vote upon it might be had at 1 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday next. I think that is a fair proposition. I think it is fair to all Senators. I do not think we who favor the proposed legislation will have any advantage by reason of that delay. I think of those who are absent, probably as many are against cloture as are for cloture. I do not think the Senator from Texas or his group would lose any advantage by reason of a 2 days' delay, but I believe it would be more fair to Senators who are away, than to undertake to compel

a vote on the question day after tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I, of course, can only construe the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky as a refusal of my proposition to vote on the question Saturday. I appreciate the position of the Senator from Kentucky as to the absentees, but, Mr. President, do not the absentees owe us any duty? Do not the absentees who are at home, playing golf, walking around among their cattle, owe us any duty to be here?

Are we under any obligation to sit here and go through the agony of all this debate—and it is agony, I will say to the Chair and to the Senate, and everyone knows it is. It is no pleasure. Does anyone think we get any enjoyment out of the stress and the strain of discussing what we know involves the very fundamentals of our political life, of our institutions, and of the rights and freedoms and the liberties of our people? Yet we are asked to wait now because some absent Senator is not here. No one knows how he will vote. No one knows whether he is going to come back at all. Yet we must sit here and go into winter quarters.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Vice President here? Can he sign orders of arrest and get absent Senators back here by Saturday, if it is desired? The Vice President is here, and, as I understand, he is still able to sign his orders of arrest of absent Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume the Vice President is in town. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, and I am sure the Senator from Tennessee is well advised of the Vice President's authority, without really asking me about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I assure the Senator I am very well advised as to the facility by which orders of arrest can be obtained in this body, and that they can be executed, and that it will not take any longer than Saturday morning to have any Senator here whom it is desired to have here.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to any absent Senator coming here and casting his vote, but he cannot cast it, as we have observed heretofore, out in Colorado, or Oklahoma, or New Mexico. He must be present in the Senate. He does not have to be present at a meeting of a committee of which he is a member in order to vote, but he has to be present on the floor of the Senate in order to vote.

Mr. President, I will make one final proposal. I propose to the Senator from Kentucky, as the majority leader—and this proposal includes the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and all other Senators who are supporting the bill—that we will agree to withdraw opposition to the motion to take up the bill; we will do that today, if necessary, and debate the bill with the distinct understanding that a vote be had on cloture at 1 o'clock on next Monday, and, of course, the

necessary proceedings to secure cloture to be complied with, the signing of the petition and all the necessary legal requirements, and that if the motion for cloture is rejected, or fails, that this bill shall be laid aside, and not thereafter be considered during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment, please. Mr. President, that will give every absent Senator who wants to be here a chance to be here. Those who do not want to be here do not have to come. I do not apprehend that any motion for their arrest will be made, and that they will be brought here under arrest.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Texas, of course, is familiar enough with the rules to know that orders for arrest only occur in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. I grant that.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there is no use of confusing the issue here by saying that we can send out to arrest Senators. When there is a quorum in the Senate we cannot do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky on that point. By what I said I was not trying to confuse anyone. What I have in mind is that only those who want to come, will come, and that any Senator who has as much enthusiasm for the bill as some Senators seem to have, would get on an airplane, or ride old Pegasus, or walk, in order to get here in time to vote, if he is concerned with voting.

Mr. President, I do not see why the Senate should go into winter quarters during the Russian winter and wait here on the battleground for Senator Flub-dub, who is not eager enough about the bill to be here. He has been notified through the press of what has been going on. He was notified a few days ago by the majority leader that absent Senators should come to Washington and attend to their business.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to whom the Senator refers as Senator Flub-dub, unless perchance he might be some one of the newly elected Senators who are coming into the Senate at the beginning of the year. But be that as it may, I am willing to enter into this agreement with the Senator from Texas and with the Senate: If the opposition to the motion to take the bill up is withdrawn now, I will agree to file a motion for cloture, to be voted on at 1 o'clock Monday, so that we can notify absent Senators at once, and give them from now until 1 o'clock Monday to return. I am willing to agree to that proposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was not the whole of the proposal. The remainder of the proposal was that if upon such a vote Monday at 1 o'clock cloture was denied, the bill would be definitely laid aside for the session.

Mr. BARKLEY. That agreement ought to be made subject to the condition that if some Senator who has not

had an opportunity to express briefly his attitude on the bill wants to do so, he may do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. To make a speech, yes, but I am talking about laying the bill aside.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would say to the Senator that I should myself feel under those circumstances that it was my duty not to press the bill further during the session.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a rather personal question. The Senator says that so far as he is concerned he is willing to enter into such an arrangement. Does the Senator feel that he is authorized to speak for the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]?

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is aware, of course, that any Senator may make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill. I respect the Senator, and I know that he is acting in good faith. Please believe that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

There can be no doubt about my position. Last Friday or Saturday—or perhaps it was Monday—I stated that after I should have exhausted all the parliamentary rules which are available to me in an effort to bring the bill up for consideration, even to the point of voting on the question of cloture, if I could not obtain cloture I should feel that that was an expression of the Senate on the question of whether it wished to limit debate; and in such a situation I should not press the bill further. Let me state to the Senator that if cloture is voted down at 1 o'clock next Monday, I shall feel bound as majority leader of the Senate to move to lay the bill aside for the consideration of any other business which may be before the Senate. There will be no difficulty on that score.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not willing to participate in an arrangement under which a Senator who wishes to obtain consideration of a bill is required to agree, in consideration of his being permitted to get his bill before the Senate, to file a petition for cloture. I have observed that no Senator likes to vote for cloture, although some of us will vote for it if we have to do so. Others will not. We are confronted with a proposal to gag the Senate. I am not willing to have any Senator require that another Senator, in order to have his bill brought before the Senate, shall say in advance that he will surrender rights which he has, and agree, whenever it suits the opposition, to have a vote on a petition for cloture, and that, if he is defeated he will withdraw the motion to take up the bill. I am not willing to establish that precedent, so I object to the request of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no question of unanimous consent pending. I appreciate the attitude of my colleague—

Mr. CHANDLER. I understood that there was a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no question of unanimous consent pending. The Senator from Texas has proposed that, in order to obtain an expression of the Senate on the question of cloture, if the opposition to making the bill the unfinished business is withdrawn, I shall file a petition for cloture.

That is not a unanimous-consent request. I have stated publicly and privately that I will do so, and I will do it. As soon as possible, and a sufficient time in advance to comply with the rule in order to obtain a vote next Monday, I will file a petition for cloture. I appreciate the attitude of my colleague; but unanimous consent is not required to file a petition for cloture.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Did not the Senator from Texas propose a unanimous-consent agreement to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then, I object to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, one of the conditions of the proposal was that the senior Senator from Kentucky was speaking for the proponents of the bill. In view of the action of the junior Senator from Kentucky, I shall be forced to withdraw the proposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague that I do not require unanimous consent in order to file a petition for cloture. I can file it as soon as the bill is made the unfinished business of the Senate. I propose to keep faith with both sides on this question. I have said that I would file such a petition. There is no question of unanimous consent involved. My colleague would not have to agree to anything by way of unanimous consent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Texas made a request for unanimous consent. I objected to the way in which he made it, because if he can do what he is undertaking to do in connection with this bill, he can do it in connection with any other bill which comes before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The unanimous-consent feature was entirely superfluous to the proposal of the Senator from Texas.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. As I understand, unanimous consent has been requested, and has been refused. Is that the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator correctly states the parliamentary situation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. MCKELLAR. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The regular order is that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has yielded—

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that. That is why I am asking that the Senator from Mississippi be allowed to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, when I was unnecessarily interrupted—

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

Mr. BILBO. If I may yield without losing the floor, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not want the Senator to lose the floor.

In view of the situation which has been precipitated, I think I ought to announce to the Senate that unless the situation changes we will endeavor to have a session of the Senate on Saturday; and I now give notice to the Senate that it is my intention to have a session on Saturday. I give that notice to the supporters of the bill no less than to the opponents.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, when unnecessarily interrupted I was attempting to bring to the attention of the Senate the observations of John Temple Graves as bearing upon the situation incident to the pending bill.

The meeting referred to was one between the President, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Under Secretary of War Patterson, A. Philip Randolph, and others.

The first time I urged him to do this was at a conference at the White House last September 25 (1940) at which were present Secretary of the Navy Knox, Under Secretary of War Patterson, A. Philip Randolph, and others. On that occasion and on several others the President gave as a reason for not taking definitive action against this discrimination that "the South would rise up in protest." On several occasions I have said to him "What South are you talking about, Mr. President? The South of BILBO and Cotton Ed SMITH, or the South of Frank Graham and Mark Ethridge?" (This was before Mr. Ethridge had faced the facts about segregation and incurred the displeasure of the national Negro leadership.) I assured the President that apparently I had more faith in the inherent decency of Southern white people than he did in that I was certain that at least on an issue like this far more southerners would approve his taking an unequivocal stand than would disapprove. \* \* \* But for 5 months we were given the run-around. Appeal after appeal was made to Washington with little tangible result. Conference after conference was held, and nothing happened. Knudsen of Office of Production Management refused even to meet or discuss discrimination with any Negro delegation.

He is from Missouri.

Discontent and bitterness were growing like wildfire among Negroes all over the country. Communists were trying as usual to capitalize on this. It was only then that Mr. Randolph and several others of us planned the march as a last resort to get some consideration of the plight of the Negro. \* \* \* We are glad that things turned out as they did, though the Executive order does not go nearly as far as the circumstances warrant or the needs of the situation demand."

Unquestionably there was need of Federal interference in the Negro's behalf, and both the Negro and the war effort have been helped.

That is the help which the President gave by the issuance of order No. 8802, which dealt with the industrial plants and had nothing to do with mixing the races in cafeterias and offices in the District of Columbia.

In the great melees of men and goods and money which war production brought about, the Negro was losing his relative economic status quo. With peace jobs eliminated and war jobs denied, he was in danger of being worse off than before in comparison with the white man. During the boom times before 1929 he had been admitted more and more to skilled trades and the training required for them, but in the following days of depression he had lost out—as he generally does.

That is why I have insisted that the Negro will be discriminated against so long as he lives in this country.

There is an old saying which became current at the beginning of the recent panic which started before the Roosevelt administration. It is alleged to have emanated from a Negro in the North. It is to the effect that the Negro was always the last to be hired and the first to be fired.

Representing about 10 percent of the total population, he accounted for about 20 percent of the unemployment during the 1930's. After war production began, the situation grew worse rather than better. Of 29,215 employees at 10 war plants in the New York area only 142 were Negroes.

This ought to be sufficient proof to the Negro that when Republicans promise him anything—as is well known, most of the industrialists are Republicans—their promises are mere scraps of paper, because after the war-production program started, of 29,215 employees at 10 war plants in the New York area, only 142 were Negroes. That is the kind of deal the Republicans give the Negroes.

In 56 plants at St. Louis there was an average of only 3 Negroes to each.

I noticed that that statement was published the other day.

There were practically no provisions for training. But in the year after Executive Order 8802 was issued the situation improved, partly as a result of the increasing manpower needs and partly as a result of the order. The aviation industry, which had less than 300 Negroes in January 1941, had 3,500 in April 1942. The number employed in navy yards increased more than 300 percent.

Liberal southern leadership, especially the liberal press, has applauded these gains and defended against other southerners the Executive order and the Fair Employment Practice Committee which have contributed to them. But southern liberals have tended to draw away from the administration and from the Negro leadership as evidences multiplied of an intent to use the war for breaking down the whole structure of southern race relations.

I have read all the contribution by John Temple Graves. It leads to this one statement—and this is the meat in the coconut:

But southern liberals have tended to draw away from the administration—

From Roosevelt, from the New Deal, from the Democratic Party—

and from the Negro leadership as evidences multiplied of an intent to use the war for

breaking down the whole structure of southern race relations.

That is why the southerners are balking at some of the orders that come out of the White House and the orders issued by some of the bureaucrats and politicians in the set-up at Washington; because they are trying to take advantage of the war situation to break down and destroy a creed, a sentiment, a feeling, and a condition which have obtained for 100 years or more—to break them down overnight, and to force upon the South things that would so flagrantly violate the rules of social relationships between the races in the South that we would die before we would submit to what those who are making such attempts or are thinking about making such attempts are trying to do.

I read further from the article:

Editor Virginius Dabney wrote in the Richmond Times-Dispatch—

Remember that Virginius Dabney, along with Graves, is one of those who has been trying to befriend the Negro and help him out—

last April that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (and its magazine, *The Crisis*) had been "responsible for many important and justifiable advances on the part of the Negroes, but the manner in which it has stirred Negro citizens, and particularly Negro soldiers, to demand the complete wiping out of all racial differentiation overnight, is one of the chief reasons why there is such inter-racial tension among us, and why some Negroes are indifferent to America's war effort. \* \* \* So difficult and complex a problem as the race problem cannot be solved in any such abrupt and hasty fashion as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People seems to desire."

That is true. A great many Negroes in the South are not interested in this war, and they do not want to take any part in it. They go out and hunt a case of syphilis in order to escape it, rather than to take a part in it. The sponsors of this legislation are trying in the name of the war effort to do something that has taken others at least 150 years to do. They are trying to take advantage of the situation, because they think they have the power to cram this constitutional monstrosity down the throats of the people of eight States.

Let us run our own business. The people of other sections of the country may need our aid some day, especially the people who live on the Pacific coast. When the oriental question becomes rather acute, they will need the help of the 140 or 150 Representatives of the Southern States in solving their problems and in saving themselves from the rule of the orientals and from the oriental scourge.

I continue to read from the article:

Against this attitude of the liberal southern white man is the persisting one of northern Negro leaders. Reciting injustices to the Negro "particularly in the Southern States," *The Crisis*—

That is White's paper, of the N. A. A. C. P.—

declared editorially in March 1941: "The Crisis leaves to its readers the question of

whether there is a great deal of difference between the code for Negroes under Hitler and the code for Negroes under the United States of America—the leading democratic Nation in the world."

That is exactly what the smart, intelligentsia Negro leaders are doing to their race. They are cramming this kind of stuff into the minds of the rank and file of the Negroes; and the Negroes are showing signs of resentment. They are showing signs of revolution. They are showing signs of balking on our united front to win the war.

Let me read again what that Negro, White, says:

The Crisis—

That is his paper—

leaves to its readers the question of whether there is a great deal of difference between the code for Negroes under Hitler and the code for Negroes under the United States of America—the leading democratic nation of the world.

Mr. President, what do you suppose a Negro thinks, and how do you suppose he feels—does he feel like going out and fighting Hitler?—when his leader, Walter White, tells him that he will get just as good a deal under Hitler as he will under the United States of America? The Negroes think, "Then why should we risk our lives for the American Government?" That is what that false leader of the Negro race, Walter White, is doing. He is nothing in the world but a racketeer and a profiteer, racketeering and profiteering off a few misguided white folks and off the members of his own race, living on the fat of the land. That is all he is playing the game for.

Reading further:

Ray Wilkins vowed in Detroit after the Sojourner Truth riots that the Negroes are "fed up with this democracy stuff."

That is another expression by one of their great leaders—

And when an official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, William Pickens, issued a statement praising the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron at Tuskegee, first Negro aviation unit in history, he was officially dropped from the executive board for implied acceptance of segregation.

I want Senators to understand that:

When \* \* \* William Pickens—

One of the officials of Walter White's New York N. A. A. C. P.—

issued a statement praising the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron at Tuskegee—

The Negro school in Alabama—

first Negro aviation unit in history, he was officially dropped from the executive board for implied acceptance of segregation.

In other words, White's position was that he would have nothing to do with Negroes who permitted themselves to be segregated at Tuskegee, a great Negro school in the South, to be trained for service of their country; that they should not have moved a peg or done anything else to get ready to win the war; but that they should be trained together—not isolated, but taken in, all over the United States, and trained side by side with the whites.

That is the spirit and attitude of all the Negro leaders who are behind this piece of legislation. When the rank and file of the Negroes follow their leadership, imbibe their teachings, share their sentiments, and begin to clamor for the recognition and reception of the things which those leaders are putting in their minds, hell is going to break loose in the entire South, and at the same time there will be trouble in the black belt in Chicago, too.

Reading further:

Southern Negro leaders have not made up their minds whether to follow the Southern white liberals or the Northern crusaders for all or nothing.

They want to know. Some of the Negroes want white wives, and some of the Negro girls want white husbands. That is all. That is their dream.

I read further:

But they are for the most part willing, nevertheless, to stress the national need in wartime and the boon of this country to all of its people. "In spite of the immemorial denials of so many democratic blessings to him," wrote President James E. Shepherd, of the North Carolina College for Negroes, in a letter last spring to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "the Negro will be loyal because he knows that at our worst he has higher hopes here than any other land will offer him at its best."

That is pretty good.

And President F. D. Patterson, of Tuskegee Institute, has denounced Walter White and the current activities of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as definitely harmful to his race.

Thank God we have a few sensible Negro leaders.

"Walter White's ego," he wrote a southern Negro editor last March, "is undermining the effectiveness of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This organization has shown itself to be an effective instrument of protest against injustice in the courts and discriminations which have an implied State and Federal sanction.

We are all against injustices to the Negro.

The decisions it has been able to obtain from the Supreme Court in regard to these have been significant and far-reaching. But in the realm of practical adjustment of Negroes in American life it fails miserably. The very nature of progress is a give and take affair. The extent to which White has been able to get the official ear in Washington has accomplished little because it has been used to protest adjustments short of what he has deemed was complete democratic integration."

That northern Negro leaders are determined to use the war as their shining chance for immediate and all-inclusive elimination of racial distinctions is a matter not in dispute, since they proclaim it. What about the Roosevelt administration?

If there be any one listening to me or any one reading what I am saying, who has reached such a point that he thinks a Negro is as good as a white man, of course, we cannot agree. I have not as yet reached that point. In Philadelphia they have schools where white children go to school with the Negro and sit side by side in the schoolroom, a Negro boy and a white girl on the same bench, with

Negro teachers, primary teachers, superintendents of schools. When the true history of that attempt to mix the races in Philadelphia is known to the people generally, there will be a demand that something be done about it. I have some letters in my files received in the last 2 or 3 days describing things that are happening in the Philadelphia schools as the result of this attempt to miscegenate the two races in the schoolroom.

Is it, too, looking in that direction? Throughout most of the South the activities of White—

That is Walter White—

Randolph, and the others are identified with Mrs. Roosevelt and her known position on the race question. What the administration itself has in mind I do not attempt to say, but there is a growing disposition among anti-New Dealers in the South to believe that it follows the First Lady. Governor Frank Dixon, of Alabama, a nephew of Author Tom Dixon ("The Kiansman," "The Leopard's Spots," etc.) intensified this point of view last July when he refused to sign a contract with the Defense Supplies Corporation for 1,750,000 yards of cloth to be made by Alabama convicts. He gave as his reason a clause in the contract against race discrimination in performance of the work.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield to me?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have a letter from Perry Howard, the national committeeman from Mississippi, commenting upon the statement he made before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and some implications that might be drawn from the remarks of the able Senator from Mississippi who is now enjoying the privilege of the floor. I should like to have the privilege, if I may, of having the letter read.

Mr. BILBO. If it is a request for unanimous consent, I am willing to agree if I will not be taken off the floor.

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President; I do not offer the letter for the purpose of removing the Senator from the floor.

Mr. BILBO. If it will not take me off the floor, I shall be delighted to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the letter being read without disturbing the parliamentary situation on the pending bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. Let me say, in fairness, that, although the Senator from Mississippi is mentioned, there is no implication or any form of characterization of the Senator from Mississippi. It is simply probably a good-natured disagreement.

Mr. BILBO. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would never have such a thing in mind, but there are some on the floor whom I would not trust. I should be glad to have the letter read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
November 17, 1942.

Senator CHARLES L. McNARY,  
Minority Leader, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McNARY: My attention has been drawn to the remarks of Senator BILBO

on the floor of the Senate on November 13, 1942, while the Senate had before it the motion to take up the bill to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in elections of Federal officers. At page 8833 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, Senator BILBO is quoted as having said:

"Perry W. Howard, a distinguished Negro from my State, who practices law in the city of Washington, appeared before the committee. He is a Republican National committeeman from my State. Howard was frank enough to tell the committee that, so far as helping the Negro to vote in Mississippi is concerned, the proposed legislation, which seems to be gnawing at the heart-strings of some of the politicians, would have no effect, and would do the Negro no good. It would not give him the right to vote."

Read in its context this statement implies that I opposed the anti-poll tax bill before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I wish to disavow that implication. A cursory reading of my statement before the Senate Judiciary Committee shows that I uttered no word in opposition to that measure. On the contrary, I sought to have the committee write into the bill additional provisions to make certain that the desired end—the enfranchisement of poor white people and Negroes—would be obtained.

I specifically attacked the arbitrary actions of registration officials, who, under the guise of an educational test, require Negroes seeking to register to read and interpret a section of the Constitution, and asked the committee to amend the bill so as to give to each major political party representation in the matter of registering voters. If each major political party should be given representation at the registration of voters, the representatives of those parties would see that those of their political faith are not arbitrarily excluded from registering, which, like the poll tax, is a prerequisite to voting.

In order that there may be no mistake of my position in this matter, may I state unequivocally that I favor the passage of the Pepper-Geyer bill and the wiping out by congressional action of every device resorted to by Democratic States to disfranchise large segments of the population. I repeat what I told the committee that "a colored man is qualified to vote for his country if he is qualified to fight for it."

If the opportunity presents itself, I shall appreciate your inserting my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may receive the same circulation as Senator BILBO's statement.

Yours very truly,

PERRY W. HOWARD.

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to have this contribution from the Republican national committeeman from my State. I will make some observations on his letter when I come to it.

Especially objectionable to southern employers is a practice under which the United States Employment Service is said to permit of no entries indicating race on its cards. Employers who are able to adjust their plant operations to the working of white and colored employees together are confronted with an irreconcilable situation when the Employment Service, which has a monopoly of available new workers, sends them colored stenographers, clerks, or secretaries to be installed in the same offices with white employees.

Here is an attempt of Mrs. Roosevelt and Executive orders and employees and appointees to carry out the policy of forcing a breakdown or destruction of

racial relationships in the South. This is done by the bureaucrats, appointees, officeholders by appointment under the authority of Congress, granted in an effort to help win the war; and there is nothing Senators can do about it. But Senators from the South are being blamed for all this monkey business on the part of these appointees and employees, men who could not be elected constable in their home districts if they should run for office; yet they occupy swivel chairs in Washington, and overnight direct a transformation of the social relations of the whole southern portion of the United States, relations which have been in the process of building for a period of 100 years.

The anti-poll-tax bill is merely one wing of the campaign, and I have a very strong suspicion that it was partially conceived at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and not in the executive departments, either.

This practice is the greatest single source of irritation and suspicion in the whole anti-discrimination policy of the administration. For many southerners it constitutes proof that Washington is interested not merely in manpower for the war effort and a fair share of jobs for the Negro but in breaking down race segregation in the South under cover of war. A definite departure is indicated in Section 5 of a United States Employment Service Bulletin, issued July 1, 1942. This permits the honoring of "discriminatory specifications \* \* \* if the employer refuses to eliminate" them. Governor Dixon criticized in his statement "those who seek to foster their own pet social reforms in a time of national crisis." Jumpy as he may have let himself become on the race issue and hostile as he may be to the administration, he will have company of southerners more liberal than himself if his suspicion that the Administration is using the war to force reforms in this or any other field is correct. More and more there is growing an appreciation of the fact that domestic crusades which mean a division in the face of the enemy are suicidal and that the so-called double V (for victory over enemies abroad and over enemies at home) is really a double X, a double-crossing of hopes for the very arena in which domestic crusades are waged.

Race segregation is an issue which cannot be forced in the South without hate, fear, violence, and a tragic dissipation of energies that belong to the war. Whatever the right and wrong of it, there are too many irreconcilables to make a solution possible now.

Something which the agitators for complete equalities between the races overlook is the vast difference between the Southern situation and that elsewhere. Of the 12,800,000 Negroes in the United States, more than three-fourths are in the South. The "Negro problem" in a State like New York, where Negroes are only 4 percent of the population, is different both in nature and in degree from the problem in Mississippi where Negroes are 49 percent of the population.

In many counties of my State 95 percent of the population are Negroes.

And the differences are multiplied by variations in education, living standards, health, civic responsibility, and law-abiding. In part, it is the southern white man's fault that the southern Negro is less qualified than he might be and should be for the full participation now being demanded. But the fact of that lesser qualification is sure. The kinds of advancement to which he is most entitled and of which he is most in need are those which

will qualify him for participation. Most of the agitation for doing away with segregation and all other racial distinctions now comes from States where the percentage of Negroes is small, but the basic problem is in States where the percentage is large. The difference is too often overlooked.

I appreciated the frankness of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] when he said he came from a State where there were no Negroes, and therefore he was not advised about the problem. If all Senators from States where there are not many Negroes and who know nothing of the situation and the problems we have to meet and solve in States where there are such large populations of Negroes would take a similar position they would not be so ready to be led off by the radical politicians who are trying to play the poor Negro for his vote with this kind of fool legislation.

Proportions of Negro to total population—

This will be interesting—

Proportions of Negro to total population

	Percent
Illinois.....	5
Pennsylvania.....	5
New York.....	4
California.....	2
Ohio.....	5
Indiana.....	4
New Jersey.....	5
Connecticut.....	1.9
Georgia.....	35
Alabama.....	35
Mississippi.....	49
Louisiana.....	36
South Carolina.....	43
North Carolina.....	27
Virginia.....	25
Florida.....	27

Not until the last census did the white population show any excess over the Negro in Mississippi. The Negroes have been in the majority in Mississippi until the last census. Give us a little more time and we will improve that situation.

If individuals and organizations undertaking to lead the Negro were forced to live where most of the Negroes live there might be a much better meeting of minds on the subject.

The most distressing, I might say disgusting, experience is to carry on a conversation with a citizen from a section of the United States where there are no Negroes and where there is no Negro problem, and to hear him tell about how the Negro should be treated and how he should be handled. My sympathy is aroused when I meet such a person because I know it is a case of lack of opportunity to become familiar with the facts. In other words, his position is due to downright ignorance of the problem he discusses.

An argument among those who are proposing that the war be made an occasion for forcing advances for the Negro is that promises of advancement after the other World War were not fulfilled. If the promises were of total elimination of all racial wrongs, discriminations, underprivileges, and economic hardships, they have indeed not been honored. But if they were promises of a progress greater than the race had ever made before and greater than any other group is

making, with a constant more in prospect, there are aspects in which they have been honored in excellent degree.

Some of the Negro leaders do not care how many hospitals we give the Negroes or how many colleges we give them. The only thing in which they are interested is the social relations. They want white wives, they want to sit down at the white man's table, they want to sleep in his bed. They do not care anything about the hospitals or the colleges for the Negroes.

There has been a striking advancement in Negro education; for example, in 1910 about 30 percent of all Negroes were illiterate. Today only about 8 percent are in that classification.

Mississippi is doing all it can to eliminate illiteracy among the Negroes.

There were 64 Negro high schools in 1915, today there are 2,500. There has been advancement in health. Fifty years ago the annual death rate among Negroes in the United States was approximately 33 per thousand. "Heroic improvements in health facilities and modes of living," reports President Edwin R. Embree, of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, "have cut that rate more than in half—to an estimated 14 per thousand. This is still 32 percent above the annual death rate of 10.6 for the United States as a whole, though it compares favorably with the death rates for total populations in all but a few very advanced countries." And it is immensely better than the Negro death rate of about 25 per thousand before the last World War. There has been advancement in organization. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has expanded from about 50 local chapters to more than 500.

Walter White is having a big time now. His revenues are copious.

The National Urban League (of Negroes) is organized in 48 cities. The National Negro Congress has 102 chapters. The ranks of organized labor have been opened. In Alabama one-third of the 102,000 Congress of Industrial Organizations members are Negroes. Reflecting the improving lot of the Negro is the Negro press. There are now 230 Negro papers in the country, with a total circulation of 1,406,800. Negro business organizations have also flourished. The North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., largest Negro business in the world, had assets of \$476,695 in 1918. Today those assets are \$7,222,192. The company's insurance in force has grown in the same period from \$16,096,722 to \$57,730,690.

That is a southern Negro insurance company.

A very great advance has been in factors represented by the radical decline in lynchings. Careful records of Tuskegee Institute include only two lynchings of Negroes this year.

With the ideas which have been pumped into the Negro's head, and with the Eleanor Clubs throughout the South, I am afraid we shall not be able to show that good a record after the war.

The number has been similarly near to zero for several years. It compares with 64 lynchings in 1918, 80 in 1919, or, going further back, 130 in 1901. Unhappily the number may increase now as a result of the agitations of the white man against the black and the black against the white.

So we may look for more. This will be very gratifying to Walter White, because he thrives wonderfully when he can start

his fight for the antilynching bill. If we in the South were left alone we could keep up the record we had before the present situation arose. That situation will afford a great opportunity for Walter White to start his tirade in favor of the antilynching bill again, when, as a matter of fact he and his crowd are responsible for conditions which are increasing lynchings in certain places in the country. If Congress were to pass the antilynching bill it would take a special recorder to keep up with the number of lynchings which would occur in the South. But we cannot convince the Negro agitator who is profiting from the poor Negro and a few poor deluded white persons.

Another advance has been in the number of leading southern daily newspapers that have championed the Negro. This, in some respects, is the most notable advance of all, for the friendship of the white liberal southerner is the Negro's basic hope in the South.

That is if he is going to stay in the South.

An improving point of view among southern whites toward the Negro was illustrated, too, in the South-wide outcry against Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, when he interfered with his State's higher educational system and raised the race issue in excuse.

The greatest advancement for the Negro—in what it promises even more than in what it has brought about—is his discovery by the Democratic Party.

I think I had better read that last sentence again.

The greatest advancement for the Negro—in what it promises even more than in what it has brought about—is his discovery by the Democratic Party. For the first time in history the Negro vote went to this party in 1932. It went again in 1936 and 1940. Insofar as it represents something near to a balance of power in pivotal States like Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio, it may have become now of more value to the Democratic Party than is the vote of the white man in the South.

That is a new idea for Senators to think about, that the Negrophilists of the North, Democrats and Republicans, figure that they can get more votes in the electoral college and make greater progress for their political parties by playing all-out to the Negro and give him social equality and let him marry into white families. That is what the Negro demands. That is his ultimate dream. Perhaps better political progress can be made in that way than for the Democratic Party further to depend upon the solid Democratic South. I am afraid that it might be true of some of those who are sponsoring the proposed legislation that they are willing to sacrifice the solid South, because if they have any political sense they ought to know that they are wrecking the solid Democratic South. They apparently would rather sacrifice the solid Democratic South and make up with the Negroes in other sections of the country.

The Negro may actually exercise more political power in the Nation now than do the white southerners who vote. That is a tremendous fact. Its implications run in many directions and some of them are tragic. In an increasingly political and Federal day

the Negro is going to be competed for by both parties in years to come and on a basis of concessions that will bring unprecedented advancement—

For the Negro. The words "for the Negro" are not in the text. I have put them in. The Negro is smart enough to know that. I received a letter from a distinguished lawyer in the South, who had a vision of what is coming to the South by reason of the attempt of the Negro group to force these things on the South, in which he asks that the Congress be gracious enough to grant the South a plebiscite to decide whether we want to continue to do business with a gang which tries to cram that sort of thing down our throats.

The Supreme Court has also discovered the Negro.

I repeat that statement—

The Supreme Court has also discovered the Negro. It has decided against lower court convictions of Negroes where Negroes had been excluded from the jury.

We have no objection to putting the Negro on the jury when a Negro is being tried in the South. A Negro does not have to be put on the jury when a white man is being tried. The fact is that if a Negro is being prosecuted I would rather have a Negro on the jury, because a Negro takes great delight and pleasure in convicting another Negro.

It has ruled that the pay of Negro and white school teachers must be the same, that railroad and other facilities must be equal in quality and service, that equal graduate schools must be made available.

The Supreme Court did not say that a Negro must be allowed in a Pullman car with a white man or white woman. It did not say that the Negro must eat in the same dining room. The Supreme Court said that the Negro must be given equal facilities with the white man, and it is up to the railroads to provide equal facilities.

An interesting result of the decision for equal pay of school teachers, as Jonathan Daniels has pointed out, is that the teaching profession among Negroes tends to be more than ever one of the best paid ones available to the race and to draw, therefore, the best talent of the race, while the same pay for white teachers, representing a low income according to white standards, will continue in its present tendency to discourage talent in school teaching among that race.

Teaching draws the best talent among the Negroes. Negroes are willing to stay in the schools and teach, because by reason of the high standard set for teaching throughout the country, they can get more money at teaching than in other occupations. But the best talent in the schoolroom in the white schools will go out and hunt something else, because white teachers can get more outside the schoolroom than in the schoolroom, by reason of the poor salaries paid to school teachers generally, according to white standards.

Each of these Supreme Court decisions means enormous forward marches and promises for the Negro. But the promise can be spoiled by any sharp aggravation of race relations in a South which seems for the present honestly seeking an adjustment to the decisions.

The poll-tax bill, sponsored by my friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], is one of those sharp aggravations.

The Negro was discovered, too, by the New Deal. Even though some of the measures brought actual hardships on him rather than help during the first years, the whole target was the underprivileged American; and since the Negro is as a class the most underprivileged, it is he who has received most of the benefits and who will profit most from the social and economic measures as they are adapted and systematized in years to come.

The Negro in the South has gloried in the New Deal help to the underprivileged in the W. P. A. The fact of the matter is that the Negro, until the war program came and wages soared to such heights, had quit working in the South and was devoting his attention and time to the W. P. A.

Best of all for him, in the long run, the Negro has been discovered by the economists.

#### God pity the Negro.

There was a time when, except for his own convenience and the conscience of white men, it made little or no economic difference whether the Negro ate anything or wore anything, was sheltered anywhere or had the comforts and gadgets of civilization. But that was before mass production made mass consuming a practical necessity of a machine age. More and more now the great corporations and business establishments know that the final process in their economic integration is the manufacture of customers. And just as the South as a whole contains, because of its comparative poverty, the great potential customer pool in America, so does the southern Negro, whose economic lot is the lowest, represent the southern purchasing power that offers most to development.

Much of this advancement of the Negro has come about as a result of efforts by the very leaders and organizations that are agitating him now to demand a radical and immediate more in the midst of a war which threatens him most of all Americans. The very hands that have given him so much of this are in danger now of taking it away. If the war is lost or if the peace between white men and black in the South is lost, there will be no advancing, nor any holding of advances made. This war must be won. And the black man in the South, where most black men live, must get on with the white man in the South, no matter what Washington orders or New York demands.

Or, I may add, Pennsylvania.

Segregation in the South is not going to be eliminated.

I repeat that statement—

Segregation in the South is not going to be eliminated. That is a fact to be faced, but it does not preclude a constant improvement in the Negro's side of Jim Crow. Universal suffrage is not going to be granted the Negro in the South now, either, and that, too, is a fact to be faced. But it does not eliminate the Southern process under which more and more Negroes are being permitted to vote.

The poll tax, an institution operating far more against white voting than Negro and preserved considerably more in the interests of those who fear union labor and the tenant farmer than those who fear the black man, must be abolished.

I am one of those who have been urging the abolition of the poll tax in party affairs in my State.

But many southern liberals believe the repeal must be left to the States themselves, that the Federal Government has proved too rough-handed and uncomprehending to settle suffrage problems in the South. It is interesting to note—and pertinent to all that has been written here—that Alabama would in all likelihood have lightened its cumulative poll tax in 1939 but for outside agitation against race segregation. When the Southern Conference for Human Welfare met in Birmingham in the spring of 1938, Frank Dixon had just been elected Governor on a platform calling for reduction to two of the number of years of back payment required under the law. With a legislature completely in his hand at that time he could have brought about the reform if he had put the whole power of his office into the effort. He was prepared to do so. But when some of the Northern Negro leaders, Northern Federal officials, and Communists who composed a part of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare made a scene over race segregation (required by Birmingham city ordinance), there resulted such a flare-up of racial and anti-Communist feeling that the new Governor changed face altogether on his poll-tax promise and made only the most perfunctory request for it when the legislature met.

A real advance, even though small, which the South was about to grant under spur of its own developing liberal impulses, was destroyed by untimely outside agitation for the impossible. And that is what threatens now. The Negro needs much and is promised much but there is no hope for him unless he gets along with the white men of the South.

If the Negro believes that he and his negrophile friends of the North can invade the South and enter into the realms of paradise, according to his dreams, let him try it and find out that there is no gold at the end of the rainbow.

In further support of our position on this question I am pleased to put into the RECORD—I shall take the time to read it, because I have plenty of time—an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday, November 18, 1942. The Baltimore Sun is a great metropolitan newspaper of the North, having readers throughout the Nation. Its circulation is 161,517 in the morning, 173,294 in the evening, and 254,412 on Sunday. This is what the Baltimore Sun says:

#### WE ALL HAVE SOMETHING AT STAKE IN THE POLL-TAX ISSUE

The so-called poll-tax bill now before the Senate involves more than the comparatively simple question whether the eight States which now require the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite of voting shall be allowed to continue that requirement in force. A still broader and more fundamental question than this is whether the States shall continue to enjoy the power to determine the qualification of their own voters, which our Constitution confers upon them.

The power of the States to say who shall vote, and to regulate the voting procedure, is basic in our Federal system. If the Federal Government, by means of this bill or by any comparable measure, can dictate the qualifications of voters and lay down electoral procedure, the Federal Government can dictate to the States on just about anything over which it may choose to take jurisdiction. And when the Federal Government begins dictating to the States in this way, the end of State sovereignty will be in sight.

In other words, if Congress should establish its power to invade the rights of the States by the passage of the pend-

ing fool poll-tax bill, it could pass laws regulating the affairs of people throughout the Nation. It could pass a law requiring all the ladies to wear a certain style of hat, a certain tailored uniform, or use a certain grade of lipstick, rouge, or powder. There is no limit to which it could not go. It could pass a law that no woman should vote. It could pass a law that no red-headed man or woman should vote. It could pass a law that no white-headed man or woman should vote, and that no man should vote after he had reached a certain age. The proposed legislation would be the entering wedge. It would open the flood gates. It would prize open Pandora's box. There would be no end to what could be done. The proponents of this proposition are maneuvering to get a Senate and a House which will do anything that is ordered at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I continue to read from the editorial:

Let no one make the mistake of thinking that State sovereignty is a mere academic issue. It is a very practical matter affecting the lives of all of us, no matter where we live. Ours is one country of 130,000,000 people. It is also a land of diversified local interests and local customs. Our national unity in those concerns in which national unity is essential depends in no small degree on the maintenance in full force and vigor of institutions which enable us to adapt our laws to the needs and desires of the various regions of which our Nation is made up.

This task of local adaptation has, under our Federal system, been the responsibility of the State governments. They take account of those differences between the people of one section and the people of another, which must be reflected in the laws if the laws are to be observed and enforced. To impair their sovereign powers, as this bill would do, is, therefore, to strike at the roots of our Federal system. Such a change would be as bad for the Central Government as for the States, for if everything were dictated from Washington the structure of the Government there would soon become too top-heavy to function effectively.

Those who are opposing the passage of the bill which would override State poll-tax laws are thus standing on a principle more important than the specific detail of the bill. That principle is an affirmative and sane conception of government. Their filibustering methods may seem objectionable, as filibusters usually are, but the willingness of their opponents to override all the sound principles on which our Federal system was built seems to leave them no other course than the one they have taken.

That is why I have said I would be willing to speak for 30 days, or 60 days if necessary, in order to prevent the passage of this proposed legislation. I believe I have some faint conception of what it means and what its effect would be in the future.

I read the concluding paragraph of the editorial:

As for the specific thing, the poll tax, it is about to be eliminated as a prerequisite in Tennessee, and this by State action. In other States, agitation is under way to get this requirement modified or abolished. It is much better to leave this question to be disposed of in this manner by State action than to attempt to determine it in Washington, at the risk of undermining of the Federal system by the subordination of the States to the Central Government.

A group of bureaucrats on the Potomac would be telling the people in Montana, Alabama, California, and Florida—it would not be so bad on Florida—what to do.

At this juncture, and for the information of the public, I desire to place in the RECORD statistics showing the racial composition of the population of the United States, by States, as established by the last census. I am sure the public will be glad to have the information, because it is very valuable.

The white population of the United States constituted 89.8 percent of the total population on April 1, 1940; the Negroes 9.8 percent, and other races 0.4 percent, Director J. C. Capt of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, announced today on the basis of final 1940 census tabulations. Changes in the racial composition of the United States population between 1930 and 1940 were negligible. The whites constituted the same proportion of the total population in 1930 as in 1940, the Negroes constituted 9.7 percent of the 1930 population, and other races 0.5 percent. The census returns also show that only 9.7 percent of the whites were foreign born in 1940, as compared with 12.7 percent in 1930.

The immigration laws seem to be doing some good.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire record showing the relative proportions of the different races—the race ratios—be made a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Without objection—

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I object. Let the Senator read it if he wants to get it in the RECORD.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator object?

Mr. GUFFEY. I do.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. I think the Senator is wise in his objection; because if he will occupy his seat and will let me read the record to him he will know more than he did when I commenced reading.

White population. Between 1930 and 1940 the white population as a whole increased by 7.2 percent, the same proportionate increase as that for the entire population. Native whites increased 10.9 percent, whereas foreign-born whites decreased 18.3 percent.

They seem to be better breeders.

These changes contrast sharply with those of the decade 1920 to 1930, during which the white population as a whole increased 16.3 percent, the native whites 18.7, and the foreign-born whites 2.0 percent.

The 18.3 percent decrease in the foreign-born white population between 1930 and 1940 is in large measure due to the curtailment of foreign immigration during this decade, there having been a net loss through emigration of 47,000 persons. The foreign-born white population has, therefore, not been replenished by new immigrants; and the mortality among its members has been relatively high during this intercensal decade because of the large percentage of old persons in this group. Unless the present quota laws are relaxed—which hardly seems probable—the foreign-born white will have ceased to form a numerically important element of our population within 20 or 30 years.

Negro population: In 1940, Negroes numbered 12,865,518, an increase of 974,375, or 8.2 percent, over the number enumerated in

1930. This rate of increase was only a little greater than that for the total population (7.2) and was considerably lower than the rate of increase for Negroes in the preceding decade—13.6 percent. The regional and divisional patterns of Negro population increase were quite different from those for the total population. In all 3 divisions of the South the Negroes showed a smaller proportional increase than the total population between 1930 and 1940, while in the divisions of the North and West their rates of increase were uniformly greater than those for the total population. The Negro population increased 15.8 percent in the North during the decade just passed, 5.8 percent in the South, and 41.8 percent in the West. These facts indicate that there was a large migration of Negroes during the 1930's from the South to the North and West, probably out of the rural areas in the South to the urban areas of other parts of the country. Over three-fourths of the Negro population (77 percent) still lived in the South in 1940, but this represents a slight decrease from the proportion of 78.7 in 1930. The North had 21.7 percent of the total Negro population in 1940, as compared with 20.3 percent in 1930, and the West had 1.3 in 1940, as compared with 1.0 in 1930.

Other nonwhite races: There were 333,969 Indians enumerated in the United States in 1940, mainly concentrated in the West North Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific States. This number represents an increase of five-tenths of 1 percent over the number enumerated in 1930, which was 332,397. The Indian population enumerated by the Census Bureau is somewhat smaller than that reported by the Office of Indian Affairs on the basis of their registration records. Because of differences in definitions used by the two agencies and differences in methods of collecting the statistics, it is quite probable that many persons classified as Indian by the Office of Indian Affairs are returned by census enumerators as Negro or white.

The Asiatic races—Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Korean, and Hindu—were concentrated mainly in the West, 76 percent of them living in the three Pacific Coast States, Washington, Oregon, California.

The idea of a Senator from any of those three States lining up against the wishes of the solid South! The Pacific Coast States are going to have trouble of their own, and they will need help.

I resume the reading:

Of these five races, only the Chinese and Filipinos increased their numbers, the Chinese showing a gain of 3.4 percent, and the Filipinos an increase of 0.8 percent. The other three races decreased, the Japanese by 8.6 percent, the Hindus by 23.2 percent, and the Koreans by 8 percent. Members of other nonwhite races than those already discussed—Hawaiians, Samoans, Siamese, etc., numbered 788, as compared with 780 in 1930.

Table 1 shows the population of the United States by race, with nativity for the whites, for 1940 and 1930, and the amount and percent of increase or decrease. Table 2 presents the racial distribution for 1940 by regions, divisions, and States.

Table 1: Population by race, for the United States: 1940 and 1930

I will state what the table sets forth:

All classes of races: 131,669,275, in 1940; in 1930, 122,775,046; or an increase of 8,894,229, or 7.2 percent.

The white population of the United States was 118,214,870 in 1940. In 1930 we had a white population of 110,286,740. The increase is 7,928,130, or 7.2 percent.

Native whites: In 1940, 106,795,732; in 1930, 96,303,335; or an increase of, 10,492,397, or 10.9 percent.

Foreign-born whites: In 1940, 11,419,138; in 1930, 13,983,405; or a decrease—represented by the minus sign—of 2,564,267. That was a decrease of 18.3 percent for the white foreign-born population.

Negroes: In 1940 there were 12,865,518 Negroes. In 1930 there were 11,891,143 Negroes—or an increase of 974,375, or 8.2 percent, during the decade.

Other races: 588,887 in 1940; 597,163 in 1930—a decrease of 8,276. The decrease was 1.4 percent.

Indians: In 1940 there were 333,969 Indians; in 1930 there were 332,397 Indians—or an increase of 1,572 or 0.5 percent.

Chinese: In 1940 there were in the United States 77,504 Chinese. In 1930 there were 74,954. There was an increase of 2,550, and the percentage increase is 3.4.

Japanese: In 1940, according to the census, there were 126,947 Japanese, and in 1930, 138,834, showing a loss of 11,887, or 8.6 percent.

Filipinos: There were 45,563 in 1940, and 45,208 in 1930, an increase of 355, or only eight-tenths of 1 percent.

Hindus: There were 2,405 in 1940, and 3,130 in 1930, showing a decrease of 725, or 23.2 percent.

Koreans: There were 1,711 in 1940, and in 1930 1,860, a decrease of 149, or 8 percent.

Of all other races there were 788 in 1940, 780 in 1930, an increase of 8, or 1 percent.

Mr. President, that shows the population of the various races in the United States, indicating their increase and decrease during the decade 1930 to 1940.

Now I come to a most interesting part of this tabulation, which I think the people of the country should have before them, so they will know just how many whites and how many Negroes there are in the various States. Then they will be in a better position to judge the attitude of some Members of Congress. All this agitation is about the Negro and for the Negro. The white man never was thought of in its inception or in its prosecution.

I shall begin with the State of Maine. Of all classes Maine has a population of 847,226. Total white population, 844,543. Native-born, 760,902. Foreign-born, 83,641. There are 1,304 Negroes in the State of Maine. The total of all other races is 1,379.

In New Hampshire there is a total population of all classes of 491,524. White race, 490,989. Native-born whites, 422,693. Foreign-born, 68,296. The Negroes in the State of New Hampshire number 414. Total of other races, 121.

In Vermont of all classes there are 359,231 people. The white total is 358,806. Native white, 327,079. Foreign-born, only 31,727. Negroes, 384, in the whole State of Vermont. There are 41 of miscellaneous races.

In Massachusetts there is a total population of 4,316,721. Total white, 4,257,596. Native-born, 3,408,744. Foreign-born, 848,852. The Negro population, I am surprised to find, is only 55,391. Other races number 3,734.

In Rhode Island the population of all classes is 713,346. Total white, 701,805.

Native whites, 564,021. Foreign-born, 137,784. There are 11,024 Negroes, and 517 of other races.

In Connecticut the population of all races is 1,709,242. The whites number 1,675,407. Native-born, 1,347,466. Foreign-born, 327,941. Negroes, 32,992. All other races, 843.

Mr. President, that shows the distribution of the Negro and white populations of the New England States.

Now I come to the Mid-Atlantic States. New York's total population of all classes is 13,479,142. Total white population, 12,879,546. Native whites, 10,026,016. Foreign born, 2,853,530. I wish to repeat that. The foreign-born population of New York State is 2,853,530. That is where all this monkey business is coming from. There are 571,221 Negroes. There are 28,375 of other races.

In New Jersey the total population of all classes is 4,160,165. Total white population, 3,931,087. Native white population, 3,235,277. Foreign born, 695,810. The Negroes in New Jersey number 226,973. All other races, 2,105.

Pennsylvania: Total population, 9,900,180. Total white, 9,426,989. Total native white, 8,453,729. Total foreign-born white, 973,260. Total Negro, 470,172. Total of other races, 3,019.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In view of the comparison of figures of population, and the break-down between whites and Negroes in the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania, I am at a loss to understand why it is that the able Senator from Mississippi says that all this "monkey business" is coming out of the State of New York. Is it possible that the State of Pennsylvania has nothing whatsoever to do with it?

Mr. BILBO. It is stopped on its way to Washington and refined in Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BILBO. The east North Central States. Ohio has an enormous population. Total population, all classes, 6,907,612. Total white, 6,566,531. Total white native, 6,047,265. Total white foreign born, 519,266. Total Negro, 339,461. I will have to modify my statement in regard to what is coming out of New York and Pennsylvania. Total of other races, 1,620.

Indiana has a total population of 3,427,796. Total white, 3,305,323. Total native white, 3,194,692. Total white foreign born, 110,631. Total Negro, 121,906. Total of other races, 557.

Illinois: Total of all classes, 7,987,241. Total white, 7,504,202. Total white native, 6,534,829. Total white foreign born, 969,373. Total Negroes, 387,446. Total of other races, 5,593.

Michigan: Total all classes, 5,256,106. Total white 5,039,643. Total white native, 4,356,613. Total white foreign born, 683,030. Total Negroes, 208,346. Total all other races, 8,118.

Wisconsin: Here we will uncover something. All classes, 3,137,587. Total white, 3,112,752. Total white native, 2,823,978. Total white foreign born, 288,774. Total Negroes, 12,158. Total

other races, 12,677. In other words, there are 12,000 Negroes out of 3,000,000 persons in Wisconsin.

That concludes the distribution of the white native and white foreign-born and Negro population in the east North-Central States.

Mr. President, I shall be detained for some considerable time in stating for the RECORD the figures with respect to populations, over the objection of my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. I will say to the majority leader that I am ready to continue, but if he wishes to suspend for the day—it is now 5:15 p. m.—I am perfectly willing to yield the floor, if I may regain it on the Senate convening tomorrow. I presume the majority leader will move that the Senate recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have, of course, no objection to the Senator from Mississippi retaining the floor. I realize that he has not delivered more than four-fifths of his speech, and I do not want the RECORD or the country to be deprived of the other one-fifth of it. Therefore I am willing to agree that the Senator be recognized tomorrow.

Mr. BILBO. I yield with the understanding that I shall be recognized by unanimous consent on the convening of the Senate tomorrow to continue my speech.

#### DEFERMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FROM MILITARY SERVICE

During the delivery of Mr. BILBO'S speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator—I do not want to take him off the floor—how long he thinks he will speak? I ask that question for the reason that I have just received from the Selective Service System a report on the men in Government service who have been deferred from the draft because of occupation. I am very anxious to submit the report to the Senate and to make some comments thereon; but I do not want to interrupt the Senator unless he is willing to be interrupted.

That leads me to ask the Senator another question: Would he object, unless he desires to continue now, to having the Senator from Maryland ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes so that he might present the report, provided that the Senator from Mississippi would not lose the floor by so doing?

Mr. BILBO. I always try to accommodate my colleagues, especially the Senator from Maryland. If he can obtain unanimous consent, I shall yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland may have the floor for 15 minutes, and that at the conclusion of that time the floor be returned to the Senator from Mississippi, so that the parliamentary situation will not change, and the Senator from Mississippi will then have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and the Senator's request is granted.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that about a year ago a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Maryland, who is speaking, was constituted to make certain inquiries into Government procedure. In the course of those inquiries we went into the question of deferment from the draft of persons in the Government service who otherwise would be subject to the draft.

Therefore, in the questionnaire submitted to the various Government bureaus and departments we asked for a statement as to the number of persons who had requested deferment from military service. The questionnaires were returned. They showed that up to that time approximately 6,000 persons in the special agencies examined in the Government services had been deferred from military service. A further examination of the facts adduced by the questionnaires disclosed that a great many of the deferments, sometimes on the ground that the persons concerned were indispensable, were of men who were under 26 years of age. That fact elicited the curiosity of the committee as to how young men who were 26 years of age could be so indispensable to the Federal Government that the Government could not spare them to serve the Nation during the war.

As a result of our examination into the facts, we asked General Hershey to review some 800 or 900 cases which seemed to us to be at least worthy of re-examination, to say the least. We did not give the names of the individuals concerned to the newspapers at the time, because to do so might throw on an individual who had been properly deferred a stigma which, when the facts were adduced showing that his deferment was justified, he would never be able to remove. For that reason I shall not state any of the names involved in the 900 or so special cases into which General Hershey's staff made an examination.

However, in summary, we find that 42.41 percent of those who were originally deferred are not now deferred. In other words, nearly half the deferred persons whose cases we requested General Hershey to examine have since had the deferment lifted or erased, and they are now available for military service.

Another 14 percent had deferments which expired automatically. Those deferments were for a limited time only. This leaves about 44 percent of the persons involved in the original 900 special cases as even yet deferred. Some 60 of those have been deferred because of dependency, which is proper, assuming that there is dependency. The remaining 323 have occupational deferments.

Without attempting to pass on the individual cases of the 323 who still remain in the deferred class, I find by consulting the table that a great many of those gentlemen are very young men.

That fact brings up the question as to whether the Government policy of deferment is too liberal.

For example, in the Department of Agriculture we find that there is a young man who is an engineer aide. He is 29 years old, is single, and is in classification II-B. Here is another one: He is a junior chemist, and is only 23 years old. He is single, and is in classification II-A. Here is another one, a young man 28 years of age, single, who is an assistant scientific aide. He is in classification II-B. Here is one 25 years old, an associate engineer, single, and yet he is classified as II-B. Here is a junior chemist who was 24 years old, and single. He was in class II-A. Only recently has his deferment expired.

What I have just cited could be duplicated many times by reference to the sheets which I have before me. I do not care to take time to read them all.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I understood the Senator's committee to have reported some time ago that there were supposed to be about 6,000 instances of Government employees in the District of Columbia, I believe, who had been exempted.

Mr. TYDINGS. They were mostly, I think, in the District.

Mr. STEWART. Comment in the morning papers—I believe an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning—refers to the suggestion as to there being 6,000, and states that the number, very likely, is nearer 25,000. I should like to ask the Senator whether that is correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will recall that the committee of which the Senator from Maryland was chairman made only a limited inquiry into those connected with various governmental functions. It did not primarily go into the Navy Department or the War Department and various other agencies that were actively engaged in the war effort because the primary purpose of our inquiry was to find where personnel could be transferred from nonwar effort to war effort. Therefore we did not go into the agencies such as the War Department and in the Navy Department having to do primarily with the war effort. I cannot answer accurately the question of the Senator from Tennessee, but I can say that the 6,000 cases we had called to our attention were not by any means all the deferred cases in the Government service. Whether the figure 25,000 is correct, I do not know, but I do know that the figure 6,000 is away below the total number of deferred Government employees.

Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, but I hope the interruption will not be prolonged.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator a question. Did his investigation disclose how many deferred employees of the Government in Washing-

ton were between the ages of 20 and 30 years? I see innumerable numbers of young men working for the Government between those ages, and I understand that they are deferred from military duty. I am wondering, first, how many there are, if the Senator has any figures, and whether they go before the draft boards here or the draft boards at their own homes in order to obtain deferment?

Mr. TYDINGS. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, there were about a thousand cases of young men who were under 26 years of age to whom the committee especially directed its attention upon the theory that if these young men were single and were under 26 years of age they would almost have to be in the category of geniuses to be doing work indispensable to the Government's conduct of the war in order to be entitled to obtain occupational deferment. There were about a thousand of those cases.

After the light of publicity had been turned on this matter, all of them have since had their deferment either expire or have had it reconsidered, and they are now available for service, with the exception of about 323, and I was just reading what some of the 323 men are doing.

I do not want to use my time by reading all the names, but, for example, here is another one, a man who is 26 years old, employed as an assistant technologist; he is single, and is in category II-B.

Here is a young man, who is 26 and single, who was a senior engineer and draftsman, who is in II-B.

Here is a young man, a smoke jumper, rigger, whatever that may be, who is single and 26, who is in III-A.

Here is another man who is 28, single, and an assistant chemical engineer, who is in II-B.

So there are still in the Government service a great many cases of comparatively young men and single who are deferred.

General Hershey says he believes in a majority of these remaining cases the grounds of deferment as considered by the local boards seem to be warranted, and there has been a stricter application of the rules permitting deferment now than was the case a year ago.

So we are in the process gradually of clearing up a great many of what appear to be unjustifiable deferments.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I know from the facts appearing before the Appropriations Committee that there are thousands of young men here engaged in research. Can the Senator, from his examination, say whether, under the rules, the fact that a man is engaged in research work is a ground for deferment?

Mr. TYDINGS. It would depend upon what kind of research work the man was engaged in. In order to answer indirectly the Senator's question, let me point out that a great many of these deferments are in the Department of Agriculture; a great many of them are in the Department of Justice; they are pretty well scattered throughout the Government service. There are 140, I believe, in the Tennessee Valley Authority—

Mr. MCKELLAR. Under the new rules is the Tennessee Valley Authority con-

sidered to be a war agency so that all young men of military age working for it are allowed to be deferred? If it is, we should change the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the short table I have here, which I am trying to interpret accurately, 140 in the Tennessee Valley Authority had occupational deferment. That means that there was an extremely large number in that one authority.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The point is that there is no doubt, from this very brief examination into the deferment situation, that there is apparently a lack of uniformity throughout the country as to when a man can be and cannot be deferred because of his occupation. Then, too, there has been too much of a liberal attitude toward occupational deferments of men who could, in my judgment, readily be replaced.

I think that those two observations are sound, and I believe that the conditions which they encompass are being, to a large extent, corrected from day to day.

I have great confidence in General Hershey and in the staff under him. I think they are trying to do an impartial and a fair job. It is not the staff in Washington which has permitted this situation to exist, but rather it is the local boards throughout the country. I know that General Hershey's forces are to a greater and greater extent sending word to the local boards telling them just when a Government employee should be deferred and when he should not be deferred, whereas heretofore they have had very few yardsticks to guide them. So, there is that to be said in explanation of the matter; but the fact remains that employment under the National Government has been too much of a haven for young men who are qualified for military service and whose services rendered to the National Government are not indispensable and are not irreplaceable.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the consent of the Senator and of the Senate, in keeping with this discussion, to have printed at this point an editorial entitled "Federal Deferments," which brings out the fact that there are some 25,000 now who are dodging the draft, as the Senator has so ably set forth.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be glad to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Is there objection?

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

#### FEDERAL DEFERMENTS

The President's order canceling the draft deferment of all Government employees except those "who by reason of unique experience are really irreplaceable" was long overdue. Some of the Federal agencies have consistently and wisely refused to seek deferment for employees. But there has nevertheless been palpable circumvention, on a very considerable scale, of selective service. Particular care ought to have been taken not to allow this to happen. For it has served

to aggravate public resentment over the way in which Government agencies have handled other aspects of their own manpower problem. The Presidential order will at least facilitate the prompt reclassification of those Federal workers who should be subject to the same process of selection that applies to nonessential workers in private industry.

There is, apparently, no reliable over-all estimate of the number of Government workers who now have a deferred status. Senator TYDINGS asserted last June that the total was in the neighborhood of 6,000 persons, and his estimate has since been raised, on good authority, to 25,000. Assuming this to be no more than a very rough approximation, it is clear that the Presidential order incidentally constitutes the merest beginning in the business of efficient utilization of manpower in the Federal agencies. Repeated charges, in Congress and outside of it, that the Government is the chief waster of labor have been too well substantiated to warrant further delay in reappraising Federal employment requirements and in seeking to place workers in jobs for which they are best qualified.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a day or two ago President Roosevelt issued an order, I understand, forbidding hereafter occupational deferments in the Government service, and I think the President acted wisely and fairly when he issued that order. However, I cannot escape the belief that the facts which our committee adduced formed the basis of the record of improper deferments which caused the President to take this action.

I do not believe that the issuance of that mere order, or the facts which I have presented here, which have been covered by the Selective Service System in their various examinations into these cases, have cleared up the matter by a great deal. I think there are still in the Government service a great many men who are improperly deferred, who should not be deferred, and I am hopeful that General Hershey will continue his investigations until all men who are improperly deferred are made available for military service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter from General Hershey to me dealing with the subject I have been discussing.

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

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,  
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,  
Washington, D. C., November 17, 1942.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Inquiry  
in re Transfer of Employees Under  
Senate Resolution 223, Committee on  
Appropriations, United States Senate.  
Subject: Final Report on Investigation of  
Selective Service Classifications of Certain  
Federal Employees.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Under date of June 16, 1942, you transmitted to this headquarters a list of certain governmental employees who were registered under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, with the request that investigation be made with regard to their classification.

From time to time during the investigation I have reported to you certain developments which have arisen, which would give you preliminary information on the progress of the investigation.

This investigation has now been completed, and I am attaching herewith the full report, showing the classification presently

assigned to the registrants, together with other pertinent information which has been obtained.

In conducting this investigation, contact was first made with the governmental agencies concerned, and information obtained which would primarily indicate the reason or basis for the claim made by the agency for the deferment of the registrant. In addition, the agency was requested to furnish certain other information which would be of value.

Upon the completion of this investigation, this headquarters undertook to obtain from the local boards having jurisdiction over the registrants, through the State directors, a check on the information furnished by the governmental agency, together with the reason for granting the request. This thorough investigation necessarily required a considerable length of time, but was deemed advisable in order that the report should be as complete as possible. Both the governmental agencies and the local board displayed a high degree of cooperativeness in furnishing the information required.

I have had the results of this investigation broken down by classifications within the Selective Service System as they relate to the individual agency, and am attaching herewith this information.

In reviewing this tabulation, it is interesting to note that the report for the subcommittee shows 42.45 percent of all registrants investigated are not deferred. The registrants in this group are either in class I-A (available for military service); class I-C (member of land or naval forces of United States); IV-E (available for work of national importance; conscientious objector); or IV-F (mentally, morally, or physically unfit). The national average for these same classes is 27.4 percent.

In addition to this figure of 42.45 percent, a large majority of the 14.8 percent shown under occupational deferments which have expired and whose classification is still pending, will undoubtedly be classified in class I-A, as immediately available for military service. If this entire group were reclassified in class I-A, this would then show a total of 57.25 percent, or better than half of these registrants presently not in a deferred classification.

The information which has been collected in each individual case is, of course, on file in this headquarters for your further examination, in the event any individual questions arise, and I should be very pleased to furnish any further information you wish.

It is hoped this information will prove satisfactory to your subcommittee, and I wish at this time to express my thanks for the cooperation of your subcommittee in calling these matters to my attention, and for your complete understanding of all matters pertaining to the Selective Service System.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,  
Director.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the matter presented by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the other proceedings be placed in the RECORD after the conclusion of my speech so that there will be no break in what I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ROUTINE BUSINESS

After the conclusion of Mr. BILBO'S speech for the day,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The Chair is informed that there are certain matters of routine business on the desk which should be properly referred and disposed

of. Is there objection to the reference of a bill and the receipt of and appropriate action on other routine matters? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

(The matters referred to appear elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Sundry persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Burns Parker to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ira Lamar Morgan to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi.

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

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

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

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

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

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

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

That concludes the calendar.

## RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 20, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 17), 1942:

## THE JUDICIARY

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Edward Burns Parker to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama.

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ira Lamar Morgan to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi.

## IN THE ARMY

## APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps  
Grant Renne, Jr.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## To Finance Department

Maj. Hilton Edward Heineke.

## To Corps of Engineers

Second Lt. Francis Joseph Crown.

## To Ordnance Department

First Lt. Donald Max Simpson.

Second Lt. Charles Richard Petticrew.

Second Lt. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr.

## To Chemical Warfare Service

Second Lt. Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr.

## To Air Corps

First Lt. John Porter Tomhave.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, to rank from November 1, 1942

Woodfin Grady Jones, colonel, Infantry.

James Merriam Moore, colonel, Infantry.

James Patrick Hogan, colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Paul Clarence Paschal, colonel, Infantry.

Gooding Packard, colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Francis Marion Brannan, colonel, Infantry.

Adam Empie Potts, colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

William Rutledge Orton, colonel, Infantry.

## IN THE NAVY

## APPOINTMENTS

To be assistant surgeons, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Donald N. Twaddell Charles M. Grace

William B. Harkins John H. Wigton

Robert E. Coker John R. Seal

John E. Moss Raymond N. Olson

Arthur B. Bradsher, Jr. Franklin B. Wilkins

John C. Meyer Arthur R. Payzant

Albert C. Kelly Byron E. Bassham

Edmund N. Ervin John W. Flaiz

Abram S. Kinne Jean E. Neighbor

Sherman M. Peabody Alvin B. Hayles

Angus M. Brooks Daniel R. Kohli

Ralph Fred Allen Edward W. Kloth

Thomas H. Harvill Joseph R. Connelly

William S. Credle Erwood G. Edgar

Solomon Barnett Gold-James K. Norman

man William C. Muiry

Richard H. Driscoll Lloyd A. Stirrett

John D. Langston Pierre F. LaBorde, Jr.

Arthur N. Kelly Joseph L. Nielson, Jr.

William G. Paine Leo S. Madlem, Jr.

John F. Geraghty Elmer R. King

Elmer E. Hinton James E. Kelly

John H. Gifford  
Don J. Weekes  
Louis A. Ensenat  
J. Robert Close  
Jack R. Bostwick  
Moffitt K. Holler  
Walter H. Johnson  
Richard L. Merkel

Robert L. Bailey  
Henry R. Ennis  
Paul Reed  
William E. Steiner  
George A. Vail  
Stuart A. Patterson  
Harry R. Rowe

## POSTMASTERS

## CALIFORNIA

Lillian I. Webb, Fair Oaks.

## FLORIDA

Cecil C. Smoak, Deerfield Beach.

## GEORGIA

Esther D. Martin, Broxton.

## ILLINOIS

Erwin J. Mahlandt, Breese.

Budd L. Kellogg, Downes Grove.

Eulalie E. Mase, Forreston.

John P. Hook, Fulton.

DeCourcy Lloyd, Glencoe.

William I. Tyler, Granville.

Porter J. Campbell, Hardin.

Oliver P. Dickson, Homer.

George H. Wales, Lanark.

Carl E. Saur, Malta.

Ruth A. Tilford, Mansfield.

O. Cammie Seeders, Palestine.

David W. Leigh, Ramsey.

Marcus M. Wilber, Sorrento.

William Hubert Darby, Tampico.

Curtis E. Veach, Valier.

Grove Harrison, Viola.

Floyd E. Madden, Willow Hill.

## KANSAS

Tillman W. Floyd, Ashland.

James D. Egbert, Cimarron.

Asa I. Cox, Colony.

Stephen E. Murray, Jamestown.

Lafranier M. Herrington, Kanopolis.

Lee Calvin, La Cygne.

Axel A. Peterson, La Harpe.

Francis G. Burford, Longton.

Elizabeth Mansfield, Lucas.

Noah D. Ziegler, Oakley.

Cecil C. Pember, Olathe.

Lovisa J. Peacock, Protection.

Robert R. Morgan, Rexford.

Leigh D. Dowling, St. Francis.

Harry F. Geistfeld, Washington.

James A. Hanks, Wetmore.

Paul L. Turgeon, Wilson.

## KENTUCKY

Watson G. Holbrook, Whitesburg.

## MICHIGAN

Melvin B. Mills, Benzonia.

## MISSISSIPPI

Fletcher H. Womack, Crenshaw.

Woodard M. Herring, Inverness.

Frances G. Wimberly, Jonestown.

Bettie S. McLeod, Kreole.

Florence Churchwell, Leakesville.

Viva H. McInnis, Rosedale.

Beall A. Brock, West.

## MISSOURI

Floyd L. Decker, Crocker.

Wilbur S. Scott, Deepwater.

Anvil A. Lewis, Eminence.

James P. Moore, Liberal.

Verne H. Gracey, Reeds Spring.

James E. Ferguson, Williamsville.

Frederick L. Stafford, Windsor.

## NEW YORK

Gerald Aldrich, Bemus Point.

Mildred E. Brown, Bliss.

Michael G. Gaffney, Clinton.

Mary I. Callahan, Deferiet.

Walter S. Blade, Delanson.

Clayton I. Burch, Earlville.

Emily C. Stevens, Eldred.

Eugene E. Towell, Fillmore.

Louis C. Donovan, Mount Morris.

Dennis A. Shannon, New York Mills.

Clarence A. Chamberlain, Orangeburg.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Ronald Keeley, Hazen.

## TEXAS

Rufus F. Stanley, Brownwood.

## WYOMING

Minnie C. Corum, Encampment.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, as falsehood and deception have no rights which we are bound to respect, give us a mighty passion for the truth, mediated by the unaging Christ. With humility we pray that we may ever be aware that this loftiest shape of the soul is the armor which makes men free; it is the master in the realm of knowledge; it is the everlasting foundation of the divine kingdom on earth; in its atmosphere, we pray Thee, to keep our vision clear and the inner eye unblind.

Grant that spiritual enrichments may fall upon the soul of our country, making urgent transformations that our way of life may break clear around the world. Oh stay the chilling blows of unjust criticism, the words of the ready, of the misinformed critic and of those who think the half is greater than the whole. Dear Lord, at times the silence of awe is upon our lips; men are dying, our sons are giving the last full measure of supreme sacrifice, homes are being made desolate, and the tides of hope are passing out that the lights may come on again all over the world. O Man of sorrows, help us that all may find in Thee that self-forgetfulness and that peace which is born of pain and the path that shines through the darkness. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 16, was read and approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

The Honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. VERONICA BOLAND as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-Seventh Congress from the Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania to fill the vacancy in that district is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present herself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mrs. BOLAND took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION OF HON. CHARLES I. FADDIS

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

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day tendered to the Governor of Pennsylvania my resignation as a Representative in Congress from the Twenty-fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania to take effect on December 4, 1942.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. I. FADDIS.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders of the day I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject that is now producing the filibuster in the United States Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders today I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of a better method for the collection of income taxes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert a short but very important editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 1942.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report

of the Director, Selective Service System for the period from September 16, 1940, to December 8, 1941.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 1942.

THE POLL-TAX BILL

Mr. COLMER. 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. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, recently when the ill-timed and unfortunate so-called anti-poll-tax bill was before this House, as the result of the pressure of the "left wingers," the C. I. O., the Society for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Communist Party, I made some rather pointed observations. Among other things, I stressed the fact that it was calculated to bring about disunity in the Republic at a time when unity of all of our people was the most coveted objective. Moreover, I emphasized the injustice to that great section of our common country—the South—in this effort, spear headed by the Democratic Party, to bring about a revival of the days of the force bills, following the Civil War.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my observations are now being realized. For today we have in the Senate body of this Congress, where the rules of debate are more liberal, the unfortunate spectacle of ruffled tempers, discord, and disunity such as has not prevailed in that great body of the Congress in many generations; and the majority leader of the Democratic Party and the administration's spokesman is resorting to drastic measures in his effort to force this unconstitutional legislation upon a great segment of our people. This, indeed, is most unfortunate. The people of this great country do not understand this procedure. Unlike the reformers in high places in this Government the great masses of our people are interested in but one thing, and that is the winning of this war. It is difficult for them to understand how, at a time when our boys are fighting our enemy and shedding their precious blood on the battlefields of Africa and the South Pacific as well as upon the seven seas, those in important positions in civil life should be fomenting and aggravating strife and discord.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being considered, indeed, presumptuous, but cognizant of my responsibility as a Member of the Congress of the United States, and as a member of the majority party, I am going to be so bold as to suggest to those in high places in this Government who have it in their hands to desist in this unfortunate and vain struggle that this controversial cup may be passed without requiring a great people to drink its unwelcome potion. It is, indeed, to be hoped that in the name of and desire for national unity the administration will remove this controversy from the national scene before the sectional fires already kindled shall flare into engulfing flames of national discord and disunity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HÉBERT and Miss SUMNER of Illinois asked and were given permission

to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein four addresses made last week at the American Petroleum Institute's annual convention in Chicago, one by William Lloyd, Jr., of Texas, one by the Secretary of the Interior, one by the Deputy Oil Coordinator, Mr. Davies, and one by the Railroad Coordinator, Mr. Eastman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a geographical analysis of committee assignments by George Rothwell Brown.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from an old friend dealing with a most serious problem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD pertaining to the dairy situation in the State of California; also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem entitled "The Card or the Flag."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFTING OF DAIRYMEN

Mr. ELLIOTT 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. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, and many times since, I have talked to the Agriculture Department, to the Secretary himself, and also to General Hershey in regard to taking away from the farms the dairymen. I pointed out at that time that our dairy products would be greatly needed to feed our people and the people abroad.

After we became involved in the war, naturally the need for dairy products was greater than ever before in order to feed our armed forces at the front and our Allies, in addition to our people at home. I pointed out to General Hershey that every time a dairyman was taken away from the farm, it was creating a shortage of milkers and dairymen to the point that cattle would be sold. I felt that the few dairymen who could be left would be of great help in preserving products derived from the dairy animal.

Now, what has happened? Being an experienced dairyman, I could see the danger developing day by day. And now, according to the latest reports, we may expect to be rationed on dairy products.

Why is it that officials in our departments and in our Government do not listen when the facts have been placed before them time and again?

In Los Angeles County, in the State of California, during the month of October 5,000 dairy cows were being slaughtered each month, according to a State report. Yes, consideration is being given by the State council of defense through its committees on agriculture resources, health, welfare, and consumers' interests, and human resources and skills. Data compiled by the Bureau of Markets, State Department of Agriculture, disclose reports from brand and hide inspection agents that there is a September 1942 increase of 40.7 percent in dairy cattle being sold for beef in the Los Angeles market. It is estimated that out of 88,000 dairy-cow population in the Los Angeles area, over 5,000 cows are being slaughtered each month, I repeat again.

That same condition exists throughout the State of California, and I presume the same condition exists throughout the United States.

In my home city of Tulare, Calif., we have the largest dried-milk plant in the United States, which is furnishing milk in that form to our armed men.

There is a reason to be rationed on products which have been shipped here in the past from foreign countries, but here in the United States, where we have an abundance of feed, territory, and equipment to produce all the butterfat that is needed, we take away many who are actual dairymen and who cannot be replaced at once, and because of the slaughter of the dairy cow that produces the dairy products, that dairy cow cannot be replaced immediately, either. When you destroy the dairy cow you destroy her offspring.

Practically all the dairymen in my section of the country work long, hard hours. I know of many dairy herds where 2 or 3 men are doing the work of caring for 100 cows or more in each dairy.

Let us be reasonable about this thing. Immediately men are actually in the work of our dairy products, they should be frozen in those positions for the duration of the war. In my dairy section, and other dairy sections in the State of California, the draft boards have continued to take dairymen to fill their quotas. Why? Because after information is sent out from General Hershey that agriculturists can be exempted and the various types of agriculture named, No. 1 on the list is the dairyman, but they enclose a letter reading "We must have our quota filled." Therefore, the draft boards continue to take dairymen from the ranches thereby forcing the sale and slaughter of cattle.

Today there is a shortage of milk in both canned and dried supplies in my State, and it will not be long until crying babies will be at the table asking for milk that we have not got. It does no good to have investigations and hearings if, after you give those responsible the facts and figures far in advance and they disregard the Congress and continue to do so as they see fit.

I, for one, am sick and tired of seeing our American people placed in a position

of being rationed on dairy products which could have been prevented by just using a little common sense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered for the day I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial published in the Sunday School Times.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. 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 New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short quotation from the Saturday Evening Post.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUSPENSION OF GASOLINE RATIONING FOR 3 MONTHS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a joint resolution in this House proposing to suspend gas rationing throughout the country for a period of 3 months during which time a committee would be appointed by the President to make a real study and investigation of the necessity for so doing. Since that time I have received hundreds of telegrams from practically every State in the Union in ref-

erence to this matter which is of such vital importance to our people.

I have requested this brief time to announce that several Members who are especially interested have called a meeting this afternoon immediately after the adjournment of the House, in the Caucus Room of the Old House Office Building for the purpose of discussing and possibly formulating a program in an effort to delay this gas-rationing order that will otherwise become effective December 1. Members of this body who may be interested and who feel that the matter is of sufficient importance to justify such a meeting are invited to attend. We have no program or agenda outlined for the meeting. A full and free discussion of the whole situation will be had.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am interested in the matter which the gentleman is discussing. The purpose of this meeting is not to stop rationing, as I understand, but to discuss methods and means by which it might be modified, if possible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct. There are many of us who feel that gas rationing, especially in States like the gentleman's State of Texas, and my State of Oklahoma, where we have enough gasoline to supply the whole Nation, is the height of folly. Our people are willing to give their tires, cars, or homes if need be to aid in the present war effort, but they are not convinced this gas rationing proposal will aid in the least. On the other hand, we are convinced this proposal will hinder and seriously impair the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by Justice Jacob Panken, on the subject The Hitler Record—Murdered a Million; Killed Many Millions.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I have received an estimate from the Public Printer which states that it will cost \$105 to print this. I ask that it be printed notwithstanding the estimate and that it may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

#### THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE WAR EFFORT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called the attention of this House to a critical situation which exists in the field of medicine through-

out the country today. To alleviate this situation I have introduced a bill (H. R. 7231) to create a medical academy to be under Government supervision.

In my remarks I will point out who is responsible for the present lack of physicians in this country. I submit that there is a group of medical barons who have been withholding from the students properly entitled to enter medical schools the opportunity of entering our established medical schools. This discrimination is a disgrace and steps must be taken to remedy this situation.

Sometime ago I addressed this House on the advisability of establishing a medical West Point comprised of nine Government-sponsored medical schools, located in each corps area to provide for the medical education of young men who may wish to become doctors in our Army establishments.

Strange as it may seem, my proposal evoked opposition in a place where I never expected any opposition could be found against such a proposal, the Medical Society of the State of New York.

Why the Medical Society of the State of New York should oppose such a proposal is one of the mysteries that the lay mind of a mere Member of Congress could not possibly grasp. But the subject is of sufficient public importance to be discussed on the floor here, and I desire at this time to make some pertinent observations.

Sometime past there has been public comment upon the problem of shortages of medical services due to the fact that a large number of doctors are now in the armed forces of the Nation. The discussion, conducted by the public press, shows that it will be impossible for civilians to obtain adequate medical service for some time to come, that doctors will not be found in certain communities and that the case load which each doctor will be obliged to carry will be far in excess of the present facilities.

I charge this situation on the discriminatory policies which our medical schools have pursued for years past. This shortage of doctors is due to the fact that our medical schools have not been training enough young men in the medical profession. There surely was no lack of candidates and there surely is no lack of candidates at the present time. I believe that every Member of this House can find among his constituents young men who have applied for admission to the medical schools and who have been refused admission, not because they do not possess the necessary qualifications, but because a large number of medical schools have followed the policy of refusing admission to any student who does not meet the standards of either social or racial background, which the particular school deems desirable. Medical schools, without authority of law, have established quotas for students of the type and background they do not particularly care for, and unless a particular young man fits into the quota he is simply refused admission, no matter how high his qualifications.

That such is the fact is even admitted by the Medical Society of the State of

New York. Look at the implication of these words, which I quote from the official organ of the Medical Society of the State of New York, volume 42, No. 14, page 1331:

It seems curious, to say the least, that Mr. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN should bring up the race and religious question vis-à-vis medicine on June 13 when, as reported on June 8, the Supreme Court in a 5-to-4 decision ruled that the exercise of free speech, a free press, and religious freedom may be limited by legislative bodies "to times, places, and methods not at odds with the preservation of peace and good order."

For another view see the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the minority, dissenting, opinion of Chief Justice Stone. Notice the peculiar implications of this misinterpretation of the Supreme Court's decision. Can you believe that since the Supreme Court ruled that there are certain regulations in the exercise of free speech and a free press and religious freedom, the Medical Society of the State of New York jumps at the conclusion that it is perfectly proper to restrict admission to the practice of medicine in a manner in which it deems fit to do so?

Does the Medical Society of the State of New York believe that it is proper to refuse admission to the practice of medicine to certain individuals because they belong to a particular race or creed?

This brings up the question of an individual, whom I will not name at this time, although I know that he has been in the forefront of the movement to restrict the practice of the medical profession in this country and perhaps more than anyone else is to blame for the shortage of doctors in this country at this time.

This gentleman sought for many years to prevent admission to the practice of medicine of American students who, due to the restrictive limitations of our medical schools, were forced to obtain their medical education in Europe.

This gentleman sought to give the impression that a medical student in Europe can pass an examination without study or practical training and without attendance of clinics. A superficial glance at any of the official curricula of a European university will convince one that this is impossible.

The question of not giving commissions to graduates of foreign universities is not a measure which was passed against the refugee doctors and one should not confuse this with a limitation to practice for foreigners. This is just one phase of a well-organized movement to squeeze certain individuals of a background which this gentleman does not like out of American medicine. This plot dates back more than 10 years and had its start with his appointment to director of the study commission of foreign medical education. This movement is supported by certain members of the American Medical Association who put their own selfish interests before the interests of the American people. In the middle twenties these narrow-minded, intolerant, and rabid people decided on a "numerus clausus" in the medical schools. The nationalities who were dis-

criminated against had to leave their country and seek a medical education in Europe. Thus the "numerus clausus" did not accomplish its aim immediately. In the first years of the thirties the American Medical Association started a campaign, with this gentleman as its leader, to prevent certain Americans from going to Europe and the European universities received letters from the association asking them not to admit American students unless the association approved them. The American Medical Association approved only those already eligible for admission to a medical college in the United States.

Insurance companies, hospitals, plants, even those manufacturing war materials, and a variety of other organizations, including even medical agencies, refuse to list foreign graduates for positions.

The problem of foreign graduates cannot be treated from a purely academic point of view as a question of discrimination. This question has a tremendous importance for the health and the welfare of the American people, and winning of this war is intimately connected with this question. According to the gentleman's own admission, one-third of the licenses in New York State are issued to foreign graduates. In 1931 not less than 800 American-born citizens were studying medicine in Edinburgh alone. I do not have the figures for all Europe, but it must have been very high, as about 12,000 premedicals are here each year, and from these only 5,000 were admitted to medical schools in this country. How many of these students went abroad can be seen from the reports of the various State boards, as the various State boards had to be notified of the intention of an American to study medicine, and these State boards had to approve the training of these students. Thus the State boards approved the training and also issued licenses in each case to the graduates of these foreign schools, the graduates of which are not permitted to have commissions in the Army. Thus the State boards approved the training and now the approved training is not approved by certain members of the armed forces, acting on the advice of the American Medical Association.

Of course, there was a whole lot of talk and many articles were written to the effect that we had adequate medical men in this country, that we did not need the foreign graduates in the Army, and that the foreign graduates were not equal in qualifications with the American graduates, as shown by the gentleman's report. This man, however, does not speak any of the European languages and when he visited the various European medical schools he relied, according to his own admission, on information from people whom he happened to meet in the various towns and who spoke English. Occasionally these people were waiters, hotel keepers, and people of similar occupations, as he freely admitted. In France, that is, in Strasbourg, which is not representative of France, he spoke with one professor personally. In spite of his admitted incapability of judging the situation thoroughly, he is accepted as an expert on foreign education and the

propaganda against American physicians trained abroad goes on.

How adequate is the supply of physicians today? We had to reduce the medical curriculum from 4 to 3 years and had to increase the number of students to each class to turn out more doctors faster. But we know well that these students are not able to learn in 3 short years as much as the so-called foreign graduates learned in 5½ years in laboratories and clinics which were not overcrowded. This could be accomplished only if the students were supermen, as the receiving capacity of the brain is definitely limited and it is impossible to crowd in more, in a given time, than the capacity is able to receive. For years the medical curriculum had to be extended because of additions to the medical science. If we reduce the time now we must necessarily have to reduce the amount of material presented, and by so doing we must necessarily produce inferior doctors. Great Britain admitted this a long time ago, and every doctor who found refuge there was admitted to practice. In contrast to this, our Army had a rule that graduates of approved medical schools who are qualified to practice in the State they reside are eligible for commissions in the Medical Corps and Medical Reserve of the Army. Now the Army does not accept foreign graduates due to the insistence of the American Medical Association, but the Army did have interns in the Army hospitals, who could apply for commissions until June 1942, who were not graduates of medical schools but osteopathic schools. Can these cult schools be compared favorably with the high standard of European medical schools?

The Medical Week carried a report of the resolution of the New York County Medical Society, October 28, 1940, to the effect that foreign graduates should be given commissions. This resolution was, however, later, at the insistence of the gentleman about whom I have been talking, reversed. Other attempts to have this resolution put through have also been reversed through the influence of this gentleman.

The medical situation requires a thorough study at this time and quick action by Congress.

I call your attention to an article appearing in the New York Times on October 19, 1942, reading as follows:

The critical shortage of physicians brought about by the demands of the Army and Navy has prompted Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to approve what purports to be a plan of action but which leaves us exactly where we have been these many months. In other words, the Procurement and Assignment Service, little more than a registry of physicians, accepts the responsibility of ascertaining the needs of the civilian population for medical service and providing the medical personnel to meet them.

The service has no authority, no personnel and, to judge from its record, no competence to accept any such large responsibility. It can do no more than follow the present absurdly cumbrous procedure.

Suppose that there is an acute shortage of physicians in some State. Because of State licensing laws, the only

outside doctor who can be sent in is a uniformed member of the Public Health Service staff. The Public Health Service cannot act spontaneously. It waits until a request is received from the State health authorities. But the State health authorities wait for the State medical society to act, and the State medical society for the State and local committees of the Procurement and Assignment Service. The Washington headquarters of the Procurement and Assignment Service also waits, because it cannot give orders to its committees. When at last it has heard from its State branch and at last the State health authorities have acted, the Public Health Service may come to the rescue. Since the committees of the Procurement and Assignment Service are virtually arms of the State and local medical societies, and since doctors, no more than businessmen, encourage competition, it is easy to understand why in one case 4 months elapsed before the Public Health Service could send one of its men to an area in which there was no doctor nearer than 20 miles.

If we are to reduce production losses now, traceable to a rising tide of sickness in mushroom communities where the population has doubled, trebled, even quintupled, it is plain that the doctors still left must be shuffled about. Industrial organizations and labor unions are helpless because of State licensing laws. We have heard enough of the formula that "Whenever possible the civilian needs as determined by these committees should be met through local arrangements, resources, and agencies." There are no local resources and even no State resources in much of the West and the South. The Public Health Service is the only national organization qualified to deal with the emergency. The time has come for an Executive order or congressional legislation to put the Service in command of the situation for the duration of the war, with full power to act directly.

Let us enact H. R. 7231. Let us give all our young men and women qualified and eager to study medicine the opportunity to follow the profession of their choice. Let us protect their constitutional rights and at the same time protect our country against a recurrence of the present shortage of physicians to take care of our people during an emergency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### CORRECTION OF A POSSIBLE FOOD SHORTAGE IN UNITED STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, our agricultural sins are most assuredly catching up with us. The morning papers tell us of the new proposed rationing of cheese, milk, and butter. A couple of months ago, when the metropolitan press and others were questioning the patriotism of the farmers of America, they were following a path which will lead to a food shortage. The time to correct this feeling is now.

While a few months ago, cheese and condensed milk storages were thought embarrassing, we now find that rationing is proposed. The arm-chair dairymen who have been juggling butter storages and rigging butter prices for years have not yet woken up to the causes of the low summer storage stock of butter. They could not understand why there were only 65,000,000 pounds of butter in storage on August 1 to juggle.

The sooner we put our agricultural house in order, the sooner the consumer will have the protection of an abundant food supply. With millions of consumers without any increase in income, it is time that people familiar with the facts have a voice in the proceedings.

It may be easy to ration in a country that imports 40 percent of its food but it is a different picture in a country capable of producing millions of more pounds, bushels, and tons than have ever been produced if and when we get ready to use the knowledge and facts of agricultural production and put them into operation. Black markets can be better prevented by an abundance of food production than they ever will be by hiring snoopers. So many people will be hired to watch their neighbors, there will not be many left to do the work of the Nation.

Any shortage of milk and dairy products at this time is due to the programers and their unsound procedure.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of substantial legislation was passed by the Seventy-seventh Congress up to this time and there will probably be more before the session is over. The most important legislation considered and accepted by this body has been the various acts beneficial to the men in the service. The Seventy-seventh Congress has stood by the men in the armed service and has done everything possible for their welfare and benefit.

The most outstanding of all legislation passed had to do with doubling of the base pay of the soldiers, increasing the pay from \$21 to \$42 per month, and the subsequent adoption of the Rankin amendment which further increased the soldier's pay to \$50 per month. However, Mr. Speaker, this work has only started. It is my sincere hope that as time goes on more benefits will be given the men in our armed service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

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

There was no objection.

#### GASOLINE FOR THE FARMER

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the matter of gasoline rationing in the Middle West is a matter of grave concern not only to the people of the Middle West but to their Representatives as well. We are faced with gas rationing to conserve gasoline, and particularly tires, for defense needs. Each farm is a defense plant and the efficient operation of each farm in the production of food has the same importance as the operation of our war plants and factories. Any blow to farm production is a blow to our war effort.

In the rural sections it is imperative that the farmer have sufficient gasoline to deliver his products to market, to obtain his supplies and repairs and machinery, and for the multitude of necessities for the operation of the modern farm.

I urge that the seriousness of the Middle West's situation and the fact that there is excellent gasoline supply to the Middle West, and the further fact that the people of the Middle West, and the farmers in particular, have much greater distances to travel for necessary car use, be considered by the O. P. A. before any drastic gasoline rationing is put into effect, and that further investigation and study be made.

I include an editorial of the Mankato Free Press of November 13, which so well emphasizes the situation confronting the Middle West in general and the farmer in particular:

#### GASOLINE FOR THE FARMER

Delay in gasoline rationing until December 1 should provide additional time for Office of Price Administration officials to consider a special and urgent problem in connection with such restrictions.

That is the consideration that is to be given to the farmer of the Middle West and Northwest in the matter of mileage allowances under the rationing program.

Purpose of the entire gas rationing plan is to conserve both gasoline and tires, particularly tires, for essential defense needs. That envisions a possible long war during which the tires of private car owners might be requisitioned to carry plant workers to their jobs. It is all a question of insuring sufficient transportation facilities and fuel to carry on, however long the war may last.

Point that seemingly has been overlooked, or at least has received no special emphasis thus far by Office of Price Administration officials is that each and every farm is a war plant in itself. Every week and every month emphasizes anew the fact that the products which the farmer produces are fully as essential as arms, ammunition, tanks, and planes.

Therefore the efficient operation of each individual farm is just as necessary as the efficient operation of individual war plants and factories.

In the East, where farms are small, bus and railroad facilities cover the countryside in a dense network, the problem of transportation for the farmer is not so vital. A bus or truck line runs past most farms, or a short distance away at the farthest, railroad terminals are within short distances of most farmers.

Out here in the Middle West it is a different matter. Inability to get to a market that will supply him with repairs, with machinery, with the multitude of needs that enter into the operation of a modern farm, could and will seriously hamper the farmer's production. Any lag in farm production is a blow to the Nation's war effort.

These are matters which should be taken into consideration by the Office of Price Administration in instructing rationing boards regarding the mileage allowances that are to be made for farm owners of cars and trucks. They are matters in which Midwestern Representatives in Congress might well show an interest and concern as well. This is not a special plea for consideration for the farmer over other individuals, it is merely a warning that unless the farm is properly regarded as a defense plant and an integral cog in our wartime machinery, for which transportation is an essential and important need, the Nation as a whole and our entire war effort may suffer serious consequences.

#### GASOLINE RATIONING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under present orders gasoline rationing will go into effect in the entire United States on December 1 next. This in spite of the fact that in many States like Kansas there exist great surpluses of oil and gasoline—so great, in fact, that it is necessary to restrict production from existing wells.

Of course, the argument is made that the purpose of rationing gasoline in States which have a surplus is to conserve rubber. If that is true, then why does not the Office of Price Administration get away from the hypocrisy of attempting to save rubber through gasoline rationing? Any sound program for the conservation of rubber must necessarily contemplate the most effective and efficient use of the tires now on our automobiles. Along with this, every consideration should be given to those whose present occupation requires the use of motor vehicles. It is certainly not asking too much of the O. P. A. to urge that its regulations put as few existing businesses out of existence as possible.

The effect of gasoline rationing as contemplated at present will be to put hundreds of thousands of small business institutions and their employees out of business. In many cases these business institutions and their employees have

cars equipped with tires which will last for from 1 to 4 years with careful use. That is, if these tires are driven the same number of miles that they have been driven for business purposes during the preceding years, they will last from 1 to 4 years. Yet the attitude of the Office of Price Administration is that it is better to restrict the use of these vehicles, put the man out of business and let his tires rot on the wheels rather than give him enough of the surplus gasoline supply to enable him to carry on his normal business activities. Does this make sense? Is it any wonder that the fine, solid, sound-thinking patriotic citizenry of this country is fast becoming fed up with the blundering way in which the vast, overstaffed, underefficient, and arrogant bureaucracy of Washington is day by day destroying business, creating unemployment, and needlessly regimenting and controlling the daily activities of our people?

Pursuant to leave given to me to extend my remarks, I am herewith including a copy of a letter which on yesterday I addressed to Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, in which I call attention to the inequity and the utter lack of consistency in the present regulations if their purpose is to really conserve rubber:

NOVEMBER 18, 1942.

Mr. LEON HENDERSON,  
Administrator, Office of Price  
Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: The imposition of gasoline rationing in those areas of this country where a surplus of gasoline exists is doing more to break down public morale and impede the war effort than anything which has yet happened. The people in these States are intensely patriotic. They want to do everything possible to win the war, but as they see it the imposition of gasoline rationing is going to seriously impede their efforts in this direction.

They have been told that the purpose of gasoline rationing is to conserve rubber. If that is true, they cannot understand why gasoline is used as a basis instead of rubber. There are hundreds of thousands of cars in this area, the tires on which have a life of from ten to thirty thousand miles. These cars are used for strictly business purposes, yet the highest allotment of gasoline which can be granted in most cases is a ration for a maximum of 560 miles of driving per month or 6,720 miles per year. On this basis the rubber on these cars will last from 1½ to more than 4 years. Why should these cars, now used for essential business purposes, be taken off the road when they have much more than enough rubber on them to carry them through as long a period as we are likely to be confronted with a lack of rubber for business and occupational purposes?

To illustrate what I mean I call to your attention specifically the case of Cornell & Co., a firm of auditors and accountants at Hutchinson, Kans. This firm employs 10 accountants. Its business extends all over the State of Kansas. In addition to a considerable amount of private accounting work, this firm has contracts and agreements for auditing the books of public officials of 29 counties and 27 cities and school districts in the State for the year 1942, the work to be completed by December 31, 1943. These counties and municipalities are located in all parts of the State. Many of them are in an area where railroad and bus transportation is not only inadequate, but in many cases nonexistent. If you will take a look at the map of Kansas you can

very readily see that we have practically no north and south public transportation in the west three-fourths of the State. Even east and west transportation in the west three-fourths of the State is very inadequate. With the imposition of gasoline rationing, public transportation facilities are going to become more congested and more inadequate than ever.

Heretofore, all travel by this firm of accountants has been by motorcar and that is still the only way by which they can adequately serve their territory. These men know from past experience how much mileage they will have to cover in the way of business travel. They have also made a careful estimate of the life of their present tires in miles. The names of the accountants, together with the mileage in their present tires and the miles needed for business travel are as follows:

Accountant	Life of present tires in miles	Miles needed annually for business travel
Ed. J. Hammel.....	20,000	10,000
Perry S. White.....	20,000	10,000
V. W. Cochran.....	30,000	8,000
Royal G. Sanborn.....	15,000	8,000
Milton O. Cole.....	20,000	8,000
J. T. Lenoir.....	20,000	6,000
F. S. Evans.....	8,000	8,000
R. C. Anderson.....	15,000	8,000
R. C. Schmelzer.....	15,000	6,000
D. J. Newby.....	20,000	6,000

It will be seen by reference to the above that, based upon the mileage needed annually for business travel, these men have on their cars now a sufficient amount of tire mileage to run them from 1 to 3½ years. The question then presents itself whether it is more conducive to winning the war to permit these tires to rot on the wheels than to make sensible and moderate use of them for strictly business purposes.

I agree that we must conserve our tires—that pleasure driving must be cut down and perhaps eliminated altogether. If we are to conserve rubber, however, why don't we do it on that basis? If it has to be done through the medium of rationing gasoline, why shouldn't the local rationing board, in making allocations for business purposes, be authorized to take into consideration the condition and the probable life and mileage existing in the tires now on the car? If, for instance, a set of tires has a probable life of 20,000 additional miles by careful usage, and it is necessary for the owner to drive 10,000 miles annually for business purposes, why shouldn't he be given an allotment of gasoline sufficient to carry him 10,000 miles per year? Under the system of tire inspections now being set up it will be possible at all times to determine the condition of tires and any abuse of the same on the part of the owner could be penalized by cutting down his gasoline ration. Wouldn't that be a much more sensible way to approach the question of conserving rubber than a purely arbitrary allocation of gasoline?

What I have said with respect to the firm of auditors is 100 percent applicable to traveling salesmen and all others whose business requires any considerable amount of travel. An even stronger case can be made for an accountant inasmuch as a large part of his municipal and county work consists of audits which are required by law. Leaving that out of consideration altogether, however, it seems to me that any sensible application of a plan to conserve rubber can only be based upon rubber consumption rather than upon gasoline consumption.

Proposals have been made to you and resolutions are pending in Congress which provide for a deferment of gasoline rationing for 90 days until a further study of this matter can be made. I think this deferment should

be granted before the American people have saddled upon them an ill-advised, poorly conceived system of rationing which cannot help but seriously impair our war effort.

Very sincerely yours,

CIFFORD R. HOPE.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters from constituents.

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

There was no objection.

#### DRAFT DEFERMENT FOR NECESSARY AND ESSENTIAL MEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 16, I introduced H. R. 7789, to extend draft deferments for necessary and essential men until such time as all other categories and classifications are exhausted.

Section 4 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 provides that quotas of men to be inducted for training and service shall be determined on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof who are liable for training and service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the land and naval forces on the date fixed for determining quotas.

This bill proposes that quotas shall be determined on the basis of the number of registrants rather than on the basis of the number of residents. The bill also proposes that quotas for induction shall be so determined that essential men wherever located will be deferred until all available nonessential men have been called. This provision is a limitation designed to correct present conditions whereby some local boards are required to reclassify essential men as available for training and service, whereas other local boards have a large supply of nonessential men available.

Since the manpower behind the line is an essential part of the military system, some corrections must be made in the present method of determining the value of the service contributed.

This bill may not cover all the adjustments necessary, but its consideration will develop other problems, and an application of sound logic and practical common sense on the serious condition that exists, especially as it concerns food, may contribute to a victory for the people.

#### REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the cost of this war is going to be tremendous. About this we can do but little, for we must win the war regardless of such cost. However, while we do not want to see any funds wasted through our war efforts, there is another angle to present-day expenses and what proper attention to these expenses now may mean for the future. I am talking of the nonwar, nonessential expenditures which have been made so freely during the past 10 years. Each and every Member knows that while making some cuts, we could well in the past have economized to a far greater extent. Therefore, I am now calling on the Appropriations Committee of the House, who will soon start their hearings on the next year's appropriations, to scan as never before every single nonwar request for funds that comes before their committee. The Appropriations Committee, to my way of thinking, has one of the greatest responsibilities and opportunities to be of service to our country in their handling of all future appropriation matters. This committee should not come to the floor of the House with a single appropriation item until it has been carefully analyzed and reviewed. We are of necessity going to have to reduce these nonessential expenditures, hurt as it may, if we are to have our post-war fiscal policy in good shape. Now is the time during this war to cut down or entirely eliminate W. P. A., N. Y. A., overlapping bureaus and agencies. We hear a cry for more manpower. All right, let us get this manpower out of nonproductive jobs and into essential work. The way to do that is to cut off the funds for such nonproductive agencies.

So I want to lay directly in the lap of the House Appropriations Committee this responsibility to stop all unnecessary expenditures of the taxpayers' money. Our citizens are now being called upon to pay the highest taxes in history, with more yet to come. Under such circumstances there can be nothing else to do except reduce or cut off all and every nonessential expenditure. As legislators, we owe that to our country. Stop this spending.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein speeches delivered at the Departmental Auditorium in the city of Washington on October 28, 1942, in commemoration of Axis aggression against Greece. These include addresses by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State; the Greek Minister of Information; and the Greek Ambassador;

also a letter from the President of the United States to the Ambassador of Greece, and the Ambassador's reply.

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

There was no objection.

#### GASOLINE RATIONING

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a group of Congressmen have called a meeting for this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock in the old House Caucus Room to discuss the matter of postponing gas rationing for 90 days. I hope every one of you will attend. A number of you signed this call. Many more would have signed it had they had the opportunity. Only seven of those contacted declined to do so. This matter is of greater importance than most of you believe. I hope you will be there at 2:30, in the old House Caucus Room.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weiss] be permitted to extend his remarks by inserting a speech by the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix by inserting a copy of a speech made by myself in Pittsburgh, Pa., on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PRINCE LEOPOLD, AUSTRIAN NATIONAL HERO

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last an exceptional address was delivered by the Reverend Louis A. Sander, of Portland, Oreg., over the Columbia Broadcasting System Church of the Air. This address has particular significance to those of Austrian descent and those who are interested in the great history of that country. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may insert a copy of that speech in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein the advertisement of Montgomery Ward which appeared in the Washington Post of November 8, being a reply to the National War Labor Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LXXXVIII—566

#### MONTGOMERY WARD

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hope the membership, if they have not read this advertisement to which I just referred in the newspaper, the reply of Montgomery Ward to the National War Labor Board, will do so. I think it is high time that the Congress take some action in the things that the radical labor leaders are doing through the National War Labor Board. That Board is a stepchild of the old Defense Mediation Board, and the labor members resigned from that Board because they could not get what they wanted. Instead of the President appointing other labor members who would give honest, conscientious consideration to the things happening, he appointed the old members to a new board, and now they have their own way. They are trying to wreck business in this country; and if the Congress does not act shortly, we will find that we will have a labor government in this country, and it is going to be too bad when the national labor leaders compel every man and every woman in this country to join the labor union and do the things that these radical leaders want them to do. It is high time that we acted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### FOOD

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the food situation of this country is going to be increasingly difficult. The farmers are having continually more trouble in keeping men and women on the farms and prices are always higher when there is scarcity. It seems to me high time that we have an over-all study of the food situation as it relates not only to our men in the service, but the men on the production lines as well. We cannot keep up morale on too little food. It is advisable that we treat this whole problem as seriously as any other part of our war program. We should make food production a basic industry.

This would insure adequate labor supply. Planning for the consumption of essential foods by the armed forces, the production forces and the civilian population can come only after there is a realistic program for adequate production.

Only such an over-all food program will bring the best results for this country and for the world.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I received permission to extend an address by the Attorney General of Puerto Rico. I am advised by the Public Printer that this runs over the usual amount to the extent of about \$120. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### GASOLINE RATIONING IS NOT NECESSARY IN THE CENTRAL STATES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have on various occasions called attention of this House to the fact that rationing of gasoline in the Central States is unnecessary and unwise; that such action will result in destruction of many small businesses and dry up sources of much needed Federal and State revenues, not to mention the unemployment it will cause.

We have no shortage of gasoline in Missouri and other Central States, but our people are voluntarily cooperating in the plan to save tires by reduced mileage and speed. As evidence, I submit that the collection of State tax on gasoline sales in Missouri for the first 10 months of 1942 was \$1,327,254.98 less than it was during the first 10 months of 1941.

No other State has a finer system of highways than Missouri. Our highways were built from sale of bonds payable from funds collected from sale of automobile license plates and a tax of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline. Rationing of gasoline in Missouri would force us to levy a tax on all personal and real property to pay interest and provide sinking fund for retirement of such bonds.

Missourians are ready to make any sacrifices necessary to win the war, but they should not be forced to suffer needlessly. Rationing gasoline in Missouri would be like rationing hard coal in Scranton, Pa., oranges in Florida, oysters in Maryland, and potatoes in Maine. Try that and see how the patriots of the Eastern States, who want Nation-wide rationing of gas just because it may be scarce here, respond.

The bureaucrats admit that there is no shortage of gasoline in most of the States, but tell us rationing of gasoline is necessary to compel us to take care of our tires. Then, to add insult to injury, they require tire inspection. If gasoline rationing will make us preserve our tires, why the inspection to see if we are preserving them? Is it contemplated that all those thrown out of work by gasoline rationing will be hired as tire inspectors and put on the Government pay roll? There are some of us, Mr. Speaker, who do not concede that American citizens are so foolish and improvident that they will fail to take care of their own property unless compelled to do so. Probably a small percent do need a guardian, but, if so, why punish all for the shortsightedness of a few?

Do we really have a serious shortage of tires for civilian needs? Retreads are being made at the rate of 1,500,000 monthly, and new tires of reclaimed rubber at 500,000 per month. This is a total of 2,000,000 replacements against a normal 3,000,000 replacements. The Office of Price Administration tells us that the 35-mile speed limit adds approximately 40 percent to the number of miles in a given tire, and if they are correct, the

slower speed at which we are driving should bridge the gap between present and normal replacements until we have a sufficient stock of synthetic tires.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter to which I want to direct the attention of the House. All automobile owners have paid a fee and received a stamp which entitles them to use their car for 12 months from date of such payment. If the Government, which collected about \$175,000,000 from sale of such "use stamps," now unnecessarily prohibits the use of our automobiles by rationing of gasoline, the damage to the morale of the people will be very great at a time when we need unity and full cooperation. Let the administration keep faith with the people, and the people will do their part.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are willing to make any sacrifice when convinced that it is necessary for winning the war. All of us are making sacrifices now. But should we be asked to suffer unnecessarily just to satisfy the whims of those who are as much interested in regimenting the people as they are in bringing victory on the battlefields?

Those who receive gasoline now must sign a pledge to their Government that they do not own more than five tires and will not drive over 35 miles per hour. Section 35-A of the United States Criminal Code, a section reprinted in each gasoline ration coupon book, makes it a criminal offense, punishable by a maximum of 10 years in prison, a \$10,000 fine, or both, to disobey these rules. Heavy is the hand of regimentation.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of other matters, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject of Union for Democratic Action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with respect to contemplated changes in the rules governing the obtaining of proxies by the Securities Exchange Commission under sections 14 (a) and 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MUNDT was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD).

#### POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, there are two activities going on from which we should take a lesson. Those of us who live in the States along the eastern seaboard have been struggling with the problems of gas rationing for many months. Those Members living outside of the ra-

tioned area have shown little interest or concern in the problems which we have had. Now the lightning is about to strike you. We have a similar situation with regard to legislation pending in the Senate. We have there a bill to invade the rights of certain States, and through an unconstitutional measure to break down State laws. Those of you who are not immediately affected have followed the course of least resistance and voted for that bill. But I warn you today that if the groups which are back of that bill succeed in securing its enactment, then you will shortly be confronted with their demands for additional legislation, not only to break down State rights in eight Southern States, but to break down the rights of other States in other sections of the Nation. Then you will cry out, when it is too late, just as so many of you are now complaining about the rationing of gasoline.

In this connection, I call your attention to the following comments by Mark Sullivan:

[From the Washington Post]

#### A DELAYING ACTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

#### FILIBUSTERING FOR STATE RIGHTS

True, the Senate filibuster against the poll tax is a delaying of legislative government. But it is a delaying only. As a mere delaying, it must be weighed in the balance against the thing which the filibuster is invoked to resist.

The present filibuster is invoked to resist a measure which, if enacted, would assert the right of the Federal Government at Washington to dictate the qualifications of voters in every State and every election precinct in the country. This right is now solely exercised by the States. To take this right from the States, to transfer it to the Federal Government at Washington would be a fundamental distortion of the basic blueprint of American government. It would be more than a distortion. It would be the setting in motion of a process which ultimately would mean extinction of the States as units of government. For the most essential function any government can have is to fix the qualifications of its voters. Take that function away, and the States could not survive as governments.

The poll-tax bill, which the present filibuster resists, would be, if enacted, the completion of a mechanism for revolution—slow-moving and insidious revolution, but revolution surely. This bill would be the most animating motor. Other parts of the mechanism already exist. They show themselves frequently—though a country preoccupied with war fails to notice them.

The other day, a Federal agency at Washington, a panel of the War Labor Board, asserted jurisdiction over a strike of city employees in Newark, N. J. This action not only gives Federal sanction to the assertion that employees of government have the right to strike (a right so generally denied in the past and present that President Roosevelt within 3 years has denied it exists). Further, if the War Labor Board makes a decision in favor of the strikers, the decision must take a form directing the mayor of Newark to take affirmative action—to restore strikers to employment, to raise strikers' pay, or what not. If such decision of the Federal Government is to be made effective, it can only be done by some form of compulsion, force—compulsion exerted by Washington upon the functioning of a city government, which is solely a creature of the State.

Such examples of attempted invasion by the Federal Government upon the functions of the States and their subdivisions are frequent, and cumulative in their effect. They are, in some cases, distortions, and in other cases outright denials, of the fundamental charter and historic practices of American government. It is this process, and the most portentous part of it, that the present filibuster resists.

As between the filibuster, and that which the filibuster resists, the filibuster is a perfectly legal, long-recognized device of American parliamentary practice. While not frequently invoked, it has existed for 150 years. It is recognized by the rules, and stands firmly upon the rules. So completely is it recognized that a provision for ending it has long been written into the rules. A filibuster ends whenever two-thirds of the Senate says it ought to end.

How long ought the present filibuster fairly go on? Until there is complete public familiarity with the issue involved. Until every citizen of every voting precinct in Rochester, N. Y., and Des Moines, Iowa, and everywhere else, knows that if Congress can undo a poll tax, as a qualification for voting in some States, it can undo any and every qualification in any and every State, and dictate new qualifications from Washington. Until every citizen can free himself from preoccupation with the war long enough to become familiar with the whole process, and all the details, by which rights of States and of individuals are being taken away; the forces behind the process, the end toward which it works.

There is one question the reader will ask, which ought to be answered. Why is it, if this bill is so portentous, that apparently a majority of the Senate would vote for it, if it were permitted to come up? To give the answer fully would require more space, and careful discrimination among individual Senators. To the largest portion of the answer there is a clue. It is found in the position of two exceptionally able Senators, who oppose the bill—Republican Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, and Democratic Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. These Senators, because they are men of courage and understanding, of principle, would oppose the bill no matter what States they came from, or what the pressure of political groups upon them. But it happens to be symbolic (though symbolic only) that Vermont and Wyoming are two States which contain almost no Negro voters.

The key to the support of this bill, much of it extremely reluctant, is the large groups of Negro voters, in several large Northern States, mistakenly influenced by leaders of their own race and white.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER AND ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to.

Monday will be District day. I have no knowledge whether the Committee on the District of Columbia will have any bills to present, but it is District day and if they have any bills they will be taken up. I hope, however, they will be non-controversial.

Then on Monday afternoon the Mexican claims bill will be taken up, and if the gentleman from Michigan agrees, if a roll call is had on the passage of that bill it will go over until Tuesday.

Mr. MICHENER. You mean we will have the roll call on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Have the roll call on Tuesday.

Then the Panama Canal bill, for which a rule has been granted, will be taken up on Tuesday. Outside of that I have no knowledge of any legislation for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. The Panama Canal bill is a bill which would authorize the payment of compensation to certain civilian employees who assisted in the construction of the Panama Canal?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. The Mexican claims bill is a bill reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee and for which a rule was granted some time ago, but which rule was just reported within the last few days?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

Mr. MICHENER. Aside from that, the distinguished majority leader has no other legislation in mind for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I have no other legislation in mind.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I understood the gentleman to say the Mexican claims bill would be taken up on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. It will be taken up on Monday with the understanding that if there is a roll call, the roll call will go over until Tuesday. That is, insofar as the leadership is able to carry out that plan.

I have no other legislation in mind except matters which can be taken up by unanimous consent. Of course, next Thursday is Thanksgiving Day. I can see no reason why we should not adjourn over Thanksgiving. There is no legislation coming up. That would mean that if we get through on Tuesday we would adjourn from Tuesday until Friday, because we must meet on Friday in order to adjourn until the following Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. There would be nothing controversial at all at least until the first Monday after Thanksgiving?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly; with the exception of the two bills I have mentioned, which might be controversial.

Mr. MICHENER. And with a good prospect that there will not be much controversy before the first of the year?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very hopeful that that situation will exist and I will do all I can to see that it does.

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

There was no objection.

#### REAL PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present

consideration of the bill (H. R. 7781) to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. This bill came out of the District Committee, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER]. Its purpose is to meet a situation that exists in the District of Columbia, where certain religious and educational property, particularly religious property, was put on the tax rolls, which property had never been on the tax rolls before. The bill has been very carefully worked out. This is the same bill that was reported out of the Senate committee with one amendment in the House committee. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER] will more fully explain the bill; but it is a very deserving bill and is aimed to meet an unnecessary and uncomfortable situation that exists in the District, where certain religious property and probably some educational institutions, heretofore tax-exempt, have been put on the tax rolls.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, the real purpose of the bill is to carry out tax exemption in the District of Columbia as it has heretofore been interpreted and understood until very recently?

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill undertakes to carry out such objective to the extent that it is felt it should go.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia shall be the following and none other:

SECTION 1. (a) Property belonging to the United States of America.

(b) Property belonging to the District of Columbia.

(c) Property belonging to foreign governments and used for legation purposes.

(d) Property belonging to the Commonwealth of the Philippines and used for Government purposes.

(e) Property heretofore specifically exempted from taxation by any special act of Congress, in force at the time of approval of this act, so long as such property is used for the purposes for which such exemption is granted. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall report annually to the Congress the use being made of such specifically exempted property, and of any changes in such use, with recommendations.

(f) Art-gallery buildings belonging to and operated by organizations which are not organized or operated for private gain, and are open to the public generally, and for admission to which no charge is made on more than 2 days each week.

(g) Library buildings belonging to and operated by organizations which are not organized or operated for private gain and are open to the public generally.

(h) Buildings belonging to and operated by institutions which are not organized or operated for private gain, which are used for purposes of public charity principally in the District of Columbia.

(i) Hospital buildings, belonging to and operated by organizations which are not organized or operated for private gain, including buildings and structures reasonably necessary and usual to the operation of a hospital.

(j) Buildings belonging to and operated by schools, colleges, or universities which are not organized or operated for private gain, and which embrace the generally recognized relationship of teacher and student.

(k) Buildings belonging to and used in carrying on the purposes and activities of the National Geographic Society, American Pharmaceutical Association, the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, the National Lutheran Home, the National Academy of Sciences, Brookings Institution, the American Forestry Association, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the American Chemical Society, the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf, and buildings belonging to such similar institutions as may be hereafter exempted from such taxation by special acts of Congress.

(l) Cemeteries dedicated to and used solely for burial purposes and not organized or operated for private gain, including buildings and structures reasonably necessary and usual to the operation of a cemetery.

(m) Churches, including buildings and structures reasonably necessary and usual in the performance of the activities of the church. A church building is one primarily and regularly used by its congregation for public religious worship.

(n) Buildings belonging to religious corporations or societies primarily and regularly used for religious worship, study, training, and missionary activities.

(o) Pastoral residences actually occupied as such by the pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi of a church: *Provided*, That such pastoral residence be owned by the church or congregation for which said pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi officiates: *And provided further*, That not more than one such pastoral residence shall be so exempt for any one church or congregation.

(p) Episcopal residences owned by a church and used exclusively as the residence of a bishop of such church.

(q) Buildings belonging to organizations which are charged with the administration, coordination, or unification of activities, locally or otherwise, of institutions or organizations entitled to exemption under the provisions of this act, and used as administrative headquarters thereof.

(r) (1) Grounds belonging to and reasonably required and actually used for the carrying on of the activities and purposes of any institution or organization entitled to exemption under the provisions of this act.

(2) Additional grounds belonging to and forming a part of the property of such institutions or organizations as of July 1, 1942. Such exemption shall be granted only upon the filing of a written application to the Commissioners, supported by an affidavit that such additional grounds are not held for profit or sale but only for the enlargement and expansion of said institution or organization.

If, however, at any future date the grounds so exempted, or any portion thereof, shall be sold and a profit shall result from such sale the taxes thereon for each year from the date of acquisition of such property for which no tax has been paid shall immediately become due and payable, without interest: *Provided, however*, That the total of such taxes shall not exceed 50 percent of the net profit derived from such sale. The Commissioners shall be furnished a copy of the contract of sale together with other evidence necessary to establish the amount of profit or loss therefrom at least 10 days prior to the date of settlement of such sale. Taxes

assessed under this subparagraph shall constitute a lien upon such property.

Sec. 2. If any building or any portion thereof, or grounds, belonging to and actually used by any institution or organization entitled to exemption under the provisions of this act are used to secure a rent or income for any activity other than that for which exemption is granted such building, or portion thereof, or grounds, shall be assessed and taxed.

Sec. 3. Every institution, organization, corporation, or association owning property exempt under the provisions of paragraphs d to q, inclusive, of section 1 of this act, shall, on or before March 1, 1943, and on or before March 1 of each succeeding year, furnish the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a report, under oath, showing the purposes for which its exempt property has been used during the preceding calendar year. Upon written application by the institution, organization, corporation, or association filed before March 1 of any year, the Commissioners may extend the time for filing said report for a reasonable period. A copy of such report shall be forwarded to the Congress by the Commissioners.

If such report is not filed within the time provided herein, or as extended by the Commissioners, the property of the institution, organization, corporation, or association affected shall immediately be assessed and taxed until the required report is filed: *Provided, however,* That such tax shall be for a minimum period of 30 days.

Sec. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon written application by the owner of real property, filed within 90 days from the date of the approval of this act, are authorized to abate any tax assessed against any real property exempted by this act where such tax was assessed after January 1, 1941, or to refund any such tax within the limitations of appropriations therefor.

Sec. 5. Any institution, organization, corporation, or association aggrieved by any assessment of real property deemed to be exempt from taxation under the provisions of this act may appeal therefrom to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in sections 3 and 4 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939, as amended: *Provided, however,* That payment of the tax shall not be prerequisite to any such appeal.

Sec. 6. The Commissioners are authorized to make and promulgate such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the intent and purposes of this act.

Sec. 7. The following acts or parts thereof are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 1 of "An act exempting from taxes certain property in the District of Columbia and to amend the Act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," approved June 17, 1870 (16 Stat. 153);

(b) Section 8 of "An act for the support of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1876, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 503);

(c) Section 8 of "An act for the support of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 399);

(d) Section 14 of "An act providing permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108);

(e) "An act to construe an act entitled 'An act to relieve the churches and orphan asylums of the District of Columbia and to clear the title of the trustees of such property,'" approved March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. 513);

(f) The second paragraph of section 5 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the Dis-

trict of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, reading as follows: "That hereafter property used for educational purposes that is not used for private gain shall be exempt from taxation and all other property used for educational purposes shall be assessed and taxed as other property is assessed and taxed" (32 Stat. 616); and

(g) The last sentence of "An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C.," approved August 15, 1916 (39 Stat. 514-515, ch. 342), relating to the exemption from taxation of a rectory, parsonage, glebe house, or pastoral residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INCREASE OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ARMY NURSE CORPS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7633) to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who reported the bill, for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill has for its purpose the equalization of the pay of the Army Nurse Corps. It provides for the relative ranks from colonel to second lieutenant. You will recall that at the time the Women's Army Auxiliary bill was on the floor a commitment was made that this legislation would be considered by the committee and promptly reported. As I say, the first purpose of the bill is to equalize the pay of the Army Nurse Corps.

A second portion of the bill permits the commissioning also of physical therapists and dietitians in the Army service.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. This bill is of immediate importance, is it not, in the securing of an adequate nursing service for the armed forces and for the proper care of the sick in all our hospitals?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. It is interesting to note that since the beginning of this emergency and the extension of our Army the Nurse Corps has grown from 949 to a present total of 17,507. It is further important to realize that by the time the Nurse Corps reaches the strength it should have for our present armed forces its membership will increase to 32,000.

The War Department states that this bill is urgently needed in order to carry out the war program.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. How much additional cost is this readjustment of salary going to entail?

Mr. KILDAY. I would not be able to give the gentleman the over-all cost. It will have the effect of changing the pay

of nurses from the present status of \$90 per month and room and board, and put the nurses on the same status as other officers of the Army holding comparable rank. The over-all cost will, of course, depend upon the ultimate program for nurses in the Army.

Mr. CARTER. Is not the gentleman interested in the increased cost? Does he not believe this is something about which the House should be informed before letting a bill of this kind come up?

Mr. KILDAY. I assure the gentleman we went into that with the War Department in the hearings before both the subcommittee and the full committee. Because of the fact that it is not possible to know the exact number of nurses who may be inducted into service they cannot give us any picture of the over-all cost; but I submit to the gentleman that with pencil and paper and the figures I have given him he will be able to figure it out. My mathematics do not carry me that far, but the gentleman being a member of the Appropriations Committee will doubtless be able to figure it out for himself.

Mr. CARTER. Was this matter submitted to the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. KILDAY. It was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, but as the report shows, the Bureau of the Budget had not completed its investigation of it and its report has not as yet been received.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman believe the matter should be withheld until the Bureau of the Budget does make its report?

Mr. KILDAY. Ordinarily, yes; but we are assured by the War Department that this is emergency legislation needed to permit them to place adequate forces in the theater of operations. Under existing circumstances the corps is not sufficient, and the compensation is not adequate. In addition to that we find that we cannot get our physical therapists and dietitians into the theaters of operations where it is essential they go. All who are familiar with the martial law of the situation realize that no civilian should go into the theater of operations when we can prevent it. This bill has for its purpose the conferring of military status upon these people whom it is essential we get into the theater of operations. On the theory that this is actually emergency legislation that must be passed, I submit there is not time to await the report to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CARTER. Will not these dietitians and nurses be available even though this legislation does not go through and the salary adjustment does not take place?

Mr. KILDAY. Not if they retain their civilian status. The gentleman must be aware of the fact that the status of a civilian in the theater of operations is a very awkward one and there has been some reluctance on the part of the Army to allow civilians in the theater of operations. They hold a very precarious position under international law.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is only upon the strength of the gentleman's statement that this is emergency legislation and that failure to pass it might

interfere with the war activities that I am restrained from objecting to the bill. Otherwise I would feel that I should object. May I say that I do not believe the House, even in wartime, should pass legislation without knowing what the financial outlay is going to be. Committees should not bring in a bill before it has received a report from the Budget Bureau. However, having a great deal of faith in the statement of the gentleman, I will withdraw my objection and defer to his judgment in this matter.

Mr. KILDAY. I want to assure the gentleman that this is emergency legislation and I call his attention to the fact that the report which the committee is now filing carries with it a table showing the present compensation and the higher rate, together with an estimate and the numbers to which the Nurse Corps will go. Therefore, within the record it is possible for one who can multiply and add to determine the additional cost of the legislation that is involved in this report.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been very much interested in this legislation for some time. I spoke on this subject on the floor of the House on more than one occasion and I am very happy to see that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has acted with such dispatch. May I call the attention of the Members to the fact that the Army authorities are in favor of this bill, and that there has been no objection from any source whatsoever. I am familiar with this subject and I say further that the Army has been studying this particular type of legislation for some time.

This merely equalizes the pay of Army nurses who hold the relative rank of those in the Women's Army Auxiliary organization who hold the same relative rank; therefore, the measure is only fair and just. It is emergency legislation because we cannot get the nurses to volunteer in sufficient number to take care of the needs unless this legislation is passed. I sincerely trust there will be no objection to its immediate passage.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the gentleman that in my State public-school teachers with college degrees receive only \$90 per month and pay their own board and room. May I inquire of the gentleman whether or not this increase is to be effective for the duration of the war only or if it is to be from now on?

Mr. MAY. It is for the duration of the war.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I concur, and I am sure practically everybody on this side concurs, with the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], in reference to this bill. It has been the policy here that no bill involving the expenditure of money should be called up and passed by unanimous consent until a report is received from the Bureau of the Budget as to the cost of the legislation. Emergency measures are the only exception.

Some of us are convinced that the proposed bill is an emergency war measure

and should be enacted now for the best interests of the national defense. For that reason we withdraw our objection. This exception, however, is not to be considered as a precedent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law the members of the Army Nurse Corps, during the present war and for such period thereafter as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, shall have relative rank and shall receive pay and allowances as follows:

(a) The Superintendent shall have the relative rank of colonel and shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers without dependents of the sixth pay period;

(b) Assistant Superintendents shall have the relative rank of lieutenant colonel and shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers without dependents of the fifth pay period;

(c) Directors shall have the relative rank of major and shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers without dependents of the fourth pay period;

(d) Assistant directors shall have the relative rank of captain and shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers without dependents of the third pay period;

(e) Chief nurses shall have the relative rank of first lieutenant and shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers without dependents of the second pay period;

(f) Head nurses and nurses shall have the relative rank of second lieutenant and shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers without dependents of the first pay period.

SEC. 2. Any nurse paid under the provisions of this act shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of the period to which she is entitled for each 3 years' service not exceeding 30 years. For the computation of service for this purpose there shall be counted all active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as a contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse of the Army or Navy subsequent to February 2, 1901.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by Mr. Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT TO PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2723) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], whose committee gave consideration and study to the bill, and request that he make an explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill (S. 2723) reported by the House committee has two parts. The first is to meet a ruling made by the Comptroller General recently with reference to the Pay Readjustment Act which this Congress enacted earlier in the year.

When we reported that bill it was the purpose of the committee that all officers should be treated alike in the calculation of the longevity pay, but the Comptroller General ruled that the language was not sufficient to give National Guard officers and Reserve officers a part of the benefit of longevity pay. Some of those officers were actually paid by the finance officers and had to refund that money. The first part of this bill corrects that situation.

The second part, which is an amendment that our committee has added, seeks to give longevity credit to officers in all of our armed services for previous enlisted service and service as warrant officers, Army field clerks, and so forth. That part is effective only in time of war. The great need for this is that we have a large number of enlisted men, master sergeants, first sergeants, warrant officers, commissioned warrant officers, who have had long years of service. They possess all of the qualifications of leadership that will make them good commissioned officers, but in order to accept a commission they have to take a reduction in pay and it is difficult to get them to do this. This seeks to remedy that situation. The report of the committee is unanimous.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the eleventh paragraph of section 1 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"In computing the service for all pay purposes of officers paid under the provisions of this section, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, and service of Coast and Geodetic Survey officers authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.): *Provided,* That for officers in service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation, in addition to the service set forth above, all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be based on the total of all

service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity-pay purposes under the provisions of this act or as may otherwise be provided by law."

Sec. 2. The first paragraph of section 3 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, they shall receive pay as provided in section 1 of this act, and in computing their service for pay they shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.)."

Sec. 3. This act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942, but no back pay or allowances for any period prior to such date shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, for immediate consideration, the bill (S. 2740) to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this bill been passed on by the House Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. MAY. It has been thoroughly considered and studied, with adequate hearings, and it is brought in by a unanimous report of the whole committee.

The bill deals with the situations that are presented all over the country where large plants have been constructed in isolated sections and where Maritime Commission operations along the seaboards have been augmented by thousands and thousands and thousands of employees who live long distances from their place of employment and have no housing facilities.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is merely to authorize the Navy, the Army, and the Maritime Commission, as well as the Office of Defense Transportation, to provide adequate facilities for the transportation of these passengers to and from their places of employment, only if and when it is shown that there are no private facilities available for that purpose.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman consider this to be an emergency measure?

Mr. MAY. Yes; very much so.

I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the committee was particularly cautious in guarding against any of the things that usually creep into such legislation, such as authorizing the Government to take over the railroad systems of the country. We prohibited that by an amendment to the bill. We all remembered the terrible plight in which the railroads were found following Government operation during the last World War and we do not intend such a thing to again happen if we can prevent it, and for that reason we wrote in the amendment to which reference has been made.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that the department wants to furnish transportation, how will it proceed if there is some transportation available?

Mr. MAY. It will merely make arrangements with the available transportation companies that are partially capable of carrying the obligation, to furnish them additional facilities and to cooperate with them in any way they can to make it possible for these people to be transported.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That whenever during the continuance of the present war the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission shall determine that the effective conduct of the affairs of his department or agency in connection with the prosecution of war requires assured and adequate transportation facilities to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by such department or agency, including personnel attached to or employed by private plants engaged in the manufacture of war material, he is hereby authorized in the absence of adequate private or other facilities to provide such transportation, subject, however, to the following provisions and conditions:

1. The equipment required to provide such transportation facilities may be either purchased, leased, or chartered for operation by the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission, and when so obtained may be maintained and operated either by enlisted personnel, civil employees of the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission, or by private personnel under contract with such departments or agency. Equipment so obtained may also be leased or chartered to private or public carriers for operation under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, or such official within their respective departments or agency as they may designate, shall determine necessary and advisable under the existing circumstances: *Provided*, That any equipment purchased, leased, or operated by authority of this act shall have a seating capacity of 12 or more passengers.

2. That in each case where transportation facilities are provided hereunder, reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished shall be established and charged under such regulations as the Secretary of War, the Secretary

of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission shall prescribe; the receipts from such fares, and the proceeds from the leasing or chartering of any equipment as provided in the foregoing paragraph, shall be accounted for in accordance with such accounting procedure as the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, respectively, may prescribe, and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

3. The facilities and service authorized hereunder shall be utilized only for the transportation of personnel heretofore enumerated and for the purpose heretofore stated, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by authority of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission: *Provided, however*, That where the equipment and facilities herein provided for are pooled under lease or charter agreements, the reciprocal use of Government-owned and private-owned equipment shall be deemed to be within the intent of this paragraph.

4. The authority herein granted the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission shall be exercised in each case only after a determination by the Office of Defense Transportation that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a utilization of transportation facilities consistent with the plans, policies, and programs of the Office of Defense Transportation.

5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify or limit in any manner the authority vested in the Chairman of the War Production Board by any Executive order or act of Congress. All vessels purchased, leased, or chartered under this act shall be procured by or through the War Shipping Administration to the full extent of the authority and jurisdiction of the War Shipping Administration.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, respectively, to file with the Congress, within 60 days after the end of the fiscal year, a summarized report of the exercise of the authority herein granted, which report shall include (1) location, nature, and size of the plant for which transportation facilities were provided; (2) type, amount, and original cost of equipment furnished; (3) outline of lease or charter for rented or reciprocally used equipment with total costs for period of use or operation; and (4) citation of authority of the Office of Defense Transportation under which exercised.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, line 4, after the word "transportation" insert "by motor vehicle or water carrier."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: At the conclusion of section 2, change the period to a comma and add: "except that in the case of the Maritime Commission such receipts and proceeds shall be deposited in its Construction Fund in accord with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, and other applicable provisions of law: *Provided*, That appropriations for the Military

Establishment and the Maritime Commission may be used to carry into effect the provisions of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (S. 2723) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 was passed be vacated and that the bill be now considered, so that certain committee amendments may be offered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the eleventh paragraph of section 1 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"In computing the service for all pay purposes of officers paid under the provisions of this section, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, and service of Coast and Geodetic Survey officers authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.): *Provided,* That for officers in service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation, in addition to the service set forth above, all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this act or as may otherwise be provided by law."

Sec. 2. The first paragraph of section 3 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, they shall receive pay as provided in section 1 of this act, and in computing their service for pay they shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine

Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.)."

Sec. 3. This act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942, but no back pay or allowances for any period prior to such date shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer certain committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. MAY:

Page 1, line 11, after "National Guard" insert "or in the National Guard Reserve."

Page 3, line 8, after "National Guard", insert "or in the National Guard Reserve."

Page 3, after line 16, insert:

"Sec. 3. The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended by inserting after section 3 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 3A. During the existence of any war declared by Congress and for 6 months immediately following the termination of such war, in computing the service for all pay purposes of officers paid under the provisions of section 1 or 3 of this act, such officers, in addition to the time required to be credited by such sections, shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they were enlisted or held appointments as warrant officers or Army field clerks or as commissioned warrant officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Regular Army Reserve, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard Reserve, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the enlisted Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary. The provisions of this section shall not be construed to permit any commissioned officer to receive pay and allowances in excess of the maximum limitations imposed upon the total pay and allowances of any rank or grade by any of the provisions of this act."

And in line 17 change "sec. 3" to "sec. 4."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, were these amendments all agreed to by both the majority and minority members of the committee?

Mr. MAY. It was a unanimous report, both on the bill and on the amendments.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is offering only the amendments that were agreed to in the committee?

Mr. MAY. That is right. I would not think of offering anything else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND NAVAL ACADEMY OF SONS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 658, 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this Senate bill, S. 658, has been on the Speaker's desk for some time. The House took the bill up and considered it and reported out a House bill, H. R. 2794, which contains an amendment, and if consent is obtained, I desire to move to strike out everything in the Senate bill following the enacting clause and substitute the provisions of the bill H. R. 2794.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That motion is not yet in order. The matter before the House is the request whether the bill should be considered.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the matter to object. As I understand, this bill passed the House some time ago.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, it is this. The House passed a bill containing everything that this bill, if enacted today, will include. That bill went to the Senate. The Senate also had a bill with a particular Senator's name attached, doing the same thing. And this particular Senator wants his bill enacted, and apparently he had influence enough in the Senate to delay the matter and did so in an effort to force his bill through. I condemn any such tactics in dealing with the work of legislation, if those facts stated by me are correct. However, I do not want to interfere with the passage of the bill that the gentleman refers to. The American Legion called up this morning and they are very much interested in this bill. The bill should go through with the proposed amendment, but they are not interested in the authorship, as to whether it is a House or a Senate bill.

Mr. MAY. And I say to the gentleman from Michigan that neither am I interested in authorship, nor is my committee. All we want to do is to see that justice is done the sons of World War veterans, who are suffering from service-connected disability, or who have died as a result of that, and the House bill which I propose to offer as an amendment, if unanimous consent is given, includes that provision. As I understand it that is entirely agreeable to and in fact is desired by the American Legion.

Mr. MICHENER. Some Members on this side were not here when the matter was disposed of in the House, and they want an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Very well. I am talking now about the bill that passed the House. It provides that the sons of World War veterans who died as a result of service-connected injuries or as a result of service-connected disabilities, may be admitted to the Military Academy on the

same terms and under the same conditions as others who are now by law permitted to enter the academy. Further, the Veterans' Administration has approved the amendment which we have included in the legislation.

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

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. In what respect does this change existing law? Any of these boys are eligible to admission to the service schools if a Member of the Congress or the President wants to appoint them. How does the bill change existing law?

Mr. MAY. It does not change existing law, except that it applies to those sons of the veterans of the World War whom I have mentioned.

Mr. MOTT. The sons of these veterans are eligible for appointment to the Military and Naval Academies at the present time. My question is how this bill proposes to change existing law?

Mr. MAY. I did not get the gentleman's question at first. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I served as chairman of the subcommittee which considered this bill. Shortly after the close of the World War there were 40 appointments authorized at the Military Academy for the sons of men killed in action in that war. Of course, there are no longer any sons of men killed in that war who are eligible for admission to the Military Academy or the Naval Academy because they would be above the maximum age limit. This bill will change the qualifications of a son whose father was killed in action to a son of a man who has died of service-connected disability.

Mr. MOTT. Does the bill provide for additional appointments to take care of these?

Mr. KILDAY. There are no additional appointments, nor are the appointments of any appointing officials diminished or increased. They are chosen under the basic act by the President. That makes them appointed by the President, but it is based upon competitive examination of those who qualify, under existing law, as being the son of one killed in action; and under the proposed legislation, on a competitive examination, from among those whose fathers have died of service-connected disability.

Mr. MOTT. These are Presidential appointments?

Mr. KILDAY. These are Presidential appointments.

Mr. MOTT. Then they would increase the number of appointees to the academies?

Mr. KILDAY. No. The present law authorizes 40. Under existing law 40 are authorized.

Mr. MOTT. But they have never been appointed?

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, yes; but the pool has been diminished, you understand, from lapse of time, so that it is practically exhausted now. This creates a new pool, all of whom will be sons of men who served in the World War and who died of service-connected disabilities. Heretofore they must have been killed in action.

Mr. THOMASON. Under the present law these men are not eligible at present.

Mr. KILDAY. They are not eligible.

Mr. THOMASON. And this bill makes them eligible?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection?

There being 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."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 1 of the Senate bill following the enacting clause, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2794, as follows:

"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 active service during the World War (as defined by existing laws providing service connected compensation benefits for World War veterans and

their dependents): *Provided*, That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to service connection of the cause of death shall be final and conclusive and shall be binding upon the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as 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."

#### UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7768) to provide a uniform allowance for officers and warrant officers commissioned or appointed in the Army of the United States or any component thereof.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill have the unanimous consent of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. MAY. This is a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not asking if it is a unanimous report. I am asking if it has the unanimous consent of the committee?

Mr. MAY. Certainly it has.

Mr. MICHENER. Some of these bills are far reaching and when they are brought in without any previous notice and unanimous consent is asked for their consideration, it places one who wants to be a little careful about legislation in a rather unusual position for fear he might object to something that is absolutely needed now because of the war emergency.

Mr. MAY. Let me say that I took this matter up with the ranking minority member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, with the next ranking member, and the next ranking member.

Mr. MICHENER. Some of them should be on the floor.

Mr. MAY. There was one of them present awhile ago. He is not here now apparently. I talked to him before this was called up.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to call any names. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. MAY. I will yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill also is made necessary by a ruling of the Comptroller General. It is an emergency matter, because in writing the original law covering uniform allowance it has been necessary, through the years, to

amend and reamend that law until at the present time there must be six or seven provisos attached to the law. As a result of it, it has been found by the Comptroller General that certain officers being called into active duty in the Army are not entitled to a uniform allowance. For instance, one of the most glaring cases is the case of a Reserve officer who has been a Reserve officer for a number of years, who has done his duty and gone to camp in the summer and has done everything he should do. In certain cases, when that man is called into active service, he is not entitled to a uniform allowance, yet another Reserve officer who has failed to take his tour of duty at the proper time may be entitled to a uniform allowance.

As the law is written in this particular case it places a premium actually upon the Reserve officer for not doing his duty. This bill is designed to cover every case of a Reserve officer who goes into active service so that he will receive an allowance for uniforms.

In addition to this, the bill increases the amount to be paid for the uniform allowance from \$150 to \$250 for each officer under the rank of major at the time of his appointment. This increase is made necessary by the increased costs of the uniforms required and by the increase of the amount of equipment needed during times of war. In the itemized figures showing the actual costs of this equipment at the lowest prices, the essentials required of the Army for its officers runs to a total of \$260.65, which is the minimum amount of equipment required at the present time. To those officers who in recent years have failed to receive the allowance, when called into active service, will be paid the difference between the amount paid to them previously and the sum of \$250, which is allowed under this bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 212), the act of March 9, 1942 (Public Law 492, 77th Cong.), and any provision of any other law authorizing the payment of a uniform allowance to any person upon being appointed a commissioned or warrant officer in any component of the Army of the United States, are hereby repealed, but any payments heretofore made pursuant thereto, if otherwise correct, are hereby validated.

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, an allowance of \$250 for uniforms and equipment is hereby authorized to be paid to the following personnel of the Army of the United States or any component thereof:

(a) Any person on active duty on the date of approval of this act, or thereafter accepted for active duty, in the grade of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, or captain, and entitled to the pay of the first, second, or third pay periods; and

(b) Any person on active duty on the date of approval of this act, or thereafter accepted for active duty, in any temporary or permanent grade of warrant officer (including any person appointed as a flight officer), except that of chief warrant officer entitled to receive the base pay and allowances provided for officers of the fourth pay period.

SEC. 3. (a) The uniform allowance authorized in section 2 hereof shall not be paid more than once to any person without regard to appointment in or promotion to a grade for which the allowance is authorized.

(b) Any uniform allowance heretofore paid under the provisions of the act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 212), the act of March 9, 1942 (Public Law 492, 77th Cong.), section 4 of the act of June 3, 1941 (Public Law 97, 77th Cong.), or section 6 of the act of July 8, 1942 (Public Law 658, 77th Cong.), to any person entitled to a uniform allowance under this act, shall be deducted from the allowance payable under section 2 hereof and only the difference paid to the person entitled thereto. The certificates of officers or warrant officers, including flight officers, of the Army of the United States relating to facts regarding payments received under the acts herein cited shall be accepted as supporting such facts as stated without the necessity of other supporting evidence.

(c) The uniform allowance authorized in section 2 hereof shall not be paid to any graduate of the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 4. The uniform allowance authorized by this act shall be payable only to persons now serving in the Army of the United States or who hereafter serve therein at any time during the period of the wars in which the United States is now engaged and for 6 months thereafter.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, strike out lines 5 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Any person on active duty on April 3, 1939, or thereafter accepted for active duty, in the grade of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, or captain, and entitled to the pay of the first, second, or third pay periods on June 3, 1939, or at the time of such acceptance for active duty; and

"(b) Any person on active duty on April 3, 1939, or thereafter accepted for active duty, in any temporary or permanent grade of warrant officer (including any person appointed flight officer), except that of a chief warrant officer entitled to receive the base pay and allowances provided for officers of the fourth pay period."

On page 3, insert the words "on active duty" after the word "serving" in line 13, and after the word "serve" in line 14.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 7633) to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps was passed be vacated in order that an amendment may be offered by the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That hereafter, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, the members

of the Army Nurse Corps shall have relative rank and receive pay and allowances, including mileage and other travel allowances, as now or hereafter provided by law, for commissioned officers, without dependents, of the Regular Army in the sixth to the first pay periods, respectively.

"SEC. 2. Hereafter, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, there shall be included in the Medical Department of the Army such female dietetic and physical therapy personnel (exclusive of students and apprentices) as the Secretary of War may consider necessary, whose qualifications, duties, and assignments shall be in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, and who shall be appointed and, at his discretion be removed, by the Surgeon General, subject to the approval of the Secretary. Such personnel shall have relative rank and receive pay and allowances, including mileage and other travel allowances, as now or hereafter provided by law, for commissioned officers, without dependents, of the Regular Army in the third to the first pay periods, respectively. Persons appointed under the provisions of this section and their dependents shall be entitled to the same allowances and the same rights, privileges, benefits, and gratuities as members of the Army Nurse Corps and their dependents.

"SEC. 3. The superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps shall receive pay and allowances of the sixth pay period and have the relative rank of colonel; such assistant superintendents or directors as the Secretary of War may designate shall receive pay and allowances of the fifth or fourth pay periods and have the relative rank of lieutenant colonel or major, respectively; one chief dietitian may be designated by the Secretary of War as Director of Dietitians and one chief physical therapy aide may be designated by the Secretary of War as Director of Physical Therapy Aides, each to have the relative rank of major and receive the pay and allowances of the third pay period; all other assistant superintendents and assistant directors, chief dietitians and chief physical therapy aides shall receive pay and allowances of the third pay period and have the relative rank of captain; chief nurses, head dietitians and head physical therapy aides shall receive the pay and allowances of the second pay period and have the relative rank of first lieutenant; and head nurses, nurses, dietitians and physical therapy aides shall receive pay and allowances of the first pay period and have the relative rank of second lieutenant. Every person paid under the provisions of this act shall receive an increase of 5 percent of the base pay of her period for each 3 years of service up to 30 years, and during any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the Secretary of War, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, an increase in base pay of 10 percent. In computing service of members of the Army Nurse Corps there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901. In computing service of female dietetic and physical therapy personnel there shall be credited all active full-time service (except as a student or apprentice) in the dietetic or physical therapy categories rendered subsequent to April 6, 1917, as a civilian employee of the War Department.

"SEC. 4. Employment by the military establishment of female dietetic and female physical therapy personnel (except students and apprentices) shall be limited to persons appointed under the provisions of this act while its provisions are in effect. Appointments of such personnel (except students

and apprentices) under the provisions of any other law are hereby terminated as of the last day of the third month following the month in which this act is enacted, if not sooner terminated. Persons whose appointments are terminated by the provisions of this section may be appointed under the provisions of this act in accordance with such regulations as may be promulgated by the Secretary of War.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of War is authorized to use appropriations available to the Military Establishment to carry into effect the provisions of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### WAGING WAR

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the present world war, so far as America and Japan are concerned, appears to me to be just another racial conflict. I believe historians of the future will view it as one in a long line of such contests which have swept across continents and involved peoples in wars for centuries. Surely, our war on the Pacific is a definite attempt to beat back oncoming hordes and swarms of the yellow race. It is the inevitable conflict between races holding to totally different ideals, both aggressive, determined, and dominated by the desire to apply modern science and invention to their material betterment. The scientific progress which the Japanese have made under the tutelage of western nations is now turned to destructive purposes. They are waging war relentlessly.

#### CIVILIZATION HAS WON THREE CONTESTS

Think a moment of the onslaughts our ancestors encountered after they came out of central Asia, long years ago. In several land migrations, they sifted into southern Asia, Europe, and Africa. In recent times, they have passed over the high seas which have become the great highways into all parts of the globe. Around the Mediterranean Sea our ancestors developed the great civilizations of the ancient world. Rome was the finest achievement in government which appeared before the Christian era. Before the days of Christianity, civilization was, indeed, cruel, cold, heartless—built on human slavery.

#### THREATS TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION—CARTHAGE

Our ancestors met no really serious opposition from the native tribes, or coalitions of such tribes, in their steady march from Central Asia until the Punic wars, before the Christian Era. Ancient Car-

thage, situated on the southern shores of the Mediterranean on the northern coast of Africa, was the first real rival of Rome, the pride of the ancient world. While Roman civilization was far from humanitarian, the Carthaginian civilization was much more inhuman, with several vices added. Had Carthage won in the Punic wars, and established supremacy over Rome and the Mediterranean, there would have been no foundation upon which to build the modern world. Rome displayed great courage and recuperative powers, especially in the contest with Hannibal, which was generally known as the Second Punic War. That great Carthaginian general crossed the Straits of Gibraltar, taking his formidable army, and elephants, into Spain, through southern France, across the Alps, on to the plains of northern Italy, defeating the Romans in many engagements, and inflicting a stinging blow at Cannae. Then, moving closer to the gates of Rome, camping on public land with his army and elephants, Hannibal sent his emissaries to demand the surrender of Rome. The Romans invited the messengers from Hannibal to visit the Forum, where they were holding a spirited auction. They had mapped and divided the land upon which Hannibal's army was camped and were selling it at public auction. The Romans brought their money and jewels and eagerly bid for sections where Hannibal's army and elephants were then stationed, outside the gates of Rome. The Roman officials turned to the messengers from Hannibal and said, "This is our answer to the demand for surrender." With the treasure chest realized from this auction, the Romans organized another army. They learned how to drive the fighting elephants from the battlefield with firebrands. They defeated the great Hannibal and drove his army back to Africa, finally wiping out Carthage.

While Rome deserves credit for teaching the world the art of government, it should never be forgotten that it was a civilization vastly different than that which we enjoy. This can be illustrated by a story of a great architect who lived in Rome. Because of jealousies of his competitors, he was banished from the imperial city. He had influence enough to secure an audience with Augustus Caesar, who was then on the throne. He plead his case and begged for a pardon. At a critical point in the interview, the architect drew from under his toga a glass drinking vessel and asked Augustus to make sure it was glass; then he threw it on the marble floor. The glass bent, but did not break. It is said the architect then restored the glass drinking vessel to its proper shape, and handed it back to the surprised ruler who said, "Can you make glass that will bend and not break?" The architect replied in the affirmative. Augustus said, "Then you must die. I cannot allow you to be banished. If you have such ability, you may take the lightning that plays round the Alps and bring it down to light the city of Rome. Why, you may be able to render our slaves useless and valueless. You may change the whole trend of civilization and make a mechanized world

in place of the world we enjoy today." That is the way Rome often treated her great men. In America we honor inventors and scientists.

#### THE MOSLEMS AND MONGOLS

Jesus of Nazareth brought into a cruel pagan world the doctrine of love and kindness which has been slowly penetrating the dark recesses of men's minds. The great challenge to our Christian civilization came in the eighth century when Mohammed appeared as the rival of Christendom. Foremost in his religious faith was the doctrine that unconverted heathen, the unbeliever, should be killed. The teachings of the Koran spread rapidly through Asia and Africa. The Moslems were checked near Paris, at Tours, and turned back by the victory of Charles Martel and his followers.

Five centuries after the great invasion of the Moors there came the Mongol invasion of Europe, a little more than 700 years ago. In succeeding waves, under Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, they rode over the steppes of Russia, through the Caucasus, over the Ural Mountains, down to the very gates of Vienna, where they were turned back and, by gradual degrees, were driven to the grass lands from which they had come.

These two threats were faced by a less numerous Christian world, which probably numbered about 60,000,000 people. Had these two great pincers closed at the same time, they possibly would have pinched out our Christian ancestors, and the civilization that we today enjoy might not have developed. Fortunately, these great conquering movements were five centuries apart and our ancestors were able to defeat them singly. One by one, Carthage, the Moslems, and the Mongols were overcome.

#### CIVILIZATIONS HAVE PASSED

Our Government is often compared to that of ancient Rome and there are many things in common. Students tell us that there have been 21 civilizations on this earth where man has worked his slow way up from savagery to quite a high degree of culture. Fourteen of these 21 times they have left nothing except perhaps a staircase here, a mound there, a picture on a cave wall—no written record, only the barest fragments of a people long ago passed and gone. Is it possible that we are again sinking into a period like the Dark Ages? I cannot believe it. I still see a star of hope, and firmly believe that this country will ride the storm to carry the spirit of the Declaration of Independence through ages yet to be.

Gen. Hunter Liggett, who commanded the American forces in the Argonne Woods, in the First World War, said to me, "Governor, if you ever live to experience another World War, I fear you will see much of Europe degenerate into semisavagery, and the scepter of empire will pass from Europe, possibly to Asia." As I think of the cruelty, the inhumanity practiced by Hitler and his followers, I often recall the remark of the wise old general.

## FREEDOM CANNOT BE TRANSFERRED

We often repeat, "That which thy fathers have bequeathed to thee, earn it anew, if thou wouldst possess it." Freedom—the right to worship God; the right of independent, individual action; the right to think and to act as judgment dictates—these rights have been won for us by our ancestors. They nobly did their part to transfer to us the precious heritage. If we would possess it, we must win it anew. No truer statement was ever made than "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

## AMERICA FACES JAPAN—THE ERA OF THE PACIFIC

The scene shifts from the Mediterranean, and civilization faces the most terrific onslaught in the Pacific. The American people are now the protectors of our modern civilization. The leadership has been placed in our hands. Eighty-nine years ago Commodore Perry forced his way into the Japanese islands and made it possible for European civilization to flow into that land. In the short intervening period of time these prolific people, amazingly imitative, have assimilated that part of our civilization which especially attracts them—the mechanism for conquering and controlling. Feeling certain that they had acquired the tools that would make them the supreme rulers of earth, they challenged America to mortal combat on the 7th of December 1941. We had no choice. They threw the gauntlet at our feet. We must fight in this mechanized war and we must win it, or we perish.

Western civilization faces its most critical contest. Apparently, there is now just opening the greatest struggle of all time between the Christian ideal, as developed by the white races, and the non-Christian civilization, as developed in Asia and now under the leadership of Japan. The battle cry "Asia for the Asiatics" means "Asia for Japan." The Christian English-speaking world today faces the most resourceful enemy that has ever appeared in the path of progress since our ancestors came out of central Asia. In the long struggle for supremacy, the Japanese expect to win because they multiply so much more rapidly and ask so little of life. They expect to occupy and overrun the islands of the Pacific, and the countries of South America which have admitted them. One way or another they have forced themselves into North America. They believe that the world control will ultimately pass into the hands of the yellow races, with Japan leading and making the terms.

We must throw into this war our every material possession and all our skills, knowledge, and resources. Never should we cease battling for our cause until the means to make war has been taken from the hands of the treacherous Japanese. When Germany breaks, a great drive for peace will set in. Some of the rich and powerful will want to make terms with the Japanese, so they may have laborers. Some religious groups will want to offer peace terms in the hope of gaining converts. It will require all our moral strength and courage to prevent a treaty of peace before the Japanese are entirely

and completely disarmed, so that, for generations, it will be impossible for them to participate in another world conflict.

## OUR ATTEMPTS AT APPEASEMENT

It is far too late to question the acts of our State Department in allowing scrap iron, gasoline, lubricating oil, to be shipped in such quantities to Japan to aid them in their attempt to conquer China, but we should draw a lesson from our mistakes. The lesson is this: The Japanese cannot be trusted, they cannot be appeased. It is sad to think that the gasoline that drove the airplanes over Pearl Harbor came from our own wells. Our boys were killed by scrap iron which this country shipped to Japan to be shaped into instruments of death. We have shown great weakness and despicable greed. We were appeasers at the time of the *Panay* incident when we "lost face" in Asia. How bitterly we and our allies should regret those periods of cowardly appeasement of which each nation has been guilty.

## WAR WITH JAPAN INEVITABLE

We who have lived on the Pacific Coast and have intimately known the Japanese, several years ago arrived at the conclusion that war between the United States and Japan was inevitable. We realized that it could be delayed, but that it had to come eventually. Across the peaceful waters of the Pacific on a few islands there had developed an aggressive nation with ideals and principles directly opposite to the Anglo-Saxon. The decision as to which nation should predominate in the Pacific cannot now and never could be made by a compromise nor treaty. It can be decided only on the field of battle. One or the other of the systems must perish. The irresistible force had met the immovable object.

## JAPANESE WAR MACHINE NEVER DEFEATED

During the contest that lies ahead of us we must remember that the Japanese have never known defeat. They have always won wars. They came into the western world thoroughly trained to death and to war, and worshiping the sword. They are, in no sense, peace-loving and peace-seeking people. Thirty-eight years ago they seized Port Arthur from Russia, just the way they went into Pearl Harbor, and they kept it. Japan became involved in that war with Russia, striking without warning when negotiating for peace. They used the same deception at the outbreak of the World War when they seized, by fraud and deceit, the German-held Kiaochow in the Province of Shantung. At the Naval Conference in 1921, the Japanese deceived the conference in accepting the mandate of the islands of the Pacific with the understanding they would not fortify them. Today they have strong fortifications in these mandated islands. Eleven years ago, by invasion and treachery, the Japanese took the northern portion of China, seizing Manchuria and calling it Manchukuo. They were supposed to have established an independent state, but it is entirely Japanese, and there is no freedom. The Japanese conquered Korea and

made it a province, abusing and deceiving the Koreans. The entire Empire of Japan has been built on lies and deceit. Formidable, indeed, is that war machine. They are a fanatical people and will risk anything for the Rising Sun. We must achieve complete victory in the face of such legend and tradition.

## GUAM

Speaking of the mandated islands, brings to my mind the foolish and ignorant charge made in the campaign that I had voted against "the fortification of Guam" thereby causing death and disaster at Pearl Harbor. Many false and misleading statements have been made in regard to Guam. Guam is a small island, 30 by 6 miles, far out in the Pacific Ocean, 5,100 miles from San Francisco. It is as far from San Francisco as it is from Washington to Honolulu. It has a population of 22,000, 90 percent being natives. Guam is surrounded by islands, mandated to Japan after World War No. 1. There never was a bill before the Congress to fortify Guam. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House, said "I repeat again and again, there is nothing in this bill authorizing the fortification of Guam." It was an authorization for \$5,000,000 for improvements in the harbor at Guam. The vote stood 205 against the authorization and 168 for it. I voted against the dredging of the harbor, for it could have benefited only the Japanese and would have proven a death trap for our men.

## JAPAN'S CLAIM OF SUPERIORITY

A Japanese is taught from early childhood that the Emperor is of divine origin. The Japanese honestly and sincerely believe they are superior to all other people and that they are destined to rule the world. It is said the entire Japanese race believe they are also descendants of the divine. They are fatalists, with a suicidal tendency. Death on the battlefield means to them that they are immediately transported to glory, and they ask no kinder fate. Our American soldiers are not fighting ordinary men. They are fighting fanatics—organized bandits, highly trained savage killers who are skilled and scientific. From early childhood the Japanese are trained to become regimented warriors. The veneer of civilization is very thin, indeed, over the hide of a Japanese. He places loyalty to his government and the Emperor above all else. Patriotism is his religion. Christian missionaries claim Japan is one of the hardest fields in which to work. The Japanese are not actuated nor moved by the same sentiments which guide and motivate western nations.

## SOME JAPANESE CHARACTERISTICS

The Japanese believe it was perfectly right and justifiable to send envoys to Washington to negotiate for days and weeks while they were preparing and perfecting the attack on Pearl Harbor. They knew they were deceiving Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt. They were not seeking peace but they were seeking time to get more gasoline and

more scrap iron. The very day and very hour when bombs were dropping on our boys at Pearl Harbor, they were in the State Department as peace envoys.

Some years ago I was acting as attorney for a corporation in California which had many dealings with Japanese. I remember saying to a Japanese one day, "You made a contract to do certain things for this company. You have not kept your contract." He looked up at me and said, "I have arranged it so you can get no damages against me. A Japanese just make contract fool other fellow. Nothing wrong break contract if to advantage." I said, "Do you realize that Americans want to keep contracts and that it is a better way?" "Maybe so," he said, "but we are trained the other way. First thing we do is find out whether we have to pay damage. No damage, then break contract if advantage to do so." The Japanese never make treaties with intention of keeping them. In his smiling, suave, apparently humble way, the Japanese would cut your throat, or commit any dastardly crime while smiling and acting in the most servile manner. We must teach our people to understand these traits which are so foreign to those of our blood. We have dealt so little with the Japanese that we are inclined to underestimate them, to be totally deceived by appearances.

#### JAPANESE AIMS

The Congress should be guided by the experience of the Pacific coast people, when they make decisions on the Japanese. They will be found the toughest warriors, the bravest men, the most sacrificing army that our soldiers have ever met on the field of battle. The Japanese are inured to hardship and privation. They can live on half of what an American soldier must have. It will be extremely hard for Americans who have not come in contact with them to realize their strong power. We must remember that they aspire to complete and absolute domination of the Pacific. They have their plans carefully worked out embracing the domination of the mainland of Asia and the islands of the Pacific, including a billion people under Japanese hegemony.

The war with Japan, which will have to be finished when the Germans are conquered, is a war of aggression in which we were compelled to assume the defensive. This generation and this present Government is burdened with the greatest undertaking which has ever rested upon any nation. Our every action now reaches far into the future and determines the fate of peoples of every race on this earth.

The cities of Japan are said to be made of paper and boards and can easily be bombed and burned. It is sad to think that we, a Christian Nation, must apply the torch. George Eliot, in *Romola*, says:

The Moors drove mathematics into the brain of medieval Europe on the point of a Moorish lance.

So the democracies of the twentieth century must drive into the brain of the Axis Powers—Japan and Germany—on the point of a torpedo the knowledge that the masses of this earth have a right

to enjoy the four freedoms without let or hindrance from these bandit nations: Freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

In 1861, Stonewall Jackson said to his class:

If I ever draw my saber, I will throw the scabbard away.

It must be so with America in this war. The saber is already drawn. Our people must understand Japanese war aims and plans for the control of Asia.

#### JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA

We have known for years that the Japanese were very anxious to secure the fur-bearing islands of the North Pacific and the profitable fishing grounds in and around Alaska. They have edged in on every treaty, violated the terms with impunity and their promises have meant nothing. They sent their finest engineers into the Alaskan waters, disguised as fishermen, to draw maps and take soundings. They have the best maps and records of those strategic regions that are to be found anywhere. We have struggled with the questions of Japanese admission into our country, of picture brides, and of their right to own land. We have generally yielded and lost. We have been too lenient. We have long realized the menace of the Japanese in Hawaii, but we have foolishly refused to face the issue. It is because our own people have been unwilling to do what they have regarded as menial labor that they have yielded so much to these Japanese. We must learn to grow our own vegetables and to pick up potatoes for ourselves.

#### JAPANESE LAND OWNERSHIP IN OREGON

Nearly 30 years ago, when I was a member of the Oregon Senate, a Government official visited Oregon and asked the Oregon Legislature not to pass the laws, then under consideration, which excluded the Japanese from owning real estate in Oregon. I clearly recall, when, in executive session, he made his strong appeal, in the name of Christianity, that we should extend to the Japanese the hand of Christian fellowship and welcome them to our shores. We knew the men from across the seas far better than the Government knew them. We passed the land laws and then shrewd lawyers told the Japanese how they could get around them by buying the lands in the names of their children who were native-born Americans. The result has been that nearly half of Oregon's most beautiful and productive fruit valley is in Japanese hands. They are the onion and lettuce growers in another rich valley. They are the market gardeners for Portland. They farm some of our choicest irrigated lands. The rich returns flow to the Bank of Yokohama. Even now, with the Japanese evacuated, 35 percent of the income is credited to that bank, though held by the Alien Property Custodian. I am told that only three pieces of their fruit property have actually been sold. The others are leased. Where are the owners? They were temporarily held in evacuation camps, pending prepara-

tion of camps under the War Relocation Authority.

#### WAR RELOCATION CAMPS

One of these relocation camps is on the southern border of Oregon. I recently visited it. There are 15,000 Japanese settled on lands in a 20,000-acre reclamation project intended to benefit war veterans. Here a Japanese baby is born every day; they are multiplying at a frightful rate. Our Government is furnishing them schools with white teachers lured from positions in our own schools which pay less. I am told their young people are sent to Middle West colleges for higher education at the expense of this Nation whose youth is drafted to fight the Japanese nation.

The strong young Japanese in these centers are very reluctant to work to save the crops of local farmers. No one obliges them to work outside. They constitute a privileged class. I would not treat them harshly, but I would confine them to their camps or I would plan more adequately to use their labor. There are two reasons why we are bound to exercise care and judgment: First, the Geneva Convention binds us, as an honorable nation, to certain limitations in dealing with noncitizens; second, decency and fear of retaliation upon our 100,000 citizens in Japanese prison camps makes us cautious.

We now have a Japanese problem; we have long had a serious Japanese problem on the Pacific coast. We shall have a worse Japanese problem when this war ends.

#### OUR MISTAKES—ACTION NEEDED

We have been exceedingly kind to the Japanese who have come to our land. They have expressed their appreciation with bombs. We provided schools for their children and taxed ourselves to educate them. The Japanese children, after going to our schools, have attended Japanese school after hours and on Saturdays and Sundays. At the Japanese school they were taught the superiority of their race and the traditions of the Japanese people. Their false conception of history has been instilled into the youngsters. Even as Governor of the State of Oregon I did not fully realize the seriousness of the Japanese schools in Oregon. This war gives opportunity to cut them out, root and branch, and it must be done. Japanese who were well-to-do often sent their children, American citizens, to Japan for education.

Now is the time to announce that the Japanese must return to their native land and cannot live in any part of the United States after this war is over. Their rate of increase is nearly three times ours. If allowed to remain here, they will soon make a racial problem of tremendous proportions. They cannot be assimilated into our life. This Congress should now consider ways and means to get rid of the Japanese. Those who doubt the necessity for such action should look into the matter of dual citizenship.

#### DUAL CITIZENSHIP

The Japanese Empire contends that a child born of Japanese parents, regardless

of the place of birth, is a citizen of Japan. The United States has always acted on the theory that a child born in this country was, because native-born, an American citizen, even though its parents could not take out citizenship papers. Our courts held, some years ago, that the Mongolian could not through naturalization become a citizen of the United States. About 40 years ago the case of Wong Kim Ark, a Chinese boy, was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States. This boy was born in San Francisco, of Chinese parents. The young man went back to China and, after some years, returned to the United States and claimed citizenship. The Supreme Court held that, being born in the United States, although of Chinese parents, he was a citizen of the United States—One Hundred and Sixty-ninth United States Reports, page 649. There was a dissenting opinion written by Melville Fuller, Chief Justice, and concurred in by Justice Harlan. In that minority opinion, the justices claimed that a child born in this country of Mongolian parents, was himself barred from citizenship. If a Japanese child is taken to the consulate, and his parents make open declaration that they want the child to be an American citizen only, and they have evidence that the Japanese Government concurs in their wish, then the child is an American citizen.

Dual citizenship should at once be abolished and the child of parents who cannot become citizens should, in no case, be considered a citizen of the United States. A case carrying these points is now again on appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States and it is hoped that the minority opinion of Chief Justice Fuller and Associate Justice Harlan will, in this retrial, become the majority opinion of our Supreme Court.

#### FREE MEN

There has always been a striking force, an unconquerable spirit that gives strength and power to free men whenever they fight for home, fireside, and freedom. It was displayed at Thermopylae when a little band defeated an immense army. It was displayed at the Alamo when the prisoners preferred death to retreat and surrender. It was displayed at Bunker Hill, where men fought till they exhausted their powder, then used the butts of their muskets as clubs. It was displayed at Valley Forge. It was displayed at Trenton on Christmas Eve when men crossed the river with floating ice cracking against the boats. The same spirit was displayed at battles in the Coral Seas, at Midway Island, and the Solomon Islands. Men, under such circumstances, prefer death to surrender. Since Midway I have received a letter from an Oregon boy who was there with the marines. I quote from the letter of Lieutenant Bassett:

Here has been proven, beyond any measure of doubt, that the men of the Army, Navy, and Marines are made of the finest stuff ever stuffed inside a white skin. I've seen youngster officers go out there to meet the Japs knowing they were hopelessly outnumbered and facing a bad percentage in the gamble with death. I have seen the remnants of those boys come back for more ammunition

and go out again, knowing that they could not come back a second time. A lot of them went out that way, but not one tried to stay behind. They did an awful lot of dying in those two days, but they packed an awful lot of living into their last 48 hours. Since this has been the first test of a new generation of Americans in action, I know that it is as good or a better Army than the one preceding it by twenty-some years. The heathen Emperor of Japan has a rendezvous with defeat, and the date was made out here in the middle of the ocean in the past three days.

#### THIS IS NOT "A WAR AS USUAL"

When the First World War started, in 1914, Lloyd George, of England, said, "The side that can raise the last £100,000,000 in gold will win." That statement was probably true a quarter of a century ago, but it is not true today. The almost \$24,000,000,000 in gold that we have in our vaults, 80 percent of the monetary gold of the world, does not make us invincible. Experts tell us that it is not as valuable in this titanic struggle as an equal tonnage of strategic metals. Up to this time, the superdreadnought has been queen of the high seas. The nation that commanded the ocean has been, for centuries, the ruling nation of the world. Now the dive-bomber can send to the bottom of the seas the Arizona, the Prince of Wales, the Rescue, the Lexington, and the Yorktown. Today we crown the super flying fortress queen of the battlefield.

To mellow up the enemy by encouraging revolt at home through fifth columnists is as old as civilization, but in this war it has taken on new phases never before known. One must go far back into the misty past to find a parallel to the inhuman cruelty of murdering hostages. Think of the more than 1,500 innocent humans murdered for the timely death of the second man in command of the Gestapo! Where can students of history find a parallel to the murder of a quarter of a million hostages in Europe, the enslavement of France, the murder of Poland? Indeed, this is not a war as usual. The old type of war is as out-moded as is the armored feudal warrior and the horse, that for 20 centuries carried the armed warrior from the snow-swept steppes of Russia to the shifting sands of the Pyramids. Hospitals, plainly marked with the red cross, are now points of attack. We must meet this ruthlessness with skill and war machines. Can people of our blood really wage war?

#### WE SHALL NOT LOSE THE WAR

We are not going to lose this war with the Axis Powers. We have been and still are a peace-loving nation. We are the most highly industrialized country the world has ever known, devoted to the arts of peace and commerce. Our industries, prior to December 7, 1941, were making quantities of motorcars, trucks, tractors, radios, bathtubs, and all the devices that go to make modern life comfortable. It was a world on wheels, traveling thousands of miles over perfect roads. We were in the main, happy and contented.

A few of us have been called crepe hangers because we were much disturbed over the unchecked Italian conquest of

Ethiopia and our part in the cruel crucifixion of the liberal government of Spain. When Adolf Hitler gave the German people their new Bible, *Mein Kampf*, making it a textbook for schools, teaching the doctrines of deceit, falsehood, and cruelty, then the crepe hangers became thoroughly alarmed. We urged that our own country at once be put in the very best possible shape for military defense. The deep, dark clouds of war hung low on the horizon, but they were plainly visible, long before Munich, to those who would honestly look and see.

You who would criticize should not forget that it is a gigantic task to take 134,000,000 peace-loving people, imbued with the spirit and the gospel of love and kindness, and teach them overnight to wage war which, in reality, is wholesale murder. It is some task to imbue such a people as the Americans with the spirit necessary to meet these killer nations on the battlefields.

We have accomplished some things. Five million boys have gone from homes that they loved. We have put them in uniforms and taught them the modern methods of killing other boys. We have taken the finest factories the world has ever known, retooled them, and over the assembly lines today are coming instruments of death—airplanes, guns, bombs, and those things necessary on battlefields. They are coming in quantities. From our assembly lines are rolling out the finest airplanes the world has ever seen, planes equipped to fight in altitudes 7 to 8 miles above the earth. We have not only equaled, but have excelled the enemy in the production of these munitions and instruments of conquest. We are making progress. Three new vessels go into the waters every day to be added to our fleet. There is no visible sentiment in this country that we are going to quit. We know that we must literally crush Japan and we will do it. We must transmute that shining golden hoard now buried in the depths of the earth, in the vaults of Kentucky, into the flying fortresses that will sweep the air free of our foes.

#### OUR DUTY

Everything that we have and everything we hope to be, we must offer on the altar of our freedom. The time has come when the Pacific Ocean cannot continue to be totalitarian on one shore and democratic on the other. The United States of America, the most perfect achievement of all the ages, is, indeed, the last great hope of earth. We must not, in the words of Lincoln, "meanly lose, whatever the sacrifice and whatever the cost." The United States of America, with all its faults, with all its shortcomings, is the best government the world has ever known and it must not succumb to the barbarian hordes who seek to turn back the wheels of civilization for a full thousand years.

It is the duty of everyone, whether in the Congress or out of it, to contribute his all in money, skill, ingenuity, and service to our great cause. Members of the Congress should now refrain from criticizing colleagues for their isolationist stand before Pearl Harbor; for, since that great massacre, such voices have

been stilled. Pearl Harbor united the Congress and united the American people. One of our greatest dangers today is that the press exaggerates the differences that arise over the trifles, thus causing the people to underrate the Congress and lose confidence in their Government. That is the lesson taught this Nation on November 3. We must pray that petty prejudices shall not overshadow great issues. Instead of criticizing each other, we should be throwing our full force against our real enemies. The bitter animosity developed over parity is to be regretted, because the administration needs the full fighting force of every farmer to raise food and fibers. Entirely unfair and very harmful is the feeling against the so-called farm bloc, which has been worked up by newspapers, radio commentators, and critics.

I will admit I am a bit jealous of those young men now just coming onto the stage of action, who will take their places in the greatest struggle for freedom ever waged since humankind came out of the caves, with men on fighting lines in every country on the globe. Some are using modern implements of warfare which climb high into the air, and others ride far beneath the waves. It is certainly a spectacular and stirring time in which to live and play one's part in the affairs of men.

#### THE DESIRE TO SERVE

Like every red-blooded American, I asked myself this question, "Where can I best serve my country in this hour of our greatest danger?" I again became a candidate for Congress. I have been placed among the defeated. I shall attempt to give my service elsewhere. I am extremely thankful that I have been given life during the last fourscore years—a marvelous period of world history. I have been a part and parcel of the development in my native country and in the State of my adoption. When told of my defeat, I reminded my friends that for 30 of my 60 years in Oregon its people had honored me by giving me public office. Perhaps I was actuated by the spirit of the old English lady who had also passed an eightieth birthday. As the German bombers were sighted she and her husband took to the nearest shelter. When the raid was over they returned to their ruined home. Everything they had possessed was destroyed. The old husband turned to his wife and said, "Mary, let's get a room, turn on the gas, and it will all be over for us in a few minutes." Mary turned to her husband, doubled up her fist, and said, "And let 'tler win?" I agree with Mary. I want to do everything I can do to keep Hitler from winning in this titanic struggle for the existence of our Nation and our civilization. That desire spurred me on to stay in the Congress where I thought I could best serve my country because of my long experience and my close association with those who are guiding our destiny. Like the mellow old philosopher, I shall "cooperate with the inevitable," spending my remaining days in efforts to be helpful in any way and place where my services are acceptable. In gratitude for

what life has given me, I desire to serve. With the poet, I say:

You have set me among those who are defeated.

I know it is not for me to win, nor to leave the game.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, Washington, the headquarters of the United Nations, is now the world's most important city. Its antiquated municipal organization is one of the least efficient in the United States.

This country is fighting a world war to maintain our democratic principles of government. Our National Capital contains hundreds of thousands of residents with no vote whatever on local or national affairs.

One of these facts affronts our intelligence, the other challenges our sincerity. Both of them can be, and should be, eliminated by prompt congressional action.

If any one of us were given the responsibility of writing a charter for a large American city, there are three basic elements which would undoubtedly be included.

First. A centralized and thoroughly coordinated executive branch, with full powers to protect the lives, health, and property of the people.

Second. A legislative body, composed of community residents, meeting frequently to regulate the city's affairs.

Third. An electorate of legal residents empowered to choose their local officials. Not one of these elements exists today in the city of Washington.

Considering first the executive branch of Washington's government, we find a situation of startling confusion and admitted inefficiency. The "charter" of Washington, originally enacted in 1878, has never been revised or modernized by thorough and systematic methods. New and conflicting agencies have been created by patchwork and unscientific legislation. Many powers absolutely essential under modern conditions have not been authorized. As was stated in the Griffenhagen report to Congress in 1939:

The existing organization has been built around an act adopted over 60 years ago and has obviously grown without plan or system; it is now unbelievably complex, confused, illogical, and cumbersome.

In spite of a general agreement that existing conditions are thoroughly unsatisfactory, Washington's municipal structure remains inefficient, and there are no pending plans for reorganization. The citizens are without power and without even an official representative to urge reforms. Congress, burdened by its many other responsibilities, has not taken the time to give the Nation's Capital a form of government which would compare with other great American cities.

Since Washington has had no legislative body of its own since 1874, Congress is not only the source of all basic legislation regarding the District of Columbia, but must also act as a city council. Minor local problems, which would receive immediate legislative attention in other communities, must be passed upon by 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, acting under the same formal and deliberate procedure which is properly applied to questions of great national importance. Such decisions must now be reached without the assistance of even one elected representative of the 800,000 people whose affairs are involved. This procedure is inevitably slow, unscientific, and inadequate. It satisfies neither Congress nor the District.

The third intolerable factor in Washington's civic affairs is the complete disfranchisement of its citizens. In the remote past, there may have been some justification of this, since a large percentage of the population were transients, with no intention of remaining permanently. Today a great majority of the city's residents have severed all connection with former residences, or are lifelong residents of the District. Withholding of voting rights is an unjustifiable violation of fundamental American principles. It also insures poor government for Washington by eliminating from political activity the people most familiar with local conditions.

Some weeks ago I introduced H. R. 7339, a bill providing for an elected Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House. According to my information, this is the first bill of its kind for more than 20 years, although there have been several proposals for constitutional amendments giving greater rights to the people of Washington.

I sent copies of H. R. 7339 to more than a thousand Washington residents including the officers of leading civic and business organizations. I received a large number of replies, nearly all of which were favorable to the proposal. While my bill will not be considered by the House during the present session, a similar measure will be introduced after the first of the year, sponsored by a large committee of representative and influential Washington men and women.

There is no doubt that a capable and well-qualified Delegate elected by the votes of the people of Washington would be of the greatest assistance in preparing and considering the large amount of District legislation which comes before us. Such a Delegate would render the same important services which are now performed by Mr. DIMOND, of Alaska, and Mr. KING, of Hawaii, who so ably represent their respective Territories. He would be a most valuable member of our District of Columbia Committee, whose present membership has to consider District matters without the help of a single committee member living amid the problems which require legislation. When we consider the growing importance of Washington's civic affairs, and their increasing complexity, we must realize the difficulty of dealing with them under our

present methods. There are many legislative situations calling for immediate action which cannot be satisfactorily handled because of the delay in obtaining sufficient information and in properly transforming it into adequate legislation.

We all know that our own home districts are constantly presenting problems which can only be solved by our personal attention, based on first-hand knowledge of the facts in question. Surely the District of Columbia, whose affairs are no longer local, but now national and international in effect, deserves the representation which only can be given by the full-time attention of an elected Delegate.

A few questions and answers may be useful as a summary.

Question. Why is Washington's present government necessarily inefficient?

Answer. Because it contains more than 60 uncoordinated agencies, with conflicting powers, and without authority to solve many urgent municipal problems.

Question. What changes can take place by congressional action without a constitutional amendment?

Answer. Congress can authorize an elected Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, and can reorganize the District government, granting the right to vote for local officials and on local questions.

Question. Would an elected Delegate in the House assist in giving Washington people a more efficient local government and the right to vote in national elections?

Answer. The presence in Congress of a well-qualified, aggressive spokesman for the people of Washington would certainly promote their just requests regarding both local and national affairs.

Question. What present objections to full franchise for Washington residents would be disposed of by the election of a qualified Delegate?

Answer. Such an election would demonstrate the number of voters in Washington and the type of candidates which they would elect to office.

In conclusion, may I emphasize my certainty that Congress urgently needs the assistance of an elected Delegate from the District of Columbia. At present, it is a practical impossibility for us to act as national legislators, representatives of our home districts, and efficient city councilmen of Washington. Many of us have to delegate our Washington responsibility to our able but overworked colleagues on the District Committee. This is manifestly unfair to them, and inevitably results in delay or inadequate action on Washington matters. Our Territorial Delegates are among the most useful members of the House, and a District Delegate would be of equal value to his colleagues.

A District Delegate bill will come before the Seventy-eighth Congress with the sponsorship of the people of Washington, evidenced by a large committee of representative men and women. I hope it will receive favorable considera-

tion. If it passes, Congress will then be in a better position to act promptly and wisely on the important affairs of our Nation's Capital City. Its enactment will remove the stigma of total disfranchisement from the citizens of a great city of free Americans. Washington will be back in the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THE 1942 ELECTION IN MISSOURI

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, because thousands of central Missouri voters, especially in "Little Dixie," failed to go to the polls, I soon shall be going home. When I go back to the places, the things, and the people I love, it will be as a rich man, one rich not in money but in memories. To spend 18 years in this House, to have been associated with the men and women who make up its matchless membership, is a privilege. I say "matchless" and I mean it. In ability, in honesty, in sincerity of purpose, and in high patriotism the House of Representatives stands superior. Often attacked, maligned, and misunderstood, the legislative branch, the people's branch, of our Government, has stood through every storm. This is as it must be if freedom is to survive.

November 3 marked the open season for shooting at Congress rather than at individual Congressmen. As a result of constant criticism from many, including commentators, columnists, and cartoonists, the public naturally turned upon the membership as a whole rather than take time to learn of the work, good or bad, of individual Senators or Representatives. In many places the people went to the polls not to record their preferences but to register their peevishness. Those who were displeased naturally held the party in power responsible, so Democratic losses were heaviest.

It is my purpose to discuss the Missouri situation, but because Missouri is a central State, having much in common with many others, I first refer to the general situation.

We are at war. People are never pleased with the conduct of any war until it has been won. The present is no exception to this rule. In the days immediately preceding the election the war news was the worst. Had the story of great battles won been told in time, the result in many a congressional district might have been different. As it was, the people were discouraged and many felt that we were actually losing the war. The story of the sinking of the *Wasp*, withheld for weeks, was released just before election. As if this were not enough, the House was forced to vote on the teenage draft bill, which measure alone meant a heavy loss of votes to many Democratic members. If a studied effort had been made to put Congress on the spot, it could not have been more effective.

The President's Labor Day speech had served to fan into flames the smoldering fires of dissatisfaction felt by many farm-

ers. Working long hours, threatening no strikes, and receiving small returns as compared with highly paid workers in industrial plants, they felt that a decided injustice was being done them. Urged to produce food to win the war, they wondered how they could get the job done as sons were inducted into the service and as hired help went to work in defense industries at prices far beyond what any farmer could afford to pay. These conditions, together with orders limiting farm machinery, simply did not make sense. It mattered little if the Congressmen had protested these things, just as I did. Many farmers, displeased with conditions, sought the only means of showing their displeasure.

If Leon Henderson, Harry Hopkins, Secretary Perkins, and others as little liked, had been candidates, the voters might have been satisfied to take a few direct shots and stop. But in Missouri, as in some other States, with no Senator to elect, the only Federal place to be filled was that of Representative in Congress, so this candidate got every shot directed at the administration.

Among farmers there is a feeling that certain labor leaders, who profess to speak for labor but who do not, in fact, represent the rank and file of labor—and that rank and file is absolutely loyal—should long ago have been "given the gate" instead of the key to the White House door.

Many employed in defense industries and at high wages resent the fact that in order to work they first were compelled to pay for the privilege, and frequently these fees were excessive. With a real he-man as Secretary of Labor much trouble might have been avoided. Despite misdirection and difficulties, let it be said to the credit of labor, and I am not condoning jurisdictional strikes and other stoppages, there has been no time when less than 99 percent of labor was at work. Capital, too often guilty of no-start strikes and of exorbitant profits, can show nothing better.

With a Nation at war every real American is willing to make all necessary sacrifices. All that he asks is to know that they are necessary. The necessity for many regulations has not been explained and too often orders have been conflicting and confusing. As the child told to "do" or "do not" asks "why," so does the grownup. More clarity and less confusion would have meant less complaint. An administrator does not have to be offensive in order to be effective. Cussing and threatened coercion do not assure cooperation.

Undoubtedly, orders rationing sugar, tires and gasoline, with talk of more stringent regulations to follow, had their effect in the recent election. Constant changes and lack of explanation irritated. Others willing to comply asked "why". Why, for instance, in States having ample supply of oil, should the residents be asked to use coal? Other examples might be cited.

Expressions of displeasure, as recorded at the polls or as indicated by those who

failed to vote, is not directed at President Roosevelt but at administration officials and the thousands of others who proceed with programs which, at best, must be unpopular.

Busy as he is with the conduct of the war, and I believe he is the best man in all the world to get the job done, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy does not have time to look after every detail. He is, though, blamed for every bit of arrogance, every show of inefficiency on the part of those who under his administration deal directly with the public. It is unfortunate that this fact is not fully realized.

Businessmen, many of whom were saved from utter ruin in the early part of the Roosevelt administration, forget all this and bitterly complain because of the treatment received at the hands of some young and inexperienced Labor Board attorney or at having to fill out seemingly endless forms. Surely corrections are due here. The larger service, though, should not be forgotten. Apparently, one fails to remember the boulder taken out of his road while conscious of the grain of sand in his shoe. It should not be so.

As one devoting his life to the cause of agriculture and battling in this Congress, as in all others in which I have served, for a square deal for the farmer, including the costs of labor in fixing parity, I would contrast farm conditions now with those at the close of the Hoover administration. At that time a pound of live pork would not buy a postage stamp. Corn sold at 15 cents a bushel and wheat at but little more. Everywhere farmers were going broke. Banks were closing. There was wreck and ruin. Before protesting too much, it is well that we recall these things.

Speaking of banks closing, if President Roosevelt had done no more than, during the first days of his administration, saved the financial structure of the United States, he would have done enough to be remembered forever.

I feel, as I believe you do, that right now, with millions of our men in arms, many of them fighting on far-flung battle fronts, all frills, furbelows and fancies should be "gone with the wind." We can well afford to forget about the saving of social gains while first saving America.

Here I want to make it perfectly plain that despite any mistakes President Franklin D. Roosevelt may have made in selection of men or in his peacetime policies, when we have won the war under his leadership, as we will, he will rank with the greatest of all Presidents.

Mr. Speaker, before I close I must talk a little about Missouri. Here five experienced Democratic House Members were succeeded by Republicans, this "mortality" being equaled only by Connecticut, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, and exceeded only by Ohio, where eight Democratic Representatives were defeated. Why was this?

First, Missouri is one of few States requiring civilian voters to be in the State on election day in order to be permitted to vote. With so many employed in out-State defense industries or holding Gov-

ernment positions, this alone meant a heavy loss. Workers were unable or unwilling to lose time and money to make a trip home under present travel conditions.

Second, Missouri, for the first time, had an absolutely secret ballot. So every voter, whether displeased with rationing, taxation, or the draft, or actually pro-German at heart, was afforded an opportunity to express it in silence, but feeling some satisfaction in getting it out of his system, even though ashamed.

Another influence felt in Missouri went back to 1940 and the election of a Governor. A slur and smear campaign was conducted against the Democratic candidate, who, because he resembled in physical make-up a discredited political boss, was portrayed as the advocate of all that is evil, while the Republican candidate, somewhat like Lincoln in appearance, was proclaimed as the personification of purity. Truth is that both are good men. After the election an unsuccessful and unwarranted contest, later abandoned, was started against the successful Republican candidate. In the recent election, while there was much publicity about the "attempted governorship steal" on the part of Democrats, no reference was made to the character of the 1940 campaign conducted by Republicans.

The things I have mentioned are comparatively minor. The biggest influence of all having to do with Democratic losses in Missouri was overconfidence, coupled with apathy and indifference. Certainly this is true of the district I represent. In my mind, there is no doubt but that I would have been returned by a good majority had I been thought in danger of defeat. As late as Sunday preceding the election the city press—and Missouri lacks a militant Democratic metropolitan daily press—did not question my election. It was generally conceded. The election of the young man who is to succeed me, and for whom I ask your cooperation, came as a complete surprise even to Republican leaders.

But I am soon to go. I shall go not in discouragement but with the satisfaction that I have given to my constituents my best, and happy in the thought that again I shall be a free man at home, the best place in all the world.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this body is the finest body in the world when it comes to taking the measure of men. If I were on trial for my life, I would gladly take my chances with this group as a whole or with those who sit on either side of the aisle.

Yes; I am going back home, happy in the thought that I shall be with those I love, that I shall be able to play with my dogs, look over my Shorthorn cattle on the old home farm and spend my days in peace and quiet; but always in my heart there will be a warm place for the fine membership of this great House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Permit me to state that I have listened with a great deal of interest to the timely and

informative address delivered today by the gentleman from Missouri. What the gentleman has to say is always enlightening and constructive. I just want to add that during my several terms in Congress my activities and work have been closely associated with the gentleman from Missouri and I am sure he knows that I am sincere when I say that for many years I have had a very deep and abiding affection for him. In fact, he was one of the first Members of Congress I met when I came to Washington. I believe the gentleman was starting on his second term then. I have seen him promoted during these years from a position on some of the minor committees reserved for new Members, to the great and powerful Rules Committee where he has for several years been one of the active recognized leaders of the Congress. His recent defeat by a few hundred votes was not only unfortunate for the district that he so ably represents in Congress from the great Commonwealth of Missouri, but is a real loss to the Nation. No new Member, irrespective of his ability, could possibly render as valuable service to the district, State, and Nation. I feel confident I speak the sentiment of every Member of this Congress when I say that no Member is held in higher esteem by his colleagues here with whom he comes in contact daily than is the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is now addressing this body.

Mr. NELSON. I am grateful for those words.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. During my period of service here I have never known a Member who enjoyed a greater degree of confidence, respect, and affection of all the Members of the House than the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. May I say "Amen" to the tributes which have been paid by the gentlemen from Oklahoma and Tennessee. I believe honestly that they voice the sentiment of the membership of this House on both sides in singular unanimity.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very embarrassed by these words, but I am very deeply appreciative of them.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to my colleague from Missouri, and I want to say that I have had occasion within recent years to work rather closely with my friend who has just spoken. I have appeared before the Rules Committee, of which he is a member, and I have engaged with him there and on the floor of this House in the discussion of much important legislation. He has always approached these problems with sincerity and great earnestness. In at-

tempts at solution of them I have noticed that he has approached them from the viewpoint of the best interest of his district and of the Nation. His record stands as a mute monument to his unflagging zeal and unfailing attention to his work.

Over the period of the years my friend from Missouri has made many fine friendships which he leaves behind in the House of Representatives. We shall not forget him; and as he returns home and pursues the avocation for which he has expressed such an ardent desire we who remain wish him all kinds of pleasure and happiness back there in the hills of his grand State and among his family and his friends.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was here a short time before the gentleman, but I have served with him for many years. There is no Member with whom I have served for whom I have had a more kindly feeling or greater respect than I have for the gentleman from Missouri. I know that he will carry back to Missouri with him the regards, affection and esteem of those on both sides of the aisle of this great body.

Mr. NELSON. I am most appreciative of those kind words, more especially so coming from my long-time friend from Kentucky. The fact that the center aisle divides us makes no difference when it comes to real friendship.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Just a word, in addition to what has been said. My acquaintance with the gentleman from Missouri commenced in this House. I have been highly pleased at the interest he has taken in public affairs and the work he has done. It is to be regretted that when these great waves of public sentiment set in all over the country they remove very often from public life some of the real men who should be left in office. It seems when that comes the people do not want to be convinced. They get just a little impression and they go off in a tidal wave. I am among the fallen myself, but I deeply regret that the same fate befell the brilliant Congressman from Missouri.

Mr. NELSON. I appreciate those words, and may I say to the gentleman from Oregon that I wish he might have stayed and I might have gone.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, the 27th of November, I may be recognized for 30 minutes after the business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders have been disposed of to speak on reminiscences of past elections.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### PAY-AS-YOU-EARN INCOME TAXES

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, March 15, 1943, will be a day of confusion which may well develop into demoralization. This is the day on which payments will be due under the 1942 tax bill. Of course, payments can be made prior to that date, but it is not likely many people will take advantage of the privilege.

In the enactment of the bill Congress proceeded with the single purpose of raising revenue. Little if any thought was given to the resulting hardships to the taxpayer, the fact that all Federal taxes must be pyramided upon local taxes, and the desirability of facilitating payment by some plan to ease the burden.

We have increased the number of taxpayers, we have added new taxes, and we have increased rates. By various sorts of exemptions, credits, and deductions we have complicated the procedure by which tax liability is to be arrived at, but we have made no changes in the obsolete method of assessment and collection. Such changes are necessary to ease the burden for the taxpayer and to avoid losses of revenue which are bound to result from antiquated methods.

Personal income taxes should be paid out of current earnings or according to some pay-as-you-earn plan.

To meet this situation the following suggestions, which are contained in bills I have introduced in the House, are offered:

First. Personal income taxes should be payable in monthly installments, the first installment to be paid on or before the 10th day of February.

Second. The base for fixing the amount of the tax should be changed so that the taxes would be determined on the anticipated income for the current year rather than upon the income of the previous year, as under existing law.

Third. Persons subject to the tax should file at the beginning of the year a tentative return of anticipated income for the current year, accompanied by payment of one-twelfth of the amount shown to be due, and continue such partial payments monthly. At the time of final payment a definitive return of income actually received would be filed, accompanied by payment of the balance, adjusted to the whole amount due for the entire year.

Fourth. Collection of personal income taxes should be decentralized. In the more populous centers where field agents of the Department are now located, a cashier could be designated. In less populated districts the postmaster could make collections with the facilities he now has as manager of the Postal Savings System. This would replace the present practice of many taxpayers of purchasing postal money orders with which to make payment of income taxes.

Fifth. Compulsory payment by the employer deducting taxes from employees' pay envelopes should be avoided. Such

a practice reflects no credit on our boast of the success of democracy. A local government agent with information of factory pay rolls at his disposal can accomplish the same purpose and preserve to the taxpayer his inalienable rights of citizenship to participate in governmental affairs.

Sixth. It may appear that this program will require payment of 2 years' taxes in one. Mr. Beardsley Ruml has suggested the cancelation of the taxes for the previous year. It has been made to appear that this suggestion would result in a loss of 1 year's taxes to the Treasury with a resulting windfall to the taxpayer.

I have suggested that the previous year's taxes be deferred payable at the convenience of the taxpayer or subject to regulations promulgated by the Treasury Department, meanwhile to remain a lien on the estate of the taxpayer, any balance to be collectible with inheritance taxes.

After all, there is justification for the argument that the taxes we pay really apply to the current year, and that the income of the previous year enters into the program only as the base or measure for the determination of the tax. If that argument can be sustained, it disposes of any need for concern over any supposed unpaid income taxes.

The language of the act, which is the Tariff Act of 1913, under which income taxes originated, is as follows:

There shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid annually upon the entire net income arising or accruing from all sources in the preceding calendar year, to every citizen of the United States whether residing at home or abroad, etc., \* \* \* and a like tax shall be assessed, levied, collected, and paid annually upon the entire net income of all property owned of every business, trade, or profession carried on in the United States by persons residing therein.

It will be noted that the act does not specify to what year the tax shall apply. It merely says that it shall be collected and paid annually, and it would seem that what Congress had in mind was that such annual tax should apply to the year in which it was paid and that the income of the previous year was simply the measure or the base by which the amount of the tax should be determined. The first payments under this act were made in 1914. They were taxes collected for the year 1914, and, by the construction of the act which I have suggested, were taxes which should be applied to that year, and the income for 1913 was fixed merely as the base or the measure by which 1914 taxes should be determined; consequently, under present law we will pay our 1943 taxes, measured by the income received in 1942. The change which I have suggested would base our 1943 taxes on an estimate of anticipated income for the current year, with an adjustment at the end of the year to income actually received, rather than upon the actual income received in the preceding year. Such change in procedure will, in no way, affect the Government's income. Everybody will pay income taxes in 1943, as they did in 1942 and as they will in

1944. Even a hypothetical cancelation of the taxes for a preceding year will not be too much of a price to be paid for the benefits resulting to the Federal Government and the convenience to the taxpayers in permitting them to get on a current basis and pay their taxes in monthly installments.

Our Government is now, as a part of its anti-inflation program, discouraging the practice of installment purchases. By continuing the antiquated and obsolete method of collection of income taxes, it does not set a good example.

I have said that no change in the method of the collection of taxes has been made since 1913. This is not quite true, because we have adopted the use of tax-anticipation notes, upon which the Government pays interest, which the taxpayer can buy for use in the payment of taxes, and also we have added to our tax system the compulsory payment of what is known as the Victory income tax. The Victory income tax is made payable out of 1943 incomes, so that on the theory that we pay in the current year taxes for the previous year, we now have two income taxes. We have an income tax on the theory that we are paying for the 1942 income, the first payment of which shall be made on the 15th of March 1943, and we have a Victory tax which is payable out of 1943 income, and which is to be deducted by the employers from the earnings of all employees, the payment of which will begin on January 1. So that instead of facilitating the collection of taxes and simplifying our system, we have added confusion, and instead of easing the burden to make collection of taxes easier, we have made it more difficult, and consequently built up a greater resistance to tax payments. By adopting the system that I have suggested, the practice of issuing tax-anticipation notes and all of the expense incident thereto can be eliminated. As it is now, our present income taxes will amount to \$10,000,000,000 annually. Five billion dollars is to be added by the new bill.

The first collection, except for the Victory tax, will be made on the 15th of March, when we will get one-fourth and so on quarterly through the year. Under my plan we would collect one-twelfth of this \$10,000,000,000 on the first of February, and one-twelfth of it monthly thereafter. The advantages to the Government are obvious as are the advantages to the taxpayer in making monthly installment payments out of current income.

The program which I have suggested of anticipating taxes follows the New Jersey system for the payment of real estate taxes. We had a system somewhat comparable to that which now exists in the Federal Treasury. Real estate taxes were not payable until December of the taxable year. In the meanwhile a municipality would borrow money in anticipation of the collection of its taxes. This was an added burden to the municipality and a worry to the taxpayer to raise his entire tax at the end of the year. Under the present system the taxpayer is sent a bill in the month of January for the first half of his taxes

for the current year. The bill is based on the taxes of the previous year. His first payment is made in February, his second in May. In the meantime the budget is arranged, the tax rate is fixed, and a corrected bill based upon the budget estimate for the current year is sent to the taxpayer, and the taxes are paid for the last half of the year on the adjusted or corrected basis in the months of August and November. Thus the municipality has the use of the money when it is needed; the taxpayer has the convenience of paying in installment payments out of his current income. The system has worked out to the complete satisfaction of everyone.

There should be no difficulty in the taxpayer being able to approximate his income for the current year and making payment upon that basis. If any contingency arises which would increase or decrease the taxes, adjustment can be made during the year by the filing of amended returns. The privilege of making adjustments at the end of the year to the amount actually received will obviate the necessity of making claims for refund, and will eliminate the bother incident thereto, to the advantage of the Government as well as the taxpayer.

In any system of taxation we must anticipate the cost of collection. In the plan I have outlined I am satisfied that the entire collection under this plan can be made without adding any employees to the Government pay roll. We already have an army of field agents throughout the country, any one of whom is capable of acting as cashier, and could be designated as such, and we have the Federal buildings where they can house themselves to make these collections. As a matter of fact, many taxpayers now use the post offices. I have personal knowledge that at the Elizabeth, N. J., post office at the last income-tax collection period there were upward of a thousand money orders sold. Ordinarily the number of money orders sold at that post office on those days is 200. It was well known that taxpayers were purchasing these money orders for the purpose of making payment of their income taxes.

When it is realized that all these Federal taxes must be pyramided upon what our citizens have to pay for local taxes, it is not difficult to visualize the hardship that is going to result. I refer particularly to that large class of people who are on salary, familiarly known as the white-collar man, whose income has not increased under present conditions and ordinarily remains stable. They try to maintain a respectable habit of life. Their principal object is to own their own homes. They are purchased with purchase money mortgages. In addition to interest and local taxes, they have insurance premiums to pay, and they have demands upon them for the education of their children; they must live according to a fixed station in life, sometimes bordering at a point above their ability to pay. They are people, in most instances, who are educated and whose children are entitled to have college educations. We all know the ex-

pense of a college education and the burden it is upon the salaried people in the metropolitan areas of our country.

So my appeal to the Congress is to change the method of payment so that this vast army of people may have the benefit of installment payments and live on their income and pay as they go as they try to do, by budgeting their accounts. By this method that I have suggested you will also reach the new taxpayer who has given the Congress so much concern—those people not heretofore taxable who are making very large incomes under present abnormal conditions. The machinery which I have provided will enable the local tax collectors to reach all of those who are making enhanced incomes and who we fear are not going to be definitely settled in any particular place. The local tax collector, aided by the pay rolls from neighboring factories, will be able to determine who is liable to pay taxes, and if the tax is not paid at the end of the month can, by existing machinery, levy upon the income for the next month. One or two experiences of that kind will teach any man what his duty is to his government and he will pay future installments regularly.

The only resistance that there can be to any plan for the payment of income taxes currently is this fear of bringing about the payment of 2 years' taxes in one, or giving the large taxpayer a windfall. As I have said, there are means whereby that can be deferred and made a lien upon the estate, but the more I study it and the more I think about it the more I am convinced there can be no windfall, or that there can be any concession to any taxpayer, because the taxes now paid are the taxes for the current year, and the previous year only enters into it as a measure or base for the amount to be paid.

This matter is entitled to very serious thought and prompt attention. Our time is short, and we ought to reconstruct our method of collecting income taxes before the 15th of March when the new law goes into effect. In fact, we should have it arranged so that on the 1st of February when a man knows what his income is going to be as a result of the experience had in the month of January, some such improved system such as I have suggested can become effective.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I have listened very carefully to the gentleman and I have enjoyed his remarks. The gentleman seems to object to the fact of salary reduction or tax deduction on the theory that it would violate the dignity of the worker by taking it out of his pay roll and not trusting him.

Mr. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. But does not the gentleman think that unless we do something of that sort, mindful of your suggestion about calling upon him a month later to show that he paid it or by filing some statement, that the very

man you are trying to reach will have disappeared and the tax will have gone with him?

I agree with the gentleman. I am very much opposed to the employer's deducting that money, because, the first thing you know the employee will presume that he is not getting his full salary and the employer will be put in the position of having taken it away from him. In spite of that, however, the situation is so urgent that we may have to adopt this emergency plan even though our pride be hurt and our dignity somewhat trampled, but a great deal of good will be accomplished.

Mr. McLEAN. I feel that when we speak about the gentleman who is going to vamoose and do his Government out of the tax we are speaking about a very, very small minority of loyal American citizens. We cannot reach perfection; there are always going to be defects in every system, but as I know the American workman in my neighborhood, and as I know the average American citizen, the losses resulting by reason of an employee's running away from his obligation, getting out of the community with his wages without payment of taxes will be very small and, besides, in course of time you are bound to catch up with him, and do we not have the social security and unemployment taxes whereby he can be reached?

I fear this compulsion in our American life. The gentleman remembers the coal strike of 1904 when Theodore Roosevelt was President. What brought about that strike was the fact the mine workers in Pennsylvania were compelled to buy all their supplies from the company store. They never saw a dollar of their money; all they got was a receipt. As a result of the resentment that caused that strike the company store ceased to exist. At the present time we deduct from the pay roll of these men their social-security taxes. In many cases they have group insurance and we deduct the premium for that from their salaries. In many places they all subscribe to community-welfare funds and their subscriptions are deducted.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. And War bonds also.

Mr. McLEAN. And at the present time we have a system for the purchase of War bonds, payments for which are deducted from the pay roll. In some places there is also deducted hospitalization, and I am informed there are many factories where union dues are also taken out of the pay envelopes and turned over to the union leaders. How far are we going in pyramiding the deductions taken out of the pay envelope of the American worker? Does it not make the gentleman think of things that have happened in other countries?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I, like the gentleman, of course, am very much opposed to it, but we are going to introduce to the paying of taxes hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of people who never paid before because of the exemptions. They will have to be brought into the fold; they will have to be acclimated to making out returns and paying. It is a difficult thing. People

do not rush in and pay. The gentleman knows this from the way the average person pays his normal bills. I have a high regard, as does the gentleman from New Jersey, for the average worker, but we are in no place to think too minutely of overrefinement. The men are employed for a day or 2 days at a time and work by numbers instead of by name. There is a tremendous turn-over of such labor, and large sums of money are involved in such pay rolls; so in my opinion, regardless of the merit of it, or lack of merit, it will be the only sure way we can adopt whereby this tax will be collected.

Mr. McLEAN. Another thought that comes to my mind is the desire of having the average citizen tax minded, and the best way to educate the average individual in citizenship is through the payment of taxes. Deprive him of this privilege and you deny the country the benefit of the education resulting and the interest which an individual making tax payments takes in governmental affairs. A higher value is placed on his citizenship by the individual who exercises the privilege of making payments for himself out of his own earnings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN WAR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House a companion bill to S. 2896 which extends the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to American war correspondents. I am doing this because in my opinion this group of men are performing a most unusual and necessary service. Day by day we read accounts of our Army, our Navy, and our Marine Corps. These accounts come to us practically from the field of battle. It is possible for us to obtain this information because of the thousands of loyal men and women who are serving as war correspondents. It is purely a volunteer service, but once they are accepted or approved by the War or the Navy Departments they in substance become members of the armed forces insofar as they are regulated as to where they go, or what they may do, or what they may say. Certainly we are thrilled when we turn on our radios in the morning and are told that London will come in, or Moscow, or Australia, or as I heard the other morning, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, and all the other places where today these stories are told as if they were just around the corner from us. I have in mind one correspondent in particular to whom I have listened many times. I have listened to him in London and I listened to him the other day from our battle front in Tunisia.

Men doing this type of work are exposing themselves to imminent danger. They are captured as prisoners; they are shot; they are injured. The only benefits to which they are entitled in case of injury are such as their employers may provide. Certainly, we cannot be unmindful of the high character of their services, and I believe we should extend

the benefits of this National Life Insurance Act so that they can take advantage of its provisions. I am sure there is not a citizen in this country who does not recognize the fine work they are doing. They are keeping us right with the armed forces. We are with the Army and Navy every day. We know what is going on, and we know what we may expect.

These men cannot color the news. We know most of it is subject to certain military regulations; however, the very fact they are out there on the front lines brings to the soldiers a strong sense of moral support as well as an ability to furnish us with news. The soldiers realize that these men are out there working on their own, purely on a voluntary basis, in order to keep the home folks advised as to what is happening. I think of these men very intimately, as you do. Many of them we knew around the Capitol and at home. We read of them being killed, and, aside, perhaps, from a lone newspaper paying them a tribute by way of an eulogy or editorial, that is all the recognition they get. They are not eligible to be buried in the National Cemetery or to receive any honors of that kind.

I have talked to a number of men who have been in active campaigns and who have returned home, and they tell me that the newspapermen in their opinion are the greatest force for bringing together all of the troops and all of the men, regardless of their background, their home, or their peculiarities as to race or religion. These newspapermen supply the soldiers with the news. They talk over loudspeakers and they tell the men of the news they are sending home. The soldiers are encouraged.

I believe that the people of the country demand the news and they should get it, but, on the other hand, while we demand the news, expect the news, and get the news, we should not be unmindful of that army of men who are supplying the news to us. I hope the membership of the House will examine my bill. At the earliest opportunity I am going to ask for a hearing and a favorable report. I am sure if you will consider all of these factors you will readily agree that it is not only a privilege to give these men recognition but it is our duty. When the matter comes up I hope to have the support and vote of every Member of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order previously agreed to, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, without suggestion or request, to pay deserved tribute to an army of unsung heroes who have served the United States of America and the United Nations gloriously, without ever firing a gun. Few of them are in uniform. Most of them serve utterly without compensation, financial reward, or the hope thereof. Theirs is largely a thankless job. No band plays, no bugle sounds, no cheers acclaim as they do their stern duty honestly and with patriotic devotion. No medals are struck for them. Their high reward is a sense of invaluable work

done faithfully without fear or favor. To those of the Selective Service System, these are they.

They administer the sacred trust of dealing with issues involving life and death and the destinies not only of the millions of registrants, but also of the families, friends, associates, employers, and employees of those directly affected by their decisions.

Of course, mistakes have been made. Nothing human is perfect, but on the whole, what agency of Government has functioned better? There has been no suspicion or taint of unworthiness, no breach of faith.

Our Selective Service System is of the pattern of "the American way." It is local self-government in action, with rights of review consonant with the emergency. From the thousands serving on the local boards, up through State committees and the governors, who are the responsible heads of the Selective Service System in their respective States, on up through national headquarters and the Director, to the President of the United States, who is the head of the entire system, the consciousness of all is permeated by the spirit of "the golden rule."

Today the President sent Congress a message transmitting the annual report of the Selective Service System. It is an illuminating document, well worth reading. It presents a plain, unvarnished, and uncolored story of a momentous year's work, with becoming modesty. A small part of the stupendous task may be appreciated when we remember that 27,000,000 men have been processed by the 6,500 local boards, and that the selection has been so carefully done that less than one in five was placed in Class I. The other 22,000,000 were distributed in Classes, II, III, and IV. Think of the facility and experience these local boards have gained in the two years they have been becoming expert in dealing thus with their friends and neighbors.

Naturally there has been some lack of uniformity in the decisions. Realizing that this would be so, the system was set up so that the right of review was provided for each registrant. By the use of the remedies available uniformity has been approximately achieved. That there is still room for improvement, General Hershey and his official family freely admit. And the service is being improved continually. This is an indication of strength, not of weakness. Many of us are convinced that its theory, structure, and practice are fundamentally sound, and that any substantial change would be a gamble.

Some question has been raised as to the capability of these local boards to pass upon occupational deferments because of a lack of technical knowledge. But this same criticism, with even more logic, has been made of juries. Yet the jury system, for the more than 700 years since Magna Carta, has proven itself the best means of administering justice. The genius of each system is that honest men desiring to do justice, whose minds are not prejudiced by too great famili-

arity with technical details, may be supplied by competent witnesses with all necessary information to enable them to decide issues fairly. Local juries and local selective service boards have demonstrated admirably that they have and exercise this genius.

The Selective Service System has ever been mindful of its high duty. It has furnished the required number of men to the armed forces by induction, and by deferment has rendered available to industry, agriculture, and other necessary vocations those who could be spared from the combat forces.

The Selective Service System has done well and will do better if let alone and permitted to improve itself. Every day's experience makes it better automatically.

The Selective Service System represents the best thought of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government. It is built upon the successful experience with a similar system in World War No. 1. It is our system, it is the President's system, it is the people's system. Let us maintain its integrity.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for time today and that I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next immediately after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order previously agreed to, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from again calling to the attention of the Congress and the country an incident in the remarkable saga of Battery F, of the Two Hundred and Forty-fifth Coast Artillery which is on duty at Fort Hancock, N. J., one of the key bastions of our coastal defense.

You may recall that on June 22 of this year I took the floor to tell you of the fine and patriotic action of each member of Battery F in subscribing for at least one war bond within 24 hours after the President had affixed his signature to the pay raise bill. This striking instance of devotion to our flag and country which the lads of this Army unit are so bravely serving was nobly supplemented by a voluntary act of the entire battery on Armistice Day last week. In observance of that historic day, and in commemoration of one of their deceased comrades, Private Michael G. Hartery, of the Bronx, N. Y., the entire personnel of Battery F voluntarily appeared at the headquarters of the Red Cross at Fort Hancock for the purpose of donating blood to the Red Cross blood bank. Some of the lads were required to stand aside

because of being afflicted with colds or because their medical histories show that while on Army service in the tropics they had suffered from malaria. However, one pint of blood was drained from the veins of each of the 100 members of the battery.

An amusing, yet significant, incident of the affair was that one member of the battery who was doing penance in the guardhouse insisted on being allowed to stand in line with his comrades and give his blood. I am glad to say that his request was granted. The zeal and unity which characterized this sacrifice is exemplified in the fact that the battery commander, Capt. Justin J. Yates, of New York, headed the line of donors and he was the first to give his blood. When the last man had made his donation, the entire battery repaired to its mess hall where Captain Yates was the host at a special steak dinner which was also attended by the battalion commander, Major Derby, and the regimental commander, Colonel Inghram. Despite the enervating effect of the loss of blood, each donor was right on the job from reveille to taps the next day.

While I take great personal pride in saying that well over half of the members of this fine Army unit are from my home State of New York, and one of them, Corp. William S. Shea, is a former member of my secretarial staff, yet the roster of the battery carries the names of lads from several other States of the Union, and of almost every racial origin. It is a group which symbolizes the glorious melting pot which is America. There is a Cassidy, a Cohen, a Kelly, a Napolitano, and a Greenbaum from New York, a Bjerkin from Minnesota, an Engelbretson from South Dakota, a Pearson from Missouri, a Basiewicz and a Lyons from New Jersey, a Dillon from Illinois, a Fournier from Vermont, a Pitts from Indiana, and a Hutton from California. I am sure you will agree with me that the sacrifices made by these soldiers of Battery F are a shining page in the history of this war for the survival of decency and right principles. Those civilians who are prone to chafe at the necessary restrictions of our wartime economy, and to indulge in self-sympathy because of having to forego some of the luxuries and conveniences of the sunny days of peace, might well pause long enough to read this simple, yet magnificent story which tells of the stuff and fiber of the men who compose our armed forces. Surely they will weep no more, but instead take a hitch in their belts and strip down for battle action on the home front with a firm resolve to be worthy of the sacrifices and heroic deeds, not alone of Battery F of the Two Hundred and Forty-fifth Coast Artillery, but likewise of every other unit of our armed forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes if it becomes necessary.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, the fall election for 1942 is now over. It has been my privilege to serve in this House for two terms.

These 4 years have been trying and exacting ones for all of us. Most of you have been returned to serve another term during a critical period while we are fighting the most bloody war of all time.

It was my desire to be with you for another 2 years at least, to aid with my experience gained through 4 years of service, but the voters have decreed otherwise. Had their decision been based upon true facts, it would have been pleasant to take defeat because the American people always come to a correct conclusion when their decision is based upon the true facts.

There is no bitterness on my part in what I have to say today. It is only a statement of facts as they exist, which I feel the membership of the House is entitled to know.

I have lived long enough to know from experience that if wrongs have been committed against any members of this body in the recent election, the Ruler of our destiny will see that they are corrected at the proper time, and those who have been wronged will receive their just reward, and those responsible for these wrongs will be justly punished.

I have discovered that a man can be too conscientious about his service in this House. Sometimes it may be best for himself and his constituents if he does not take his duties too seriously.

To explain what I mean: Had I gone home and neglected some of my duties here, I would have been reelected. As it so happened, I remained at my post here until it was too late to overcome the great damage done in my district by the Union for Democratic Action and those affiliated with it and those who had been duped by it.

Most of the voters did not know of its history and those responsible for it. Its dirty smear was scattered from one end of my district to the other. You could pick up the Supplement to the New Republic almost any place you cared to look for it. New Deal headquarters were supplied with it. I know because I picked it up there. Business houses were supplied with it. It was distributed generously. If the statements made in it about me were true no one should complain, but they were utterly false and libelous per se.

For instance, the article written about me said that a company I controlled and operated as president had been found guilty by the National Labor Relations Board of unfair labor practices, that I had opposed the organization of the men in my factory by the American Federation of Labor, and had paid low wages to the men over a long period of time—all of which is wholly false. The fact is that the company discussed in the article was not my company at all but another

across the river from me that did have some trouble and had a lawsuit over it, but was finally vindicated in the court of appeals in Chicago. The writer of the article in the Supplement to the New Republic must have known his statements were false when written because any investigation would have supplied him with the truth.

The fact is that William Green of the American Federation of Labor endorsed me for reelection in 1940 and again in 1942, and of course any sensible man knows that William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, would not have endorsed me if I had had a record such as was outlined in the article in the New Republic Supplement of May 18, 1942.

The unfortunate thing is that Tom Amlie, the director of the Washington Bureau of the Union for Democratic Action, is a former Member of this body, repudiated by the voters of Wisconsin for return to Congress, and also a defeated candidate for nomination to the United States Senate from the same State. When running for nomination to the Senate, he received only 83 votes in my home county, where I have my business. You are all familiar with what happened to him when the President tried to appoint him to a position with the Federal Government. His record was so bad that the President finally withdrew his name from the Senate. You Members remaining in Congress had better keep your eyes on this fellow from now on. You are likely to find him on the pay roll here in Washington. I quote from the Dies committee report, No. 2277, page 7, on Mr. Amlie as follows:

Whether Amlie is a Communist or not, there can be no doubt that his views as expressed by himself on these tremendously important political and economic questions coincided perfectly with the views of the Communists.

Had I alone been selected for the slaughter by this crowd, it would not have mattered so much, but according to the Times-Herald, the local daily newspaper, 144 Members of Congress were slated for political slaughter. There were only 11 casualties, of which I happen to be one. But let the Times-Herald article of November 17, 1942, speak for itself:

Only 11 out of 144 Members of the House of Representatives whom the Roosevelt administration, the Willkieites, the Communists, and the left-wing press sought to purge in the 1942 elections were defeated at the polls. Of eight Senators marked for liquidation by the purgers, one was defeated.

The purge campaign was directed against both Democrats and Republicans, both pre-war interventionists, and pre-war noninterventionists, most of the candidates apparently having been judged primarily by their votes for or against collectivism in domestic affairs.

Edward J. "Paving Block" Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was the first to call for a purge of the Republicans in Congress. Soon after Pearl Harbor he asserted that a Republican victory in the 1942 congressional election would be comparable to a major military disaster. Charles Michelson, publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, ascribed respon-

sibility for the present war to the Republican Party, which he charged with blocking Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations proposal.

On May 18 the left-wing magazine New Republic, collaborating with the so-called Union for Democratic Action, published a special purge supplement, which blacklisted both Democrats and Republicans. \* \* \*

The Dies committee on un-American activities issued a special report on the Union for Democratic Action, which distributed hundreds of thousands of copies of the purge supplement in the 1942 primary campaigns. The committee denounced the Union for Democratic Action as the spearhead of a Communist conspiracy to destroy representative government in the United States. The report found that 27 of the Union for Democratic Action's national leaders had been affiliated with an organization (the American League against War and Fascism), which openly advocated sabotage of American war industries, in time of peace and war.

The primary purge was almost a complete flop, but in October the New Republic got out a new purge supplement for the November 3 general election. This time it undertook to purge virtually the whole Republican Party. Adopting Democratic Chairman Flynn's argument as its own, the New Republic said: "If this Congress should go Republican on November 3, Hitler will have won a major battle."

Of the eight Senators slated for defeat, only one, a Democrat, was defeated in the primary, and the man who defeated him was in turn defeated in the final election by a Republican, a noninterventionist.

Here is what the Dies report has to say on page 4 of its report about the Union for Democratic Action and its aims and purposes:

The Union for Democratic Action purports, in its 32-page document, to analyze the votes of the Members of Congress on 20 arbitrarily chosen bills which have been up for passage during the past 2½ years. Ten of these measures were in the field of foreign policy and 10 in the field of domestic affairs. Where the Member of Congress voted in accordance with the union's opinions, he is given a plus sign; where he voted contrary to the union's views, he received a minus sign. According to the union's tabulation, only 18 Members of the House of Representatives have all plus marks.

Completely disregarding its own tabulation, the Union for Democratic Action concludes its document by calling for the defeat of a group of Representatives and Senators whom it describes as the obstructionists.

The Union for Democratic Action betrays a remarkable fact concerning its own objectives—namely, that its interest in winning the war against the Axis Powers is a secondary matter. This is clear from the fact that the union calls for the purge of various Members of Congress whose voting record on the 10 measures dealing with foreign policy has been 100 percent in support of the administration. The only possible conclusion which can be drawn from the union's position is that it belongs to that relatively small group of radicals who are trying to use the war emergency to advance their own revolutionary programs within the United States.

You Members remaining in Congress, and those coming in, will have the job of preserving our form of government. I know most of you personally on both sides of the House. A deliberate attempt has been made to destroy representative government in the United States. It has failed because of an aroused public

opinion. Keep on guard and do not permit a thing of this kind to happen in America again.

We are engaged in a great World War. We are told it is to preserve freedom throughout the world, to establish our ideals everywhere. It is a great task and, if accomplished, must necessarily lower our standard of living in our own United States. If our ideals are accomplished, it is worth all the sacrifices we may be called upon to make.

We need not minimize the bewildering complex of human life and the puzzling intricacy of its unfoldings to history. We need not shut our eyes to the tragedy of it all, but in the slow, painful years the splendor of achievement has far outweighed the tragedy. If we keep our ideals clearly before our minds, we shall yet survive and continue our civilization. The powers of mind and matter ready in this age to be organized toward high and worthy objects, are of unprecedented scope and content. The present-day economic and intellectual revolution has opened the door of human possibility wider than it ever was opened before.

In these days that so distress and disconcert us, it is preeminently fitting that we pull ourselves together and anew submit to the crucible of thought, our estimate of the human achievement, the validity of our ideals for humanity, and of our notions as to what constitutes human progress.

The noblest end of human effort is the development and elevation of men and women. There is an urgent cry for the improvement of the human race.

The world must not fail in the present crisis. I think our real purposes may be accomplished. But surely not unless God shall give us men and women cast in heroic mold; men and women endowed, not only with the understanding heart, which feels and appreciates the condition of the present, but with the philosophic mind, which weighs with just discrimination the accumulated experiences of the past; men and women who can withal lift up their eyes in abiding faith to the hilltops of the future, which even now, are touched and glorified by the light of the approaching day.

Keep our Government as it is, for the men and women who are fighting to save it, and they will take over when they return, and see that subversive elements in America are taken care of in proper form in the future.

This perhaps will be the last time I shall speak on this subject on the House floor. It has been my privilege to meet and know most of you—some quite intimately—and I have learned to know and to appreciate the sacrifices that many of you are making. May you have the guidance of God in all your deliberations during these trying hours.

Personally, I never had any desire to run for Congress. Friends persuaded me it was my duty during this critical period to do so, that I owed it to my country which had been so generous and kind to me.

I have done my best in a conscientious way to repay that debt I owe to my country and to humanity. How well I have succeeded, history only will record. I have done what I could in my humble

way. God grant that the United States of America may survive that civilization may endure and progress.

In closing, may I say to you Members of the House on both sides, who hold the destiny of America in your hands:

Build today, then, strong and sure

With a firm and ample base;

And ascending and secure

Shall tomorrow find its place.

And only the Master shall praise us,

And only the Master shall blame,

And no one shall work for money,

And no one shall work for fame;

But each for the joy of working

And each in his separate star,

Shall draw the thing as he sees it

For the God of things as they are.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; and

H. R. 7629. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2122. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925;

S. 2503. An act to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2515. An act to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs; and

H. R. 7629. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 23, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARING

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce at 11 a. m., Monday, November 23, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearing on production, transportation, refinement, and distribution problems of petroleum products.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1992. A letter from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report of the committee, dated November 19, 1942, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for fiscal year ending June 30, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 886); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1993. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7781. A bill to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7633. A bill to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 2636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2723. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; with amendment (Rept. No. 2637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2740. An act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7768. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for officers and warrant officers commissioned or appointed in the Army of the United States or any component thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 2639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7746. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAGÁN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7505. A bill authorizing a supplementary appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for emergency supplies for the Territory of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6179. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. VanNoy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7357. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bulah Fiori; with amendment (Rept. No. 2634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 7790. A bill to authorize a per capita payment of \$10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 7791. A bill relating to the naming of naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 7792. A bill to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 7793. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to farm acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 7794. A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 7795. A bill to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 7796. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7797. A bill to amend the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 7798. A bill to set aside certain provisions of orders and regulations requiring the registration and inspection of tires and tubes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 7799. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7800. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 7801. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes,

bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7802. A bill to suspend the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 14 (a) and section 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act to issue rules relating to the solicitation of proxies, consents, and authorizations during the period of the war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7803. A bill extending the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to American war correspondents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the method of ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 573. Resolution granting a gratuity to the father of Wilson R. Langston; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 574. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish the House of Representatives the number of representatives of the Department who are engaged in investigating, arbitrating, or settling labor disputes; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 7804. A bill for the relief of E. F. Hathorn and E. D. Hathorn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 7805. A bill for the relief of Sallie Grossenbacher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 7806. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon; 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:

3439. By Mr. BURGIN: Petition of Rev. A. Odell Leonard and members of the Christian Endeavor of the Second Evangelical and Reformed Church of Lexington, N. C., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3440. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of the Ladies' Aid of Willow Creek Lutheran Church, Dell Rapids, S. Dak., presented by Rev. Ole M. Odland, requesting that the sale of intoxicating liquor in camps and schools where men and women are trained for armed service be prohibited; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3441. Also, petition of Henry E. Shrader and others of Kennebec, S. Dak., to prohibit intoxicating drinks, including beer, in and around Army camps and naval stations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3442. Also, petition of Mrs. A. B. Huglin and others of Spearfish, S. Dak., to prohibit intoxicating liquor in and around Army

camps and naval stations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3443. Also, petition of the Women's Society of the Methodist Church of Egan, S. Dak., to prohibit the sale of all liquors in and near Army camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3444. Also, letter of Rev. Walter S. Van, of Colman, S. Dak., urging that liquor be prohibited in and about Army camps, especially in view of drafting 18- and 19-year-olds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3445. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of Nan-nie Van Winkle and other residents of Bladensburg, Knox County, Ohio, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, for the protection of our armed forces from all forms of vice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3446. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of Jane R. Lohman, president, Service Mothers Club, Trucksville, Pa., and signed by 31 members and friends, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, for the protection of our Army and Navy against insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3447. Also, petition of Louise M. Hartman and signed by 26 citizens of Wyoming, Pa., Twelfth Congressional District, favoring the passage of Senate bill 860, the so-called Shepard bill, prohibiting the sale of all alcoholic beverages to soldiers in uniform anywhere in the United States or its possessions and to establish zones around Army camps in which vice and sale of intoxicating beverages shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3448. Also, petition of Fred Schultz, of Plymouth, Pa., and signed by 16 sundry citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., urging the passage of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages, including beer, to soldiers in the Army camps, to soldiers in uniform anywhere in the United States or its possessions, and to establish zones around Army camps, in which vice and the sale of intoxicating beverages shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3449. Also, petition of Harry E. Edwards, of Shickshinny, Pa., and 19 sundry citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., urging passage of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages to soldiers in uniform anywhere in the United States or its possessions and to establish zones around Army camps in which vice and the sale of intoxicating beverages shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3450. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition signed by Mrs. Henry Mugler and 107 other citizens of Riley County, Kans., opposing the use and sale of liquor in and around our training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3451. Also, petition signed by Frank Colyer, R. C. Scott, and other citizens of Council Grove, Kans., protesting against the use and sale of liquor in and around our training camps and other vices around these camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3452. Also, petition signed by Mrs. S. A. Vanscoik and 70 other representative women of Marion County, Kans., protesting against the sale of liquor and immoral conditions in and around our training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3453. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Beloit Real Estate Board, Beloit, Wis., protesting against the unjust discrimination of the rights of property owners in the provisions of the national rent law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3454. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service, Camargo Methodist-Episcopal Church, Camargo, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3455. Also, petition of sundry members of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Argenta, Ill., urging passage of the bill prohibiting sale of intoxicating liquor

in and near the vicinity of the Army camps of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3456. Also, petition of sundry members of the Charleston Woman's Club, Charleston, Ill., urging that men in the armed service be forbidden to buy or receive liquor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1942

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 17, 1942)

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

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

Dear God and Father of us all, whate'er our name or sign, under the canopy of Thy goodness and mercy we pause to seek Thy face. Gather our wandering minds and our wayward spirits into Thy secret place where, even before we lift our own voices concerning the affairs of these perplexing times, we may have ears to hear those voices which tell us the meaning and worth of life. On the tablets of our hearts may there be written Thy decrees.

In days when eyes are fixed on the victory of our righteous arms may we not forget that he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty and he that ruleth his own heart better than he that taketh a city. Let all that is low, abominable, selfish, vindictive, and of a mean report be put away from us, and may all things pertaining to Thy spirit live and grow in us. Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in those things that matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. We ask it in the name of man's Best Man, love's Best Love. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 19, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### SENATORS FROM MISSISSIPPI AND NEW HAMPSHIRE—CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of JAMES O. EASTLAND, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the credentials of STYLES BRIDGES, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

### SENATOR EXCUSED FROM ATTENDANCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask leave of the Senate to be absent tomorrow in

order to attend the funeral of a friend in Cincinnati.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio is excused from attending the session tomorrow.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 658. An act 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;

S. 2723. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; and

S. 2740. An act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7768. An act to provide a uniform allowance for officers and warrant officers commissioned or appointed in the Army of the United States or any component thereof; and

H. R. 7781. An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia.

Under permission subsequently granted during the course of today's proceedings, the following routine business was transacted:

### PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Yates Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7408. A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940, entitled "An act to restrict or regulate the delivery 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"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1703).

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

S. 2769. A bill to authorize the rank of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1704).

### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 19, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2122. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925;

S. 2503. An act to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2515. An act to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 2901. A bill for the relief of Jacob Oblock; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2902. A bill to prevent discrimination against blind persons and persons with impaired visual acuity in the administration of the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2903. A bill for the relief of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla., a partnership composed of W. P. Richardson, George W. Hessler, and L. C. Park, by reason of certain claim arising within the World War period; to the Committee on Claims.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar as indicated:

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 7768. An act to provide a uniform allowance for officers and warrant officers commissioned or appointed in the Army of the United States or any component thereof; to the calendar.

H. R. 7781. An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF WAR NECESSITY BY OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. WHEELER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 314), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investi-