

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 15th day of July 1942:

Thomas A. Morris, Jr.
Mark Dodge
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) J. Kenneth Hall, DC-V (G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 26th day of October 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Littleton W. T. Waller, Jr., to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary service, from the 25th day of September 1942.

Col. Lewie G. Merritt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October 1942.

Lt. Col. (temporary) Gregon A. Williams to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1942.

John D. Hayes, a citizen of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942.

John J. Kalen, a citizen of Virginia, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of July 1942.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942:

Cyrus N. Morgan, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Roger F. Seasholtz, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Warren F. Lloyd, a citizen of Virginia.

Dudley R. Carr, a citizen of Mississippi.

Sgt. William E. Lunn, a meritorious non-commissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of November 1942:

Platoon Sgt. Benjamin F. Royal, Jr.
Platoon Sgt. Rufus B. Thompson, Jr.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 1, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Edward J. Flynn to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1943:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Josh Lee, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Dear Father, we pray in the name of Him who carried eternity in His heart. We thank Thee that Thou art sufficient for every problem and disillusionment of life. Thine arm is not shortened and Thou art the shelter for every storm and the light which no darkness can dim. Thy ministries are very precious and our souls hang upon Thy fellowship; thus

our love and life are strengthened and multiplied.

Reminded, dear Lord, of our inefficiency and dependence, we would indulge in no personal exaltation but humbly pray Thee to clothe us with a conscience that leaps beyond creed and liturgy, seeking the Christ alone whose infinite nature is interpreted in the borrowed center of the heavens: "I am the light of the world." In every county and State throughout our Union, may every man scorn disloyalty, sham, and fraud, inspired from a throne on which reigns the royalty of an unsullied conscience. Our Father, the day is weary, burdened with perplexity and unrest and need is crying from the four corners of this scarred and beaten globe. Oh, we pray for counsel that is wise, true, and just; direct all men with a searching eye to look within and in sacred calmness and quiet hear the small voice of the monitor within their own breasts. Oh, help us to be true to ourselves. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 28, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing to the National Assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States.

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

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Post Office Department.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Civil Service Commission.
6. Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management).
7. The National Archives.

THE SIXTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Saturday last, while the House was not in session, was the sixty-first birthday of our beloved and courageous Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is fitting that we should pause today to congratulate and extend to our President our best wishes and felicitations on his birthday anniversary of a few days ago.

As the Washington Post well said in an editorial of last Saturday—

No man has had so much responsibility to the people in this Nation's history. No man

has had as much responsibility to humanity. Indeed, we are all in the same boat, sailing to a new destiny, and he is our chief helmsman.

President Roosevelt is a precedent breaker. The first President to break the heretofore fixed third-term policy. If it was for no other reason than this, he would occupy a foremost page in American history.

President Roosevelt is the first President while in office to fly in an airplane.

He is the first wartime President to leave the continental United States in time of war.

Like the vision, courage, and adventurous spirit of Christopher Columbus brought about the discovery of a new world, out of which came our beloved country, so will the vision, the courage, and the sound, forward looking adventurous spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt lead the way to victory, and thereafter toward a permanent peace and a better world in which men of good will can live.

President Roosevelt has always been found fighting for the preservation of our institutions of government; for sound, practical, social justice, for the progress of our people. To me, he is the real conservative, who tries to preserve our fundamentals and ideals by regulating and controlling abuses that exist, the continuance of which existence would or might prove harmful to our Nation.

We find him in 1933, when banking and business was prostrated, when fear was in the minds of all, particularly in the minds of our bankers and businessmen, stepping into the breach and saving our banking system, the economic lifeblood of our Nation. By his courageous leadership, in addition to saving our banking system, and the deposits of well over 20,000,000 of our people, he also saved business, industry, finance from complete prostration. Simply because some have forgotten does not minimize that fact.

He then thought of the weak, of the millions of unemployed and their families and dependents, of the farmers and their families, of the youth of the land, who were facing disillusionment.

Then came the march of totalitarianism, nazi-ism, fascism, and the Jap war-crazed imperialism and hatred of America, and he led in seeing the danger that confronted us—criticized, scorned, scoffed at by some, facing division from within, he carried on with faith, vision, courage, preparing our country for the impending danger. Everyone knows of the history of the past several years, and of the unusual foresight and courageous leadership of our Commander in Chief.

He has been characterized in many ways, the great humanitarian, the great leader, the man of courage, the man without fear, the precedent breaker, the hope of the oppressed and the conquered. I do not mention what he has been termed by his enemies, as they are not worthy of being dignified by notice.

You will note I say enemies, not honest critics, or persons who honestly misunderstood and who acted as their consciences dictated, and who found out later they were wrong in their outlook of the future, and that President Roosevelt was right.

But there is one title, in my opinion, future historians will give him—and with victory he will deserve—and that is "The Preserver of Democracy."

Washington: "The Father of Our Country."

Lincoln: "The Savior of Our Country."

Roosevelt: "The Preserver of Democracy."

It is interesting to note that Washington was first inaugurated in 1789. Lincoln, in 1861, was first inaugurated 72 years after Washington. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1933, was first inaugurated 72 years after Lincoln.

We of the House appreciate his responsibilities in this critical period of our Nation's history. Without regard to party, we of the House, as the Washington Post well said, recognize "he is our chief helmsman."

While all of our Members could not see eye to eye with the President on all occasions, practically all of our Members respect him personally; respect him as our President and, in this crisis, as our wartime Commander in Chief.

A few days ago we honored the memory of another great wartime President and Commander in Chief who has gone to meet His Maker, William McKinley, who, while on the stage of life, played an important part in the history and progress of our country.

Today we pause to extend our congratulations and to express our sentiments of respect, confidence, and support, not as Democrats or Republicans, or Independents, or otherwise, but as Americans, to our living wartime President and Commander in Chief, to this man of destiny, and to express the hope—yes, prayers—that God will continue to give him good health, and direct and guide him in the performance of his grave duties, in the early winning of the war, and in the establishment of a just, lasting, and permanent peace.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN F. DOCKWEILER

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House who served with former Congressman John F. Dockweiler, of California, will be grieved to learn of his death, which occurred at his home in Los Angeles yesterday morning, January 31.

Mr. Dockweiler was born on September 19, 1895, in Los Angeles. He was a son of Isadore Bernard and Gertrude Dockweiler. His family has been prominent in the history of California since the early days. For more than 40 years his father has been an outstanding character in our State. Still living, he is regarded as the Old Roman of them all in the Democratic Party of California. He is the outstanding, living example of the type of men who led our progress from the earliest beginnings. Always abreast of the times, for many decades he has taken an active part in practically all questions associated with the progress and advancement of our State.

John was a worthy son of his father. His career was closely associated with

many fraternal, civic, political, and economic activities of our State. His versatile work was reflected in his career in this House.

John Dockweiler was a graduate of Loyola College in Los Angeles in 1918 with a degree of bachelor of arts. In 1921 he graduated from the Southern California law school and subsequently took postgraduate work and special courses at Harvard Law School.

He was elected to Congress in 1932 and served here for 6 years in the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. He voluntarily retired in 1938 when he became a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor. Among a number of candidates, he received next to the highest vote.

While a Member of the House, Mr. Dockweiler served as assistant whip of his party. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee at the time of his voluntary retirement.

In 1940 he was elected district attorney of Los Angeles County. That county contains one of the greatest constituencies served by any county district attorney in the United States. He filled the office with diligence and great credit to himself and to our State.

While a Member of this body he won the respect and affection of its membership. He was a lovable character and an honor to California.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to add a few words to what the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has had to say about the sad passing of a former colleague in the House, Hon. John F. Dockweiler. I have been acquainted with our late colleague and members of his family, notably, his splendid father, for many years. The Dockweiler family has been one of the outstanding families in California from almost the beginning of its growth. Their service in various phases of public life has been one of the things that California is proud of. Brothers of our late colleague have served on the bench and in other capacities and always with outstanding record. Our late colleague is going to be missed by many people. He has given an administration as district attorney of our county which has won the approbation and approval of all constructive citizens, and I join with the dean of our delegation the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] in professing my own profound sorrow over his death.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, Los Angeles has sad news today for many men in this House. John Dockweiler, who worked among you for 6 years, is dead. For those 6 years John represented the district which I now represent.

In California we have many legends—woven from the mission days, the Spanish land grants, the sudden impact of a bright, new civilization. The name Dockweiler is a signpost of this legend.

Isadore Dockweiler, John's father, rode horseback over southern California when the present site of Los Angeles was rolling hills, covered with cattle, herded by Mexican paisanos.

Isadore Dockweiler, pioneer, had 13 children. When they became grown, a new city, a white-walled, red-roofed city of 2,000,000 people, lay at their feet. And they were the literal symbol of this city's growth. They were Dockweiler doctors, Dockweiler lawyers, Dockweiler engineers, Dockweiler statesmen.

John, the statesman, is dead today, but in his father, Isadore the pioneer, lives on. And to him today I send my sorrow at the loss of his and California's son.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I have learned of the passing of one of the former Members of the California delegation in Congress. John F. Dockweiler served in this body for three successive terms, from 1933 to 1939, as a Member of the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses. During his first term he was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and subsequently served on the Appropriations Committee on the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the War Department.

During his service here, John Dockweiler proved untiring in his efforts to promote and develop a sound program of national defense for the Nation, realizing as he did the great conflict of American and Japanese interests in the Pacific. With almost prophetic vision he daily championed the cause of greatly augmented coastal defenses for the entire Pacific coast, and it was due to his efforts almost exclusively that the harbor defenses of San Francisco Bay were greatly improved and strengthened. Who shall say that it was not due to these very installations that the perfidious attack of the Japanese on that eventful December 7 was not extended to include the bay region in the onslaught against the United States? Without hesitation John Dockweiler, as Congressman, urged upon both the War and Navy Departments a greater vigilance of the activities of the Japanese throughout his native State of California, but more particularly in and around the harbor and industrial areas of Los Angeles. With a keen discerning mind he anticipated the real treachery with which the Japanese would initiate an attack upon this Nation.

With a splendid legal education and the experience of several years of active practice, John Dockweiler was elected district attorney of Los Angeles County just 2 years ago, having previously been a candidate for the Democratic nomination as Governor of the State of California. He administered the duties of the office of district attorney efficiently and well, always having a high regard for the rights of individuals, the while he

demanding the enforcement and prosecution of the law in the interests of good, sound government. It is indeed unfortunate for the people of Los Angeles County that the career of this able and industrious young attorney should be cut short in the very beginning of his service in government. That his absence will be keenly felt by all needs no comment on my part.

A kindly individual, John Dockweiler made a host of friends for himself while serving here in the Congress, and there are none who met him but admired him for his high principles and fine ideals. Quiet and unostentatious, he nevertheless displayed great vigor and force whenever the occasion demanded. He demonstrated in his daily life his fine character and deep religious convictions, splendid attributes, which merit for him the fond memory we shall always have of him. As he lays down the burdens of this life we pray that he may enjoy eternal rest and happiness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Military Order of the Liberty Bell, national headquarters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CAMP HALE, COLO.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CLASON, read to me a letter from one of his constituents, wherein it was stated that he had heard that there had been deaths and much illness among the boys stationed at Camp Hale in Colorado. I had not heard any such rumor but since the camp is located in my congressional district, it seemed to me that an inquiry should be made at once.

Accordingly, I asked the Surgeon General's Office to make an investigation. I am glad to report that the Surgeon General has made a careful investigation and states that there has not been a single death among the soldiers since the camp was created; that the general health of the men is good; and that there were only minor ailments, such as measles, mumps, and common colds, usual to a group of enlisted men suddenly brought together from various parts of the United States. The only losses reported were two Army mules, and they were probably caused by a fall from some cliff.

Camp Hale is a comparatively new camp where men are taught skiing and mountain climbing and generally trained for mountain warfare. It is located at Pando, Colo., which lies at an elevation of 10,000 feet. Considering the high

altitude and the vigorous exercise necessary to train mountain troops, I think that the health record of no deaths and only minor ailments among the thousands of troops stationed there, is remarkable.

I thought that you would be interested in this health report from a mountain training center high in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ERRONEOUS CHARGES AGAINST LEND-LEASE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. At the last session of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], made certain charges against the administration of lend-lease. The day after this speech was delivered, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House heard Mr. Stettinius, the Administrator of Lend-Lease, and he completely answered and denied all of these charges made by the gentleman from Ohio. Since the membership of the House did not have the privilege of hearing the reply by Mr. Stettinius, and since readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD did not have that privilege, I wish to answer these four charges based upon Mr. Stettinius' reply thereto. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] stated that thousands of cases of beer, rayon hose, and power puffs have been shipped abroad and paid for with lend-lease funds.

The gentleman from Ohio is misinformed. No beer and no powder puffs have been bought with lend-lease funds. In procuring cotton hose for lend-lease shipment to north Africa, a small amount of cheap 25-cent-a-pair heavy-duty rayon hose was included along with the cotton hose. In addition, some rayon hose was included in various barter goods previously purchased by the War Department for our forces in north Africa to use in payment for local labor on airfields, barracks, and other installations.

Lend-lease shipments of clothing—and of food—for distribution to the civilian population of north Africa are a pressing matter of military policy. At General Eisenhower's urgent request, supplies are being sent to the people of North Africa who have been stripped to the point of destitution.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] also said that lend-lease is being forced on some countries that did not want it, and mentioned Bermuda specifically.

He has been misinformed. Acceptance of lend-lease aid has not been forced on Bermuda or on any country. As a matter of fact, no lend-lease aid has been given to Bermuda. Lend-lease

aid is made available only at the specific request of the country to which such aid is to be rendered.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] also said that Harry Hopkins, as "lend-lease expediter," has absolute authority in assigning lend-lease shipments.

This charge is erroneous. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., has been Lend-Lease Administrator since October 28, 1941, when he was authorized by the President "to exercise any power or authority conferred upon the President" by the Lend-Lease Act, in accordance with the policies prescribed by the President.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] also said that the United States has no assurance that airplanes furnished our allies will not be used in the post-war period to take commercial airways away from this country.

Again the gentleman is in error. Under the terms of the master lend-lease agreements, the United States may require the return of any articles furnished under lend-lease, including all types of planes, that have not been "destroyed, lost, or consumed," and shall have been determined by the President to be "of use to the United States of America."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of sponge iron, and to include a statement from Gov. J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina, and also a brief statement from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]; also a statement from Science News in Review?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have always supposed that the rules and regulations of the Communications Commission prohibited the use of profanity and the utterance of sentiments calculated to stir up hatreds and disunity on the radio.

Last evening I listened to Walter Winchell. Apparently he feels that he is above the rules and regulations that apply to citizens generally, because in his broadcast last evening, in my judgment, he reached a new low as a purveyor of hate and discord when he contemptuously referred to the reelection of Members of Congress whose pre-Pearl Harbor voting record he had so vigorously condemned. He spoke as one who had been thwarted and rebuked by the people of the country who went to the polls and cast their votes last November. While impliedly admitting the failure of his campaign of hate directed at many Members of Congress, last night he directed his vituperation and venom toward the millions of American citizens who voted their honest convictions and returned to the Congress of the United States men and women in whom they had confidence. I was astounded to hear him in-

dict the patriotism and intelligence of millions of American people when he stated in substance that what worried him most today was the "damn fools who voted for them."

It is true that he apologetically stated that there were hundreds of good and able representatives in the Congress, and he singled out our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY], as a wonderful man. I hope that this orchid tossed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] will not be the kiss of political death such as he administered to our erstwhile colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]. Winchell has taken on a big order this time when as an officer in the United States Navy he referred to millions of decent Americans as damn fools and desecrated a decent Sabbath evening and every law of radio to give vent to his undisguised venom. It seems to me, Mr. Winchell, that you owe an apology to the people of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial on the farm problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Farm Journal on concentrated feeds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Cleveland City Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD and to address the House for 1 minute to make an explanation of the correction, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I followed Judge SUMNERS in referring to the Civil Air Patrol. The RECORD on page 443 contains an error which changed the context very much. I said that the men of the Civil Air Patrol are not exempt from the draft and that therefore the Civil Air Patrol depends on men who are not subject to military service. In the RECORD the word "not" was omitted and it appears that those men "are exempt from the draft," which is a great injustice and an erroneous statement.

Among these men of the Civil Air Patrol are fat ones, bald-headed ones, old ones and underage ones, because they are subject to the draft and are not exempt because of that service. Thus we are getting splendid service in the air from men who would not otherwise be in the military service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Nicholas Picchione on the negative side of the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio speech which I have made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Thomas Lyons, Secretary of the Foreign Trade Zone Board. I have cleared through the Government Printing Office and the cost of this will be \$90.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE SEAMEN AT GUADALCANAL

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a statement recently appeared in some of the public prints, which statement was rehearsed on the floor of this House, that seamen in the merchant marine have refused to unload supplies and discharge cargoes from ships at Guadalcanal. There is a welcome disclaimer of that statement. Admiral Halsey states that "in no instance have merchant marine seamen refused to discharge cargo from their vessels at Guadalcanal or in any other way failed to cooperate with United States forces ashore in that area."

That statement, originally made, was an aspersion upon the brave merchant marine men who daily risk their lives on the Atlantic and the Pacific, who risk being bombed and torpedoed by U-boats every hour. Those who made and repeated that lie and aspersion now have a glorious opportunity to apologize to those brave men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business of the day and any other special orders today I may proceed for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

TIRES ON JAPANESE-OWNED AUTOMOBILES AND TRUCKS

Mr. GEARHART. 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?
There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in these days when Rubber Czar Jeffers professes his inability to get the syn-

thetic-rubber program under way and our supply from natural sources continues to dwindle, one cannot help but wonder whether or not there is any co-operation among the various agencies of the Government in an effort to relieve the situation.

From isolated press dispatches which have been called to my attention, verified by independent investigation, I am convinced that there are in excess of 25,000 Japanese-owned automobiles and trucks in storage in our Pacific coastal States, upon which there are some 125,000 serviceable tires which, if put into use, would contribute much to the solving of the problem with which we are now vexed.

Furthermore I am informed that Japanese-owned tractors, threshing machines, pumping equipment, motors, and other agricultural implements of a value running well into millions, are also impounded in storage and, therefore, out of use in our food and fiber production program at a time when agricultural implements and equipment are sorely needed upon our western farms.

If there were ever an occasion when different departments and agencies of Government could cooperate to the advantage of our war effort, this situation presents a striking example. Is it not time for the War Relocation Authority to get together with Mr. Jeffers' rubber agency and the Department of Agriculture with a view of recovering this rubber for use and these agricultural implements for service upon our farms?

It is not reasonable to ask the American people to continue their personal sacrifices in order to supply service deficiencies when our war-making officials constantly overlook opportunities such as the ones to which I have today called the attention of the Congress.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago charges were made, on the floor of the House, that merchant seamen refused to unload a cargo at Guadalcanal on a Sunday, in conformity with the rules of the maritime union, thus compelling convalescent marines to do the job. It was a serious charge.

It has now been proven that the charge was baseless, in that the incident never occurred.

It is both proper and fitting that a denial of this unfounded charge be made from the same forum from which the original charge was made because, as it

happens, it was an unwarranted attack upon heroic seamen who are performing brave, noble, and essential service.

In this connection, I should like to read a brief editorial which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun of January 29, entitled "End of an Evil Rumor." It should be recognized that the Baltimore Sun papers are considered among the best in this part of the country:

END OF AN EVIL RUMOR

That story about the merchant seamen who refused to unload ships at Guadalcanal on Sunday because it was against their union rules, has been officially denied. Admiral Halsey, commander of the United States forces in the South Pacific states:

"None of the crews has ever refused to discharge its ship's cargo, and the merchant seamen's cooperation, efficiency, and courage—on some occasions in the face of enemy attack—have won high praise."

It is a salutary thing to have this report squelched by the highest naval authority in the area in which the incident was supposed to have occurred. For this story was exactly the kind that Herr Doktor Goebbels would be happy to have going the rounds. Far too many tales do go the rounds, and baseless though most of them are, they are repeated by irresponsible persons until they gain such wide currency that even sensible people begin to wonder if there might not be some truth in them. Whenever that point is reached, Herr Doktor Goebbels' aim—which is to spread distrust and dismay—has in some measure been achieved. The unfounded-rumors machine is working for him.

The Guadalcanal story was especially harmful in that it appeared to have some basis in fact and could be traced, as the others so seldom can be, to a respectable and apparently reliable source. It was especially hateful, in that it tended to discredit the men of the merchant navy—men who have been exposed time and again to attack by planes, subs, and surface warships, and whose work is at all times arduous and risky.

The merchant marine is performing its indispensable task with efficiency and courage, as Admiral Halsey has said. The story that some merchant crews refused to work in an emergency has been denied by him. That should be the end of such rumors.

I, and I am sure all of you, must agree with the sentiments expressed in this editorial.

THREAT TO LIVESTOCK DISEASE CONTROL

Mr. GILLIE. 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. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] sounded a timely warning on the dangers from the foreign livestock malady, foot-and-mouth disease. His remarks were clear, concise, and convincing, but they dealt only with what might be termed predictable avenues through which this disease, and other foreign diseases of comparable seriousness, may menace our livestock industry.

With a world at war we must not only envision the usual or predictable means by which our livestock may fall victim to this disease but in addition what may be termed the unpredictable means such as the willful and malicious activities of saboteurs.

Our enemy countries as well as other European and Asiatic countries are now suffering the most severe scourge of this disease in history. Obviously our best precautions may, during wartime, be circumvented. Therefore, our vigilance against its introduction is not enough. There must be no weakness in our preparedness plan to cope with the disease should it make its appearance within our borders.

There were 5 separate invasions of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States during the first 29 years of the present century. Each outbreak was of foreign origin and was vigorously combatted and promptly eradicated. The two most destructive outbreaks occurred in 1914-16, involving the livestock to a greater or less degree of 22 States, and in 1924-25, when 2 States—1 very seriously—were involved.

Throughout the five campaigns against this costly plague the responsibility for its control and eradication was vested in the Bureau of Animal Industry for the Federal Government, and the comparable veterinary organizations of the affected States. No State has ever shirked its responsibility during such times, but in most cases State veterinary forces have been limited, and it became necessary for the Federal Government to provide the major veterinary personnel.

Foot-and-mouth disease is an acute, rapidly spreading, infectious disease and its successful extermination calls for a large, well-trained, and mobile veterinary force. The United States Bureau of Animal Industry has kept constantly in readiness a program and personnel roster for immediate action whenever necessary.

The Bureau is the largest single employer of veterinarians in the world. In normal times they are employed in regular assignments, in various divisions of the Bureau, but in case of emergency they are quickly mobilized for such essential special duty.

The Bureau has each time been successful in quickly placing into the field to combat foot-and-mouth disease a large force of veterinarians experienced in the diagnosis, control, and disposition of infected animals.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent large sums of money from private and public sources to eradicate and control animal disease in this country and now have the cleanest livestock in the world. We are literally holding in trust for the rest of the world the best blood lines now existent for the reestablishment of herds and flocks in other countries when the war is over.

With this in mind, I have been very seriously concerned over reports that the Bureau of Animal Industry is to be broken up under plans for a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. Acting under authority of an Executive order issued on December 5, 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture is now entertaining a proposal to detach permanently the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry and place it in the Food Distribution Administration.

Such a move would reduce by about 900 the number of trained veterinarians now available to the Bureau to combat such diseases as foot-and-mouth disease,

My remarks should not be construed as minimizing the importance of the food distribution program, but I am greatly concerned when from any source or through any pretext, action is contemplated which tends to deplete the only organization that is competent to furnish the protection required by our livestock industry against the threat of such a devastating malady as foot-and-mouth disease.

Any benefit that might be furnished to the Food Distribution Administration by such a move would sink into insignificance when compared to the loss that would unavoidably be sustained should we suffer an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Record at this point a letter directed to the Secretary of Agriculture by the American Veterinary Medical Association, urging that the Bureau of Animal Industry be maintained as an intact working organization, with all its forces under the unified direction of a veterinarian as chief:

AMERICAN VETERINARY

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

Chicago, Ill., January 21, 1943.

HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The board of governors of the American Veterinary Medical Association are much concerned about the future of the Federal Meat Inspection Service and the disease control and prevention agencies which have been directed so long and so efficiently by a veterinarian as Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

The fact that the United States is today the safest place in the world in which to grow livestock is not the result of mere accident but of planned and practical methods, based on scientific knowledge such as:

1. The control of infectious diseases within the country itself.

2. The development and enforcement of regulations which have served, with rare exceptions, as effective barriers against the introduction of livestock disease plagues prevalent in other countries.

For over 50 years the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry has had the benefit of competent veterinary direction and has functioned faithfully and efficiently in protecting our livestock industry.

In cooperation with the entire veterinary profession, it has completely rooted out or brought under control several devastating livestock diseases and has eradicated foreign plagues on the few occasions that they have been introduced into this country.

The system of animal disease control developed in the United States has been the marvel of its kind and the envy of other countries.

It spells the difference between a prosperous agricultural nation and one burdened by enormous losses.

Moreover, the effective control of infectious and contagious diseases of animals under competent veterinary direction has been an important public-health factor through the suppression of those animal diseases which are transmissible to man.

On the basis of the record, there would seem to be no justification for a change in the administration or the make-up of the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, both of which have enabled it to function as a well-rounded unit to meet all requirements and emergencies. Of all times in the Nation's history, it would seem particularly ill-advised now to make changes which might create

confusion and impair the proven efficiency of an organization when it is most essential to the successful prosecution of the war program.

It is therefore our firm conviction that, for the best interests of the entire country, the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry should remain as an intact working organization and with all its forces under the unified direction of a veterinarian as Chief.

Sincerely yours,

O. V. BRUMLEY,
Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine,
Ohio State University, and Chairman,
Board of Governors, American Veterinary Medical Association.

W. W. DIMOCK,
Head, Department of Animal Pathology,
University of Kentucky, and
President, American Veterinary Medical Association.

C. W. BOWER,
Practitioner, Topeka, Kans., and President-elect,
American Veterinary Medical Association.

J. C. HARDENBERGH,
Executive Secretary, American Veterinary Medical Association, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter from the Veterinary Medical Association to Hon. Claude Wickard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S BIRTHDAY

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the splendid remarks made by our distinguished majority leader in recognition of the birthday of our Commander in Chief on last Saturday.

We Georgians look upon President Roosevelt as a part-time citizen of our State. We recognize not only his splendid leadership as President throughout the years and his magnificent work as Commander in Chief of this great Nation and of the United Nations, but particularly do we appreciate the humanitarianism of this great man and the fine work he has done at Warm Springs, Ga., in the establishment of that institution for the treatment of sufferers of infantile paralysis.

Last Friday night it was my privilege to attend a dinner given for the stars who were here to celebrate his birthday. Among those stars was a splendid young woman, a singer, who herself has suffered from infantile paralysis, but who has had the courage to carry on and continue to use her beautiful voice notwithstanding her inability to walk.

I think the most amazing thing about our Commander in Chief is the courage he has displayed in the face of his handicap, and especially the courage he has shown in the last few weeks in making that dangerous trip to north Africa in the interest of carrying on our war against the enemy.

I know we all join in felicitating him on his sixty-first birthday and wish him continued happiness and good health.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief article by Frank Kent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"LAME DUCKS"

Mr. BREHM. 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. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call attention to a bill which I have this day introduced in the House.

When the citizens of the Eleventh Ohio District inform me at the polls that my services are no longer desired as their Congressman, I trust that I will retire gracefully and not attempt to force my attention of my "lame duck" services on them, whether it be done by Executive order or as permitted in the present law which I am attempting to repeal.

I realize that there may be certain business which requires time to complete before retiring, but it seems to me that the time elapsing between the defeat of a candidate in early November and the time of seating the new Congress in early January is sufficient time for any "lame duck" to still keep his bill in.

Since coming here in January I have run into several examples where I am actually stymied in rendering proper service to my constituents because of the present law, which extends the "lame duck's" authority for full 6 months, or until June 30, following his retirement in January.

This is particularly manifest in regard to the Agricultural Yearbook. As I understand it, these books are placed to the credit of the individual Members of Congress in November, and even though the Member be defeated in November, these publications still remain to his credit and cannot be released to the newly elected Member unless the defeated candidate so orders. This very definitely works a hardship upon the newly elected Members, as well as upon his constituents back home who are desirous of obtaining these publications.

It seems to me that the authority of any defeated candidate should cease at

the same time the newly elected Congressman's authority begins, and I trust that you will see your way clear to support my bill.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1943.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a Member of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely yours,
WILSON D. GILLETTE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1943.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES WOLFENDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 88), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WILSON D. GILLETTE, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. 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. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader about the program for tomorrow, Tuesday. I understand there has been a change in the program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The Committee on Rules reported out a rule making in order a bill reported out of the Naval Affairs Committee. This will come up on tomorrow. I understand there is nothing controversial about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much general debate will there be on the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. One hour. There is no opposition to it from any source.

Mr. McCORMACK. And while I am on this subject, if I may encroach upon the minute's time given my friend from Massachusetts, I wish to make an announcement to the Democratic Members.

On Thursday after the legislative day is over there will be a caucus of the Democratic Members for the purpose of selecting a nominee for the position of Doorkeeper.

This is an announcement for my own side. Notices will not go out much before

tomorrow or Wednesday morning, and so the Democratic Members may know as soon as possible I make this announcement. The second matter before the caucus will be the question of permitting Democratic Members on select committees to also serve on the District of Columbia Committee. In other words, the District of Columbia Committee will be an exception to the rule against Members of select committees serving on other committees.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I ask the gentleman about his program for the week? I am filing a report on the telegraph merger bill and I hope to appear before the Rules Committee as early as possible. I know the chairman of that committee will grant a hearing as early as possible.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I cannot make any promises now. I cannot see how it can come up this week, but I will see that it is brought up as soon as possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by one of America's foremost authors, Stuart Edward White.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL SHIP REPAIR FACILITIES FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 87, Rept. No. 68), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 1446, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial that appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

On January 31, 1943, there was disseminated a pamphlet by the National

Lawyers Guild, and I read from it the following excerpt:

To the Members of the House of Representatives:

MARTIN DIES and his committee is the secret weapon with which Adolf Hitler hopes to soften up our Nation for military conquest.

I have many excerpts, not only from this but from other pamphlets, all of which raise clearly a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman is entitled to an hour. He asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a great struggle to preserve our constitutional government and our American way of life. The most important phase of that struggle is the supreme effort to win the war. To that end all of us, of every political party, are devoting all of our energies, our resources, and our ability. The House of Representatives has from the beginning of this emergency cooperated in every respect with the executive department in order to prepare this Nation for the struggle. There is no Congress in the history of America that appropriated more money for our military preparedness than the last Congress. The executive department has received the fullest degree of cooperation in its effort to defeat the Axis Powers.

But while this is the most important phase of the present conflict, there is another phase of almost equal importance. This is not only a clash between the armies of the Allied Nations and the armies of the Axis Powers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman tell us who made that statement?

Mr. DIES. The National Lawyers Guild. I will get to that and other statements as I go along.

Mr. Speaker, of almost equal importance with the conflict between rival armies, the armed forces of democracy and the armed forces of the Axis Powers, is the struggle between conflicting ideologies of government. The nineteenth century liberalism which advocated the protection of individual rights, which culminated in those great and eternal beliefs and philosophies which surround the individual with every possible protection in the enjoyment of his rights, has been challenged for a long time by a new philosophy which in one country is communism, in another country fascism, in another country nazi-ism, and in another country bureaucracy. But the underlying principle of all of these philosophies is essentially the same. Stripped of their verbiage and viewed in the naked truth, we find similar phrases, and similar expressions, as well as similar policies

and programs advocated in each instance.

We hear the voice of Adolf Hitler when he contended in Mein Kampf that the highest duty of the individual is to subordinate himself to the state. We read in the doctrines of Marx the pronouncement that the state must be supreme. In the fascism of Mussolini there is a corporate state administered and controlled by a self-perpetuating bureaucracy. The very essence of fascism is and has been a centralized state, a state that expands, extends, and broadens until ultimately the individual becomes a mere cog in a collectivistic system of government.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has overlooked, in my opinion, one of the most important, one of the most dangerous ideologies that threatens America now and for generations to come. That is the ideology known as Shintoism that Japan is spreading throughout the world and especially in the United States.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The point I am trying to make is simply that when liberalism first came into existence it represented a struggle of the people against centralized government and, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] stated in a speech a few days ago, and he expressed it so appropriately, the history of democratic progress has been the history of decentralization. Liberalism was derived from the word liberty. It meant those who were in favor of the liberty of the individual and of the entire body of society. It meant those who were struggling against a great bureaucratic or autocratic or oligarchic government, whichever you may term it, in which the citizen became nothing and the state was everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The House is not in order. Some Members on that side are holding a conversation.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. DIES. We sometimes overlook the fact that in our own country there has been a trend toward centralized government, not of the same nature and perhaps not as marked as in foreign countries, but, nevertheless, over a period of several or more decades there has been a constant, steady trend toward bureaucratic and centralized government and away from the original concept of our fathers.

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

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just a moment ago a gentleman stood up and pointed his hand in a certain direction. Three or four gentlemen were standing here. I wonder whether the gentleman would care to identify the person to whom he was calling attention.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will do it if the gentleman wants me to.

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

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I identify him by the group who finds this bad medicine.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is essential, of course, to this country that every Member of the House or of the other body strive in every possible way, by example, by speech, by conduct, to contribute to the successful prosecution of this war. All Members of this House are vitally and deeply interested in it. Most of us have boys who are now in the service of their country, many of us have nephews and friends and boys of our friends who are fighting on foreign soil. Put it is equally important that we as a legislative branch of this Government guard jealously and zealously the rights and the prerogatives of this body.

The very heart and core of democracy is the parliamentary system. The history of every country that has lost its liberty is the history of the gradual centralization of power in the Executive and the stripping, so to speak, of the legislative branch of government of its powers and prerogatives.

When the time comes in this country that the legislative branch of government lacks that independence and that courage to speak honestly and truthfully and to vote convictions that are sincerely and profoundly felt, that moment will mark the decay and the disintegration of this Republic. Nations are sometimes destroyed by a sudden revolution, but more often republics are destroyed by the gradual process of subversion, the step-by-step method under which under one pretext or another one power is taken away from the legislative branch and then another power is taken away from it, until finally we have the totalitarian scheme of bureaucracy which means government by bureaucratic edict, which is the first step toward dictatorship, which creates conditions under which dictatorship is inevitable.

The Roman republic preserved the externalism and the forms of a democracy or of a republic long after Caesar had usurped the real functions of the legislative branch of government. He permitted the Roman senate to exist as window dressing during a period of transition, because he well knew that the people of Rome were not quite prepared for the destruction of their republican system.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, a wise and alert Congress working in the interest of a free electorate will always be jealous of its rights and will resist every attempt that may be made to curtail those rights and responsibilities.

There is no more insidious way of destroying democracy than the method of discrediting the Congress of the United States. I do not mean by that that people should not criticize Congressmen or the Congress. I recognize that Congress, like the executive branch and the judicial branch, should always welcome constructive criticism from the Nation. There is no one so perfect that he cannot

improve himself with the aid of constructive criticism. Therefore I do not want to be understood as branding as subversive those who exercise their God-given right to criticize Members of Congress or to criticize Congress.

THE CAMPAIGN TO DISCREDIT CONGRESS

I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to what I conceive to be a well-organized and highly financed conspiracy on the part of devotees and followers of totalitarianism to discredit individual Members of Congress, to discredit committees of Congress, and to discredit Congress as a whole. It is a very clever piece of strategy, one with which I have been familiar for some time, a strategy that I knew 4 years ago would inevitably be used in this country when the occasion made it appropriate, the strategy of attempting to pin the Nazi or Fascist label upon all those who do not agree to certain principles or certain policies of the present administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, in their attempt to discredit Congress through this smearing campaign, it is only right that Congress should know who is engineering the campaign, who is financing the campaign, and why they are attempting to do it. I have here a number of excerpts from different magazines and publications. From the New Republic, for instance, as follows:

MARTIN DIES, a Democrat of Orange, Tex., who came to Congress in 1931, had been so clearly acting in the best interest of the Axis Governments that he is now the most frequently quoted American on Axis broadcasts sent to this hemisphere.

That was used not only in the New Republic but in other magazines of the same character as a part of a well-organized conspiracy to create the impression, through the Hitler tactics of propaganda, that the committee that I have the honor to serve as chairman has been pro-Axis or pro-Hitler. This first appeared in the form of a release of a statement purporting to come from the Federal Communications Commission, to the effect that the listening post of the Commission had discovered that my name was more frequently used by the Axis Powers than any other living American. The truth was that our committee had just exposed some of the officials in that Commission, and in their attempt to fight back or to discredit the committee this so-called report was first given to the Birmingham Age-Herald, a newspaper published in Alabama, and then to Newsweek and PM. I immediately took the matter up with Mr. Fly, and, of course, there was not any such report, and, of course, there was no action taken by the Communications Commission to ascertain who was the most frequently quoted American. It came from those in the Commission who wanted to smear me and to create the impression that I had favored the Axis Powers. It would be unimportant that it should be mentioned to the House were I the only Member of Congress who has been repeatedly attacked by this group, but let us remember that, preceding the last campaign, there were attacks made on a majority of the Members of this House. The attacks

were not confined to temperate language. There was no attempt to constructively criticize Congress. Wholesale and sweeping indictments were made that Members of this Congress were the tools and agents of Adolf Hitler.

Let us take, for instance, the New Republic. Here is a magazine, Mr. Speaker, that parades under the name of liberalism. It pretends to speak for the liberals of America. This magazine carried a number of statements accusing many Members of this House of being Fascists and sympathizers with the Axis Powers. I want to discuss, if I may, this magazine. I want to point out the part which the magazine, the New Republic, has played in this coalition of antiparliamentarism.

It will be recalled that the vicious document known as A Congress To Win the War was published as a supplement to the New Republic on May 18, 1942. The Union for Democratic Action and the New Republic claimed joint responsibility for the document.

Before I divulge to this House a startling fact about the New Republic, I wish to refresh your memories concerning a few of the magazine's editors. For many years Malcolm Cowley has been one of the editors of this journal. On January 15, 1942, I addressed this body at some length on the record of Malcolm Cowley. I also presented to every Member of the House 24 pages of documentary evidence which established conclusively that Malcolm Cowley had for years collaborated closely with the Communist Party; that he had, in fact, served publicly as a member of the Communist Party's campaign committees. A few days after I exposed Cowley's record, he published a volume of poems in one of which he described enthusiastically the march of a mob of armed revolutionists upon the Capitol and their successful armed seizure of the very Chamber in which we sit today. At the time I addressed the House on Cowley's record and at the very time he published his poems, he was employed in the Office of Facts and Figures as chief information analyst at \$8,000 a year. As a result of my exposure, Cowley was forced back into private life, where he resumed his editorial duties on the New Republic.

For many years one of the New Republic's contributing editors has been Rexford Guy Tugwell, original "brain truster," whose current administration of the affairs of Puerto Rico reflects no credit upon himself or those who appointed him to the position of Governor of the island. The outstanding feature of Tugwell's administration has been a complete and undisguised contempt for the legislative branch of the Puerto Rican government. While holding his important post in our overseas island possession, Tugwell has maintained his official connection with the New Republic, and his name appears on the masthead of the very issue in which the vicious assault upon Members of this House was made last May.

Bruce Bliven is the guiding genius and principal editor of the New Republic. The kind of pseudo-liberalism which Bruce Bliven represents is revealed in his

link with one of the enterprises of Joseph P. Lash, that perennial youth leader of America. Bliven wrote the introduction for one of Lash's books, a copy of which I hold in my hand. The book bears the imprint of the Communist Party's publishing establishment, which is known as International Publishers, but the chief fact with which I am now concerned is Bruce Bliven's glowing recommendation of Lash's views as set forth in this volume.

Naturally, I cannot quote at any great length from Lash's book, but I must point out that its entire substance is propaganda for the idea that American youth should, in the book's own words, "refuse to support any war which the United States Government may undertake." Appearing exactly 60 months before Pearl Harbor, the book contains Lash's own announcement that he was "waging a vigorous battle against American war preparations." Among other things, Lash demanded—and I quote his exact words—"drastic reduction in the present armaments budget, especially the Navy." Lash further proclaimed himself the leader of "mass resistance" against the United States Government in the event of this country's involvement in any war in Europe or the Pacific. I could go on quoting indefinitely the un-American sentiments of this self-styled leader of our American youth, but I must satisfy myself with the repeated observation that Bruce Bliven, principal editor of the New Republic, placed his unqualified endorsement upon this subversive propaganda which was written by Lash and published by the Communist Party.

Bruce Bliven has long proclaimed himself "a sincere liberal." That was his defense in the columns of his magazine last July shortly after our committee exposed the un-American and subversive attack upon Congress, made jointly by the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action. I declare, and the record which I am revealing proves, that Bruce Bliven more fittingly represents the utter intellectual bankruptcy of pseudo-liberalism. What possible element of true liberalism can be found in a man who at one moment comes out for "waging a vigorous battle against American war preparations" and then does a complete right-about-face and attacks Congress for having made too meager preparations for war?

As a sample of the downright falsehoods which the New Republic distributed far and wide in its attack upon the Congress, I cite a single example together with Bruce Bliven's own acknowledgment of the falsity of his magazine's charges. One of the Members of this House in the Seventy-seventh Congress—let us call him Congressman X—was accused of certain things in the New Republic's supplement of May 18, 1942. He was accused of being interested in a company where the employees were paid 10 cents an hour. He was further said to have been found guilty of unfair labor practices by the National Labor Relations Board. It was further alleged by the New Republic that the efforts of the American Federation of Labor to organize Congressman X's plant were met with

stubborn resistance by the management. All of these charges were absolutely without any foundation in fact, yet the New Republic which contained these falsehoods was distributed throughout the district of Congressman X. In the recent election Congressman X was defeated. Almost 7 weeks after election day Bruce Bliven wrote the following to Congressman X:

I find that in some instances we did you an injustice, and we are planning to print a correction and expression of regret on these points in the New Republic in the immediate future.

Now let us suppose for the moment that Congressman X wanted to sue the New Republic for the irreparable damage which he suffered in consequence of the magazine's admitted falsehoods. Would he be able to do so? Absolutely not. One hundred percent of the New Republic's capital stock is owned by a foreign corporation. That is the startling fact which I promised to disclose about this pseudo-liberal publication.

On the masthead of the New Republic, the publisher's name is given as Editorial Publications, 40 East Forty-ninth Street, New York. An investigation into the ownership of Editorial Publications revealed that all of the capital stock of the organization is owned by a foreign corporation. Consider, therefore, the effrontery of Bruce Bliven and his magazine in issuing any kind of advice on the composition of the Congress of the United States, to say nothing of their attack upon the institution of Congress. The capital stock of Editorial Publications is listed with the secretary of state of New York as \$1,750,000, but not 1 cent of that stock is held in the United States.

The case of the New Republic is reminiscent of the Bermuda corporations which the Treasury Department exposed not many years ago. I hardly need to point out that the Treasury Department kept hands off the New Republic even though its situation was exactly parallel to those Bermuda corporations which served the interests of various American concerns by avoiding corporation taxes in the United States, by concealing the source and location of funds, and by enabling those concerns to evade process within the jurisdiction of the United States. Sue the Republic? Not a Chinaman's chance, for its capital stock is safely lodged in a foreign corporation. And this, my colleagues, is the foreign corporation which lies back of the vicious attack upon the Congress which was distributed in an issue of a million copies last May. And this is the foreign corporation whose employee, Malcolm Cowley, enthusiastically rendered into poetry his imaginary seizure of this Chamber by an armed mob of insurrectionists. And this, furthermore, is the same foreign corporation whose magazine, in its current issue, sees in Winston Churchill only "a Tory Prime Minister" and sees in our American State Department only a vicious collaborator with Hitler's "nearest spiritual relatives."

"CITIZENS FOR VICTORY" ATTACKS CONGRESS

Next, I shall take up the purge organization known as the Citizens for Victory, of 8 West Fortieth Street, New York,

N. Y. This organization is responsible for many full-page attacks on Congress which appeared in the metropolitan press. For example, I hold here a photostatic copy of a page from the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1942, sponsored by the Citizens for Victory. The headline is "Will you help stop votes for Hitler?" The entire page is devoted to an attack upon Congress. They ran a number of such spreads, copies of which I have here. The Citizens for Victory, like the other purge groups, also issued a supplement on the voting records of the Members of the last Congress. I want to read you some excerpts from a letter, dated June 17, 1942, written on the letterhead of the Citizens for Victory, and signed by Frederick C. McKee, treasurer:

Thank you very much for your recent contribution to Citizens for Victory. Your donation, along with the hundreds of others we have received, will aid us greatly in our fight against the appeasers, defeatists, and obstructionists who are still trying to block America's efforts to wage a truly total war.

Citizens for Victory is convinced that the American public is tired of politics as usual, time wasting, and weak-kneed appeasement, both in and out of Congress. We know that the American people, when made to realize the crucial importance of this year's elections, will flatly repudiate the cowardly policies of the defeatists and obstructionists at the polls.

I am enclosing the record of the votes of the Congressmen of your State and district upon 10 major issues before the war. From a glance over the records of some of the more unfavorable Congressmen you will see how important it is that they not be allowed to have another chance to be wrong.

If you will examine this letterhead, you will find listed as vice chairman one Clark M. Eichelberger. Besides being the directing genius of several of the purge groups, Mr. Eichelberger is a consultant in the State Department, at \$25 per day.

Mr. McKee, who is treasurer of the Citizens for Victory, who writes so freely about the fight against "appeasers, defeatists, and obstructionists," and so enthusiastically about waging a "truly total war," is also secretary and treasurer of the National Casket Co.

It is also significant to point out at this time that one of the highest-paid officials of the Citizens for Victory is one Jay Lovestone, who was formerly general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States.

Most of the officials who make up the Citizens for Victory and the Union for Democratic Action have one main objective: That is to discredit Congress in order that their program of internationalism will not be hampered after the war by a strong and alert Congress.

The next purge organization I should like to take up is the Coordinating Committee for Democratic Action, of 103 Park Avenue, New York City. This organization on December 30, 1942, merged with the Friends of Democracy, Inc., to form one national organization to be known as Friends of Democracy.

The Coordinating Committee for Democratic Action, like its coconspirators, the Union for Democratic Action, the Citizens for Victory, and the New Republic, issued a special supplement to the public on the so-called voting records of

the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It, like the Union for Democratic Action-New Republic supplement, attacked Members as obstructionists and Fascists in an effort to undermine the people's faith in Congress.

This organization, like all the other purge organizations, has been thoroughly investigated by our committee, and while I intend to incorporate the details of this investigation into a special report, I would like to bring to your attention a few of the facts disclosed during the course of our investigation.

I hold here in my hand the supplement on Congress, issued by this organization, entitled "Your Congressman and Pearl Harbor," and call your attention to the language in the second paragraph, wherein they state that certain Members of Congress "felt a kinship for the attackers and obstructed all measures."

From another supplement, which they issued on May 12, I call your attention to the following language:

The Coordinating Committee took no part whatsoever in the controversy prior to Pearl Harbor over the United States entry into war. However, as part of the organization's regular procedure, it observed all pro-Fascist groups and tendencies and noted carefully the attempts to use high office and even the floor of Congress as a forum for working against democracy.

In the issue of their publication, *The City Reporter*, dated January 6, 1942, the following statement is made:

Both Senators and Representatives cooperated intimately with Fascist groups.

I have cited these excerpts from the official publication of this organization in order that you might see the vicious propaganda that has been circulated against Congress, as a body, and which could only raise suspicion and doubt in the minds of the people.

It may, or may not, surprise you to learn that the telephone and telegraph records of this organization reveal that they were in close touch with officials of this Government. For example, I hold here the long-distance telephone record of the calls made from New York to Washington, which shows that officials of the organization were in frequent communication with Gardner Jackson, Principal Economist of the Department of Agriculture. Several of the calls were taken by Mr. Jackson on a Government phone at the Department of Agriculture, and still other telephone records show that Morris Rosenblatt, executive secretary of the organization, received calls at Mr. Jackson's office in the Department of Agriculture, from his secretary in New York in July 1942, which was prior to the election. There are also telephone calls to Mr. R. Keith Kane, at that time Assistant Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, and now with O. W. I. There are also telephone calls to Mr. Morris Rosenthal, Assistant Director in charge of Office of Imports, Board of Economic Warfare.

I hold here in my hand original telegrams from Morris Rosenblatt, executive secretary of the organization, to Gardner Jackson, and William Lewis, Assistant Director of the Office of Facts

and Figures, and I ask unanimous consent to include these four telegrams in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, all of these organizations, the Union for Democratic Action, the Citizens for Victory, and the New Republic, and many more whose records I have here this afternoon, sought by hundreds of thousands of pamphlets and magazines to create the impression throughout the country that the majority of the Members of this House were pro-Axis. Why did they do that? What was the reason that Marshall Field would contribute large sums of money to known pro-Communist and purge organizations? Here is a man who parades himself as a liberal. Here is a man who, by his great wealth, is financing publications and organizations that attack not one Member, not five Members, but the majority of the Members of this House as secret sympathizers and agents of our enemies. Why would he do that? Is he sincerely a liberal—this man who is making millions of dollars every year? Last year, when he was contributing money to Communist organizations, he spent \$120,000 to maintain his racing stable; \$120,000 for a playboy's fad. I wonder if all the farmers in the county in which I live make \$120,000 a year. Yet here is this man in company with Arthur Goldsmith, another very rich man, who has contributed to this campaign, and William F. Cochran, a man with an enormous income in this country, who has likewise contributed. Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the days of my youth when I read those never-to-be-forgotten *Lives of Plutarch*, including the life of Julius Caesar, who was descended from an aristocratic family and who began his political career under the handicap of being denounced by the rabble as a reactionary, and who felt himself, therefore, compelled to outdemagogue the worst demagogues which Rome produced, and who undertook, by handing out large sums in bounties, free dispensations, and all sorts of free money to achieve a greater degree of popularity than his demagogic rivals who flourished during the decadent days of the Roman Republic. It is sheer hypocrisy for men to pose as defenders of the poor and then to denounce Members of Congress, the overwhelming majority of whom are not wealthy. Nevertheless, these self-chosen defenders of the poor, such as Marshall Field, depict the Members of Congress as great reactionaries and economic royalists, while Marshall Field himself, in turn, pretends a love for the poor so great that he disburses millions in order that his magazines and other publications may defame and smear the honesty and integrity of men who serve in this body because they love America and who, throughout this emergency, have demonstrated the fact that when a crisis does arise in America all men of every party, Democrats and Republicans, rally to the defense of their country.

Mr. Speaker, when I first announced that I was going to make this speech it was my intention to take up the many

details, and to show you check by check of, for instance, the Robert Marshall Foundation; how here was Gardner Jackson, sitting in the Department of Agriculture until a few days ago, writing check after check to organizations that the Department of Justice and Mr. Bidle said were clearly Communist organizations; organizations that for a period of 3 or 4 years directed their main attack upon the honesty and patriotism of a majority of the Members of this House. I intended, Mr. Speaker, to show you something about the Twentieth Century Fund. I intended to take up one by one these benefactors of totalitarianism who live in great wealth and luxury and live under circumstances that would appear unbelievable to the people of your district and my district, or to you and to me; nevertheless, they have the effrontery to use their wealth in order to attempt to create the impression in this dark hour that there are Members, or even one Member, of this House who secretly wants the Axis Powers to win; men whose boys like those of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], two of his boys are in the armed forces of this country; my own boy who volunteered; my nephew who this day is in Africa fighting for his country. I know many Members in this House whose loved ones are now engaged in this stupendous struggle. Yet here are all these so-called proponents of liberalism, who would reverse nineteenth-century liberalism and who would make of it an entirely different philosophy from what it was always understood to be. Instead of fighting against centralized government they would centralize government. Instead of protecting and safeguarding the individual against a growing bureaucracy that threatens our very liberty, they are using their influence to increase it.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I have not said that we have yet reached bureaucracy in the literal sense, for bureaucracy is government by bureaus. What I do say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are rapidly approaching a period in America when the real power and function of government will not be exercised in this Chamber, but it will be exercised by bureaucracy. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Congress is the chief bulwark of freedom in America. I denounce all organizations or groups who seek by sweeping statements and denunciations to create the impression that a majority of the Members of this House are not loyal to their country.

Why do they do it? Why was this organized attack against me revived a week ago? We should try to arrive at a correct answer; let us do so by the process of elimination.

Is it because some of the racial minorities fear that the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, may be prejudiced? I am convinced that could not be the true answer, for they have investigated my record from the time I was a little boy until the present time. I know of no man in this House who has been investigated more frequently and more exhaustively than I. Do you know what they found, Mr. Speaker, when they sent

representatives of the New Republic and of these organizations into my home county? They asked some of the citizens: "Was not MARTIN DIES anti-Jewish?"

And a Jew said to them, a Jew who lives around the corner, whose wife is one of the sweetest women who ever lived, both of whom have been my constant friends for many years—this Jew said to him:

"MARTIN DIES! Why," he said, "friend, do you not know that MARTIN DIES was one of the few men in Texas who during the power of the Ku Klux Klan, when the Klan controlled almost every political office in the State, when few dared stand out and speak against this illiberalism when the Klan became the controlling factor in this State, do you know that MARTIN DIES stood on the stump and throughout this country denounced the Ku Klux Klan, when he was burned in effigy, when his law firm was being boycotted by the Ku Klux Klan?"

"Do you know that MARTIN DIES walked into the courthouse at Orange, Tex., and defended Mr. Gloudeman, a Catholic who could not get a lawyer anywhere in the district—defended him against unjust charges when the courthouse was filled with Klansmen and when the Klan hired a special prosecutor to prosecute the case?"

They then asked some of my fellow townsmen: "Well, is he not anti-Negro, living down here?" "Anti-Negro," they said, "why, when Ben Wilkes was indicted by a grand jury as an accessory to crime after his boy had killed three white men and when Ben Wilkes could not get a lawyer in Texas or anywhere else to go into the courtroom and defend him, MARTIN DIES went there and defended him and protected him against any possibility of lynching and cleared him. No, you cannot make a case of intolerance against him, for he and his father before him have been outstanding advocates of the recognition of the fundamental rights of every man, woman, and child in all America."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this vehement and unrestrained attack upon me and upon, as I shall show later, other Members of Congress is not inspired by fear of intolerance. Is it that they fear we are opposed to measures necessary to win this war and establish a lasting peace?

Mr. Speaker, there are two kinds of isolationists in America: There was the isolationist before Pearl Harbor who was a sincere American who honestly believed that the best interests of this country could be served by maintaining strict neutrality, but who after Pearl Harbor abandoned isolationism and became a strong advocate of war measures. That is the type of isolationist who is constantly attacked in all these publications. But there is another type of isolationist, the ones who joined the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House, the ones who opposed all measures to prepare America. They abandoned this isolationism only after Adolf Hitler invaded Russia. Strange to say in all these publications and in all these attacks there is no denunciation of this type of

isolationist before Hitler's attack on Russia. There is not a single instance where any of these leaders of isolation before the break between Hitler and Stalin has ever been denounced or criticized in these publications; and, certainly, Mr. Speaker, my own record in that regard stands out above any criticism, for I have a record of 100 percent support of war measures, having supported every appropriation to protect and defend this country, having supported lend-lease under which aid was extended to Russia; so, therefore, there can be no real ground for opposition based upon that.

Then why this concerted attack timed appropriately after the Rules Committee postponed the hearing on our resolution for extension from last Friday until some future date? Why did Drew Pearson say over the radio last night that the National Lawyers' Guild would attack me today as an agent—a secret agent—of Hitler? Why did Walter Winchell last night time his insinuations at this particular moment? Why should the C. I. O. send out a letter to every Member of Congress and charge our committee with being a friend of totalitarianism and of Hitler?

I will tell you what is behind it, Mr. Speaker. There has been for 4 or 5 years a well-organized attempt to build up in this country a united front of radicals—a united front of Communists, crackpots, Socialists, men of different shades of totalitarian beliefs; there has been a well-organized attempt to bring within the sphere of their influence the Negro population of this country by appeals in publications that I could read to you. Constantly the Negroes are told that now is the time for them to achieve that degree of social equality to which they are entitled.

In the People's Voice, not long ago, A. Clayton Powell, a Negro Communist, advocated that I be assassinated—that my death was as desirable as Hitler's. Immediately other publications took it up and throughout the Negro press there was a most vicious denunciation, not only of me but of Congress.

What do they hope to gain by that? We in our country live in peace with the Negro; we respect him, for he has contributed much to the progress of our country. I have made hundreds of speeches in this country, and in many speeches I have said to the American people that the great majority of the Negroes are loyal, patriotic American citizens.

Why, then, Mr. Speaker, is this united front of radicals and crackpots so desirous of creating hatred and bitterness between the white and the colored races? Why are they making this appeal through racial publications?

I wish I had the time to read the translations of some of the foreign language newspapers and magazines published in this country in which we of the South are invariably held up as bigoted and intolerant and as naturally opposed to them because of their birth. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The real reason is that there are people in this country who do not believe in America and who

have never believed in it. They use the word "democracy" to cloak a brand of totalitarianism that is as vicious as any that ever thrived on European soil. What they believe in, Mr. Speaker, is government by bureaus, government with great centralized power, government in which they say that economic life will be regimented; true, but they are going to stop after having regimented the country economically and after having tried to do with economics what they accused others of trying to do with prohibition, namely, force everybody to be good by a paternalistic government. They say, "After we have done that we will stop and not bother your religion. We are going to give you the Bill of Rights, we will outrage and defile a part of the Constitution, but we will guarantee that we will not interfere with your religious and personal rights."

Mr. Speaker, the history of the world has always shown that free enterprise is the basic foundation of all democracy. When people are regimented economically, then the next step is to regiment them politically and religiously. When any group of supermen or social planners get control of government and impose their fanatical beliefs, they become avaricious for power and they subjugate the whole body politic.

Mr. Speaker, how can there be a free America if we attempt to build a gigantic bureaucracy in which we in Congress become powerless? Tell me bureaucracy does not wield great power in this country? Did I not go through an election and see how the long tentacles of bureaucracy could reach out into every county through Farm Security, W. P. A., and through this vicious practice of blanket authority to the Executive? I say it is wrong.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman has noticed lately that these crackpots led by a man by the name of I. F. Stone, of PM, I think his name is Feinstein, are now attacking and attempting to besmirch Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.

Mr. DIES. We have the telegrams here of these purge groups. We have telegrams from purgers like Frederick C. McKee, who parades as a great patriot. He is identified with six of these purge-Congress organizations. He is for weeding out and purging Congress of everyone who does not share his view.

Here is what he said in a letter. Let me read an excerpt:

Citizens for Victory is convinced that the American public is tired of politics-as-usual, time wasting, and weak-kneed appeasement, both in and out of Congress. We know that the American people, when made to realize the crucial importance of this year's elections, will flatly repudiate the cowardly policies of the defeatists and obstructionists at the polls.

Mr. McKee is treasurer of this organization, the Citizens for Victory, and director of the biggest casket company in the United States.

The Citizens for Victory organization distributed throughout this country the pamphlet entitled "Will You Help Stop Votes for Hitler?" Think of it, Mr. Speaker. The majority of the Members of this Congress are accused openly in the pamphlet of voting for Hitler. That is not construed as sedition, and they are not prosecuted for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to drive a point home, and I speak with all the sincerity in my heart, for I have often been on the unpopular side of many questions. I was on the unpopular side of the Ku Klux Klan. I was on the unpopular side of many questions in this House. But of one thing I am absolutely certain and that is that the greatest responsibility lies on this Congress, not only to maintain our prerogatives, but to restore the rights that have been taken away from the Congress of the United States.

How has this been accomplished? One, by blanket appropriations. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], and I, led the first revolt in the Rules Committee against the first blanket appropriation of \$4,000,000,000. We refused to vote for a rule on it for we then foresaw that whenever the Executive is given unlimited and blanket authority to use public funds, the Executive, whether Democratic, Republican, or whatnot, will find it impossible to resist political pressure. So that I believe, Mr. Speaker, that through blanket appropriations, through the right of bureaus to issue rules and regulations under which they become legislators for the country, this powerful bureaucracy has become entrenched. Why not be perfectly frank? Let us say to the American people what we all know, with few exceptions. When we call up the bureaucrats, what man in this House receives even ordinary courtesy? Why should they be courteous, when they feel that they are the real power in America, that they are the ones who administer the funds? They believe that we must come crawling on our knees to them in order to get jobs for needy constituents who are constantly pressing us for employment. We must come to them for public works appropriations in our districts in order to save ourselves from the charge that we have no influence in the city of Washington.

Bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker? It is as deadly and poisonous as any form of fascism there is and is as destructive of the freedom and the liberty of the American Nation as anything could possibly be. What does it lead to? Certainly there is no point in speaking in general terms in our denunciation of bureaucracy. Certainly we gain no end when we simply denounce it in general terms.

Let us be specific. Let us find out, Mr. Speaker, what bureaucracy leads to, how it is possible for men to secure positions with fat salaries in a bureaucratic set-up when they could not be elected dog catcher in any Congressman's district in this Capitol.

I speak frankly, Mr. Speaker, for I conceive it to be my duty to my boy and to the boys of my friends and the people of

my district during this critical hour to be perfectly frank.

I admire one thing about the British Parliament—that during the whole course of this struggle the Parliament of England has insisted at all times on its right and its freedom to criticize, not destructive criticism, not attempts to thwart the war effort, not sweeping generalities that seek to condemn this branch of the service or that branch or to repeat rumors and lies, but truthful assertions based upon facts that are incontestable. So I shall descend or ascend, as you may wish to term it, from generalities to specific examples.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All the gentleman says is well and good, I may say to my colleague, but I wish he would explain one thing. If this is a nonpartisan matter, why is it that in the middle of last summer, when we were going to have our State Democratic convention out there and we expected to see in the papers that the Speaker and majority leader would come out to speak to us—and we were all glad of it, because they would make good speeches—why did the gentleman's party send this loud-mouth Holland out there to repeat all the things the gentleman is now saying were said against the Members of Congress?

Mr. DIES. My party did not do it.

Mr. Speaker, I take first the case of Frederick L. Schuman. I intend to read the names and positions and records of many of the bureaucrats who have wormed their way into this bureaucratic set-up, in order to make crystal clear just what we mean by irresponsible, unrepresentative, crackpot, radical bureaucrats.

Schuman is chief political analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, at a salary of \$5,600 a year. Think of it. How many men in your district get \$5,600 a year? The district judge in my district, who serves five counties and has the responsibility of dealing with life and death, does not receive \$5,600 a year. Not 5 percent of the lawyers in my district get \$5,600 a year. As for the farmers, why, Mr. Speaker, out of all the farmers in my district there are not half a dozen who get \$1,000 a year after they have worked in sleet and wind and rain and in the heat of the midday sun, after they have battled insects and drought and everything else. To come out with \$1,000 a year would make them feel like "economic royalists."

Schuman is a man of violent political views. His Communist affiliations are a matter of public record. He belonged to the group which organized itself under the name of the League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford. Foster and Ford were the Communist candidates for President and Vice President, respectively. This League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford issued a pamphlet, which I hold in my hand. Over the name of Frederick L. Schuman and others, the following statement appears:

We call upon all men and women—especially workers in the professions and the

arts—to join in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism under the leadership of the Communist Party.

There are no if's, but's, or and's about this statement. Schuman, the chief political analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, signed it and will undoubtedly step up as a man and admit his participation in a revolutionary movement aimed at the overthrow of our American form of government.

How would you like to go back to your constituents, to that father and that mother who have just received word that their dearly beloved son has given his life in defense of America, how would you like to stand up on the stump, Democrat or Republican, and attempt to defend the appointment by bureaucracy of a man who does not believe in the system these boys fought and died to preserve?

In my own little town, three of the boys who grew up with my boys, who used to play on my front porch and in my yard, have all made the supreme sacrifice. For what? For bureaucracy, for totalitarianism, for socialism, for crackpotism? No, Mr. Speaker; for the American way of life and the American Constitution.

Here is the case of Goodwin B. Watson. Watson is Chief Broadcast Analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, at a salary of \$6,500. In a letter which I sent to Chairman Fly on November 18, 1941, I called attention to Goodwin Watson's long record of Communist views and his numerous affiliations with Communist-front organizations. As a result of that exposure this House once refused to allow any portion of the appropriations of the Federal Communications Commission to be used to pay the salary of Goodwin Watson. Since that time Watson's salary has been raised from \$5,600 to \$6,500 a year.

In an article which he wrote for a magazine known as the World Tomorrow, Watson lumped Coueism, pyorrhea, and Congress together as some of the great jokes of the age.

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

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has referred to a constituent of mine. I am in entire accord with what the gentleman from Texas has said, but I would like to know who appointed Mr. Watson to this office, and who appointed these other revolutionists?

Mr. DIES. Wait until I get through. In Common Sense magazine, Watson went on record as favoring a sudden, complete, and violent, that is, Communist, change from our present form of society to a Socialist society. In this article, he categorically rejected the idea of a gradual shift from capitalism to socialism. No amount of sophistry can explain away Watson's favorable views on communism as he himself publicly expressed them before he came down to Washington to draw his \$6,500 salary as one of our host of radical bureaucrats.

Watson is a fit associate of Frederick L. Schuman of whom I have already spoken, but neither one is qualified on the basis of his publicly declared beliefs to hold a Government position.

Here are four folders of exhibits which contain a fairly complete documentation of Goodwin Watson's Communist views and affiliations. I shall be glad to turn this evidence over to the committee which this House has recently set up for the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission.

William E. Dodd, Jr., is employed by the Federal Communications Commission at a salary of \$3,200 a year. Dodd was recently refused a visa by the State Department when he was assigned a commission which would take him to England. This refusal of a visa by the State Department was based upon information furnished the Department by our committee and the F. B. I. Among his many activities on behalf Communist Front organizations. Dodd was a secretary of the American League for Peace and Democracy which the Attorney General branded as subversive.

I shall be glad to turn this evidence over to the committee that this House has recently set up for the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission. And may I digress long enough to answer perhaps the question you are being asked, and that is, Why not let the Communists have a Government job, are they not fighting valiantly in resisting the Axis brutality and atrocities? Why is it we should not hire them? Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who from the beginning has not hoped and prayed that Russia would be successful in resisting this brutal unprovoked attack upon her sovereignty, and her soil. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I care not what kind of a government Russia has. I did not care what kind of a government Germany has, if Germany had not sought to impose that kind of government upon the peoples of other lands and upon my own land. I am not a maudlin internationalist who believes that I or my Government can go all over the world and make people democratic, whether they want to be democratic or not. I do not mean by that that I do share the views of extreme nationalism that has been the curse of many countries. I do not believe in extreme internationalism or extreme nationalism, but I do believe that every true American must put his own country and his own country's interests above that of every other country in the world. I have nothing but praise for the heroism and the courage of the Russian people. I would not under any circumstances sanction, indeed, I would resist, any attempt by our own citizens to go into Russia and seek to impose Americanism upon those people. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is a vast distinction between the Communists in Russia and the Communists in America. The Communists in Russia are loyal to Russia, they are fighting and dying for Russia, but the Communists in America had to wait until Hitler attacked Russia before they would come to the aid of America. So, Mr. Speaker, I conceive that it is the right of the people of this country to demand not that they shall not believe in communism, because that is an inherent right of every citizen, but I believe it is right to say to them, and

to say to the Government, "You have no right to take the hard-earned tax money of the loyal, patriotic people in my district, and to give it to people who are on record against the very Government that is supporting them."

Now let us take the case of Paul R. Porter. This man is chief of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Branch of W. P. B. at a salary of \$8,000 a year.

Think of that, my fellow Members of the House. Most of you represent ordinary and average districts in this Congress. Most of you know that even the bank cashiers, that even the presidents of banks in your small towns and villages never earned \$8,000 a year, and to the workmen, the workers on the farms and in the factories who are laboring constantly to preserve this Government, \$8,000 a year would seem almost a dream to them, something never to be realized. Yet here is a bureaucracy that is able to take this man and pay him \$8,000 a year.

Throughout most of his adulthood Paul R. Porter has been a Socialist, one of the leading Socialists in the United States. Porter has made no secret about his socialism. To cite only a single passage from his prolific Socialist writings, he has said:

Nothing less than a Socialist revolution will free labor from insecurity and industrial serfdom.

Furthermore, here is a copy of the New Republic's supplement, issued jointly by that magazine and the Union for Democratic Action, which attacked the Congress of the United States and was used as campaign document No. 1 in the purge organizations' efforts to defeat a large part of this House in the recent elections. You are familiar with this document. It was distributed all over your districts by the so-called purge groups and by the C. I. O. A million copies were scattered over this whole country. Replete with lies and libels, it sought to undermine the confidence of the people of this country in the legislative branch of their Government. I also have here a copy of the letterhead of the Union for Democratic Action, the organization which prepared this scurrilous attack upon Congress. On this letterhead the name of Paul Porter appears as a member of the national executive committee of the Union for Democratic Action. I also hold in my hand two telegrams from the national office of the Union for Democratic Action which show that Mrs. Paul R. Porter was in charge of the Washington Office of the Union for Democratic Action. Now I want to know how long we are going to sit here supinely and vote billions of dollars, much of which is used for the payment of large salaries to Government bureaucrats who are working to smear Congress and the Members of Congress. Where, by the way, is the Hatch Act? If, in the face of this gigantic bureaucracy, we have lifted our voices in vain to the executive departments and war agencies, it is still our constitutional prerogative and responsibility to appropriate the funds with which these departments and agencies operate.

In the case of another member of this gigantic Government bureaucracy, I

want you to participate in a guessing game. I want you to try to guess who made the following statement:

I believe in the abolition of the capitalist system. I believe in the necessity of the destruction of this system of exploitation by the might of workers' organizations.

Now, do you think that statement was made by Earl Browder? Or Karl Marx? Or Lenin, possibly? No; that statement comes from the pen of the principal business consultant in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs! His name is John Herling. He draws an annual salary of \$5,600 as principal business consultant. The circumstances under which Herling wrote his statement expressing his belief in the "destruction" of our American system are most interesting. Early in the life of this administration, John Herling was offered a position in the Government here in Washington. In a letter which he published over his own name and a copy of which I hold in my hand, Herling contemptuously rejected the offer of a Government post, saying, among other things:

I believe in the abolition of the capitalist system. I believe in the necessity of the destruction of this system of exploitation by the might of workers' organizations. * * * I decline to be even an insignificant member of a government which, after a year of displaying its brand of social engineering, has devised such a positive, direct, and universal scheme for workers' enslavement. * * * Nor can I entertain the elaborate rationalizations with which some radicals have spun their ways into various sections of the Roosevelt administration.

Despite his one-time emphatic and contemptuous rejection of a position in this administration, John Herling relented and accepted a \$5,600 salary in a post which he occupies today. Did he finally decide that he could further his belief in the destruction of the capitalist system better by working inside the Government than by working outside?

Let us take up the case of Paul F. Brissenden who is employed as a consultant in the shipbuilding stabilization committee of the War Production Board at a salary of \$8,000 a year. In March 1941, when the whole country, including official Washington, was becoming aroused over the Communist-led sabotage strikes on our major defense industries, Paul Brissenden and others issued a defense of the Communist Party which filled almost an entire page of the Daily Worker. Brissenden also signed a public manifesto supporting the appointment of the avowed Communist, Simon Gerson, as assistant to the borough president of Manhattan. Furthermore, Brissenden was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, a Communist front organization whose leaders were mostly well-known Communists and Communist fellow travelers. Brissenden was also a sponsor of the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance, an organization which was led by the well-known and avowed Communist Party leader, Herbert Benjamin. Associated with Brissenden as sponsors of this organization were Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, Israel

Amter, and many other equally well-known Communists. Despite whatever pretension of liberalism Brissenden may make, the record shows that he has been a long-time defender of the Communist Party and a frequent sponsor of the party's fronts. Now we confer upon him the distinction of an \$8,000 position in the War Production Board.

I do not want to tire you by attempting to read all of these examples. I have some 50 here, and 50 more over there, and I can multiply them, but I am giving you some of the leading examples, so that when you and I return to our war-worn and weary overtaxed constituency, when they ask us what we did in the great city of Washington, we can stand proudly before them and say, "Well, I attended to my job, and I stood idly by and let the bureaucrats, like Paul R. Porter, take over."

Take the case of David J. Saposs. Several years ago our committee received testimony in which it was established that Saposs had been a leader in a revolutionary organization whose avowed objective was for the "workers to take control of industry and Government and build a workers' republic." At that time Saposs was Chief Economist of the National Labor Relations Board. As the result of our exposure Saposs was removed from the N. L. R. B. Now we find that Saposs has recently been made assistant to the chief of the labor division of the War Production Board at a salary of \$8,000 a year.

In *Labor Age*, a magazine of the revolutionary group with which Saposs was prominently identified, he gave expression to the following un-American and revolutionary position:

But bourgeois democracy is a sham. When it is evident that socialism is the only remedy, it is not worth saving a democracy in which Socialist Parties only collaborate with capitalism * * *. If in the attempt to carry out such a program political action fails, then the workers must unhesitatingly resort to organized force. The (Socialist) International must take the position that if another war occurs the workers will destroy capitalism. With that end in view the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves.

At no time did we charge that Saposs was a Communist or a member of the Communist Party. It will, however, be perfectly clear to any student of the revolutionary ideologies, that the foregoing statement by Saposs was couched in the strictest Marxian terms.

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

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Is this Dr. Saposs the same man that this House of Representatives provided should not be paid out of the appropriations?

Mr. DIES. That is correct, and that is an illustration of the arrogance which characterizes men who do not need to face a constituency to account for their actions.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman, but I just want to keep the record straight. The gentleman spoke about government by bureaucracy and said that it had not yet arrived. Perhaps strictly speaking that is true, but the lawyers of this country today who wish to advise their clients, do not go to the statutes for the law, but they go to the regulations of the departments. That is almost government by bureaucracy.

Mr. DIES. Now, I have here the very special case of Maurice Parmelee. Almost a year ago, I addressed a letter to the Vice President calling his attention to the record of Parmelee, who was at that time employed in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$5,600. I cited the fact that Parmelee had written numerous volumes—all of them revolutionary in character—and that one of them, entitled "Nudism in Modern Life," advocated the practice of universal nudism in office and factory. I called the Vice President's attention to the fact that Parmelee's book contained 35 photographs, all of which are obscene, and that the volume was an attack upon the moral structure of our society and upon the church and religion. In the nudist society which Parmelee envisaged:

Convent and monastery, harem and military barracks, clubs and schools exclusively for each sex will disappear, and the sexes will live a more normal and happier life together.

Think of that, Mr. DOUGHTON. In that God-fearing district of yours, in the mountains of North Carolina, where people still go to the church-house and still believe in God and in religion, those God-fearing people that you have the honor to represent and have so ably represented for so many years, what would they think if excerpts of this lewd and filthy book were read from the stump and they were told that their money was being used and their boys were giving their all in order to make it possible for this man to use his talents and his pen in order to undermine the very basis of all democracies, which is the belief of people, not in the materialism of Karl Marx, but in the divine guidance of Almighty God?

Almost immediately after my exposure of Parmelee's activities—which included several years spent in European nudist camps—he was dismissed from the Board of Economic Warfare. The great bureaucratic fraternity was, however, not to leave Parmelee jobless for long. He is now employed as an economist by the Railroad Retirement Board at a salary of \$4,600. Time and again, a similar thing has occurred—a bureaucrat exposed in one agency, and fired as a result of that exposure, has been picked up by another agency of the Government. The contempt which these bureaucrats have for the Congress which appropriates their salaries is unbounded.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House who it

is that is responsible for these appointments that he has mentioned?

Mr. DIES. I will come to that in a moment. I want to give you some typical examples, because I want to hammer this thing home.

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

Mr. DIES. Please let me proceed for a moment. I would like to conclude this.

Now take Harold Loeb. On January 15, 1942, I spread the record of Harold Loeb before this House. He was then business specialist in O. P. A. He was let out of O. P. A. but not out of the Government service. Today Harold Loeb is senior economist in building materials for the War Production Board at a salary of \$4,600.

I know this is a matter that would be of vital interest to your constituents. I know that during these trying hours when they are all working and sacrificing to produce materials of war, in factories and on the farms, I know that the boys in the foxholes at Guadalcanal, faced by an insidious and brutal enemy, shot at almost constantly, in rags and in filth after the long stay in the foxholes, often with food not cooked, not warm—I wonder if that boy this afternoon as he lies there waiting for the enemy to show his head would get much consolation by knowing that at home, on the home front, in the battle of democracy here in America, a gigantic bureaucracy which he is called upon to fight for has given a job to the author of the following books:

The Professors Like Vodka, Doodab.

Think of a heavyweight, an economic adviser, a social planner, a superman—behold the mountain labored and there came forth Doodab.

Tumbling Mustard, Life in a Technocracy, The Chart of Plenty, Production For Use

The first three of Loeb's books are pornographic novels. I have never read filthier passages in a novel than some of those with which Loeb sprinkled his books. The other three titles of Loeb's books which I have cited are treatises on technocracy. At one time and for a long time, Harold Loeb was No. 1 technocrat in this country. Now, will you please search these 6 books and see if you can find any evidence of Loeb's qualifications for his present position as senior economist in building materials for W. P. B. In one of his technocratic works, Loeb advocated the abolition of money and the substitution therefor of erg certificates to be distributed willy-nilly at the rate of 20,000 a year to every member of society. I know of no man who could better qualify for the title of perfect crackpot, but he is the kind of Washington crackpot for whom we sit here and vote millions of dollars in salaries. I want to know when we are going to cry halt to this business.

I now take up the case of Sam Schmerler. In 1935, Schmerler was dismissed from his position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation on account of his Communist activities. In the space

of a few weeks, Schmerler found employment in the Social Security Board. There he worked for several years, meanwhile carrying on his outside radical activities as usual. Then in 1940, when the Communists launched the American Peace Mobilization, Sam Schmerler became one of the organization's leading promoters here in the Nation's Capital. Schmerler was in charge of arrangements for the Washington delegates to the Chicago convention which launched the American Peace Mobilization. Shortly after that, when the Peace Mobilization was urging and supporting sabotage strikes in our major defense industries, and when the peace mobilizers were picketing the White House, Schmerler was still an outstanding leader in the movement. At that time he was drawing a salary of \$2,600. Where is he today? Did the Attorney General's investigation lead to Schmerler's dismissal from Government service? Not at all. Sam Schmerler has been rewarded with a promotion. Today he is a Social Security policy consultant at a salary of \$3,800. There is not the slightest doubt that Sam Schmerler is a Communist. There is not the slightest doubt that his Communist activities have been consciously directed against the welfare and safety of the United States Government which employs him. Nevertheless and notwithstanding, Sam Schmerler has been rewarded with a \$1,200 increase in salary since the time of his outrageous and disgraceful activities in the American Peace Mobilization. Our committee first exposed Schmerler in 1939 as a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Furthermore, we sent his name to the Attorney General in October 1941 as one of the now famous list of 1,124 Government employees having affiliations with subversive organizations.

On September 8, 1941, I addressed a letter to the President in which I cited a small part of the record of Emil Jack Lever. At that time Lever was principal field representative of the Labor Division of O. P. M. at a salary of \$5,600. Here again, we are face to face with an old story. Since my exposure of Lever, his salary has been upped to \$6,500 a year and his present title is that of head labor adviser in the War Production Board.

I have here a voluminous documented record of Emil Jack Lever's Communist views, affiliations, and activities. I do not need to cite more than one of them. The rest are available for the inspection of the Appropriations Committee or any other committee of this House that might desire to see them. Lever was national executive committee member and treasurer of an organization whose publicly announced purpose was stated on its own letterhead, as follows:

It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers' republic.

I want to know if we are going to sit here supinely and allow a gigantic bureaucracy which has been thoroughly infiltrated by such as Lever to take over this country. If these facts shame us, you will realize that I did not make the facts; I am only reporting them.

Here is the case of David Lasser, about whom this House has heard much before. A few years ago, one of the largest and most influential front organization of the Communist Party in this country was the Workers Alliance. At the height of its influence—and I may add, its mischief—the Workers Alliance was headed by David Lasser. In 1940 Lasser broke with the Communists and denounced the Workers Alliance. But in addition to his past affiliation with and leadership of Communist front organizations, Lasser was also mixed up with technocracy. He was, in fact, editor of a technocracy magazine. Furthermore, as illustrative of his marked tendency toward one form of mental aberration or another, Lasser was president of the Interplanetary Travel Association. Today David Lasser is senior labor economist for the War Production Board at a salary of \$4,600.

I come now to the case of Tom Tippet, who is assistant chief of the rent section of O. P. A. at a salary of \$5,600. Tippet was one of the leaders in an organization known as the Trade Union Conference for United Action. Associated with Tippet in that organization were Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, and more than a score of other Communist leaders. The printed matter issued by the organization was as rabidly Communist as anything which ever appeared with the party's official imprint. Tippet was a national committee member of yet another organization whose revolutionary objectives were carried on its letterhead in the following language:

It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers' republic.

I call your attention to the case of Henry G. Alsberg who is now senior feature writer for the Office of War Information at a salary of \$4,600. In the early life of our committee, back in 1938, we exposed the extensive infiltration of Communists into the Federal Writers project. We showed how Communists had used the Writers Project to obtain the Government imprint upon their propaganda. We exposed some of the Communist filth which was put into the official publications of the Federal Writers Project. As a result of our exposure, the Congress abolished the Writers Project. Who was the head of the Federal Writers project? None other than Henry G. Alsberg who has crept back into Government employment in the Office of War Information.

Here is the case of David Karr who is assistant chief of the foreign language division of the Office of War Information at a salary of \$4,600. For 2 years, Karr was on the staff of the Communist Party's official newspaper, the Daily Worker. There is not the slightest doubt that all members of the Daily Worker staff were required to be members of the Communist Party. Karr was a writer for the Communist front publication, Equality, whose editorial council was composed largely of well-known Communists and Communist fellow travelers.

David Karr was also public relations director of the American League for

Peace and Democracy, one of the Communist fronts which Attorney General Biddle branded as subversive. Karr was a frequent writer for the League's magazine Fight.

Take the case of Guiseppe Facci who is senior foreign language information advisor in the Office of War Information at a salary \$4,600. For years, Facci has been active and prominent in the front organizations of the Communist Party in California. He was especially active in the American League Against War and Fascism on the west coast, an organization which the Attorney General branded as subversive. I have his complete record of Communist affiliations here, but I shall not take the time necessary to read it.

Take the case of David Wahl who is associate analyst in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$3,800. David Wahl signed the incorporation papers of the Washington Bookshop, a Communist enterprise which the Attorney General himself branded as subversive. Furthermore, the Cooperative League of Washington expelled the Bookshop from membership in the League on account of its notorious Communist control.

Hugh Miller is senior attorney for the Bituminous Coal Commission of the Department of the Interior at a salary of \$4,600 a year. Miller was chairman of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a Communist front organization which the Attorney General last year branded as subversive. Miller was also a leader of the infamous Communist front known as the American Peace Mobilization which the Attorney General also branded as subversive. Miller's wife, Helen, was dismissed from her position in the Department of Labor because she assailed the President as a Fascist.

Walter Gellhorn, assistant general counsel of the O. P. A. in the New York office at a salary of \$8,000, was a lecturer this week at the Communist Party's Workers School. Karl Borders, director of O. P. A. in Hawaii at a salary of \$8,000, has a long record of radical activities in Chicago.

Now, let us take the case of Jack Fahy. Fahy is principal liaison officer of the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$5,600. Jack Fahy worked in closest sympathy with and support of the Communist Party in Spain for 2 years. In the Daily Worker of October 17, 1938, Jack Fahy's resignation from the Socialist Party was published. His resignation from the Socialist Party was not so much a severance from the Socialists as it was an endorsement of the Communist Party. Anyone may refer back to the files of the Daily Worker and see that this was so. Jack Fahy is now being considered for a transfer to the Department of the Interior, where, if transferred, he is to become Chairman of the Territorial Affairs Bureau at a salary of \$6,500 a year.

Nathaniel Weyl is senior economic analyst of the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$4,600. For several years Weyl was very prominent in Communist activities among students. His

writings in the Student Review, magazine of the National Student League, make it clear beyond the possibility of any slight doubt that Weyl himself was a Communist. His writings in the Communist Party's newspaper, the Daily Worker, also leave no doubt about his being a loyal Communist Party member.

Take the case of Robert Morss Lovett, who is secretary of the Virgin Islands at a salary of \$5,800. Only a few men in this country have records of Communist affiliations which are as long as that of Robert Morss Lovett. I shall not take the time to give you his entire record, but here is a part of it:

Lovett was vice chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy, an organization branded as subversive by the Attorney General. He was a contributor to New Masses. He was also a member of the advisory board of Champion—magazine of the Young Communist League. He was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, a member of the national committee of the Student Congress Against War, a member of the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners, a signer of a letter protesting the ban on Communists in the American Civil Liberties Union, a member of the national advisory board of the American Youth Congress, a sponsor of the Mother Bloor birthday celebration, a sponsor of the Emergency Peace Mobilization which launched the American Peace Mobilization, a director of the American Fund for Public Service—better known as the Garland Fund—a sponsor of the National Student League, and a member of the All America Anti-Imperialist League. All of the foregoing organizations and many others with which Lovett was affiliated were Communist controlled.

Here is the case of Merle Vincent, director of the hearings branch in the Department of Labor at a salary of \$7,250. Merle Vincent was the first chairman of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, the Communist front organization which the Attorney General branded as subversive. Vincent was also temporary chairman of the National Conference on Constitutional Liberties where the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was organized, the latter also being on the list of the Attorney General's subversive organizations. I have here a sample of the growing boldness of the radical or pro-Communist bureaucrats. According to a recent issue of the Daily Worker which I hold in my hand, Merle Vincent delivered the first of a series of lectures at the Communist Party's own official Workers School in New York. It is time that we learned that there is a world of difference between our military alliance with Russia on the one hand and taking American Communists to our official bosom on the other hand. Pro-Communist bureaucrats such as Merle Vincent are doing their best to obliterate that all-important distinction. When some of our high Government officials rhapsodize at Communist-controlled meetings on the anniversary of the founding of

the Communist regime in Russia, it is pertinent for us to remember that Stalin does not hold pro-American celebrations in Moscow on the Fourth of July. Stalin is a thoroughgoing realist, while some of our officials behave like sentimental fools in coddling those who are wholly disloyal to our own country.

Gardner Jackson, who was principal economist for the Department of Agriculture at a salary of \$5,600. Jackson's Communist affiliations have been many. I call attention to only a few of them.

Gardner Jackson was a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. He was a signer of the Call for American Youth Congress. He was a speaker for the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. He was a speaker for the Workers' Alliance. He was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy. All five of the foregoing organizations with which Gardner Jackson has been affiliated were found to be subversive by the Attorney General.

Gardner Jackson was also a signer of a letter protesting the ban on Communists in the American Civil Liberties Union.

In my remarks to this House on September 24, 1942, I proved by checks that the Robert Marshall Foundation has become one of the chief sources of funds with which the numerous Communist front organizations are kept going in their subversive work. I also pointed out that Gardner Jackson is one of the five trustees who dispense these funds.

Alice Barrows is educationist, specialist in school buildings, for the Office of Education at a salary of \$4,800 a year. Alice Barrows was vice chairman of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, a Communist front organization which the Attorney General branded as subversive. She was also a member of the national committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, another on the list of the Attorney General's subversive organizations.

Now, take the case of William Pickens, who is principal securities promotion specialist for the Treasury Department at a salary of \$5,600. Pickens signed a manifest in defense of the notorious Communist Sam Darcy. Pickens was vice chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism, which the Attorney General branded as subversive. He was also a contributor to the Communist Party's New Masses. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, a section of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which the Attorney General also found to be subversive. Pickens was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, a speaker for the United States Congress Against War, and a sponsor of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Arthur F. Goldschmidt, special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior at a salary of \$6,500, and Marcus I. Goldman, employed by the Department of the Interior at a salary of \$4,000, were both ac-

tive members of the American League for Peace and Democracy and of the Washington Bookshop. Both of these organizations were found to be subversive by the Attorney General.

Leonard Emil Mins is employed by the Office of Strategic Services at a salary of \$4,000 a year. Mins and his father before him have been big shots in the Communist Party. Leonard Mins worked for the Communist International in Moscow for several years. He has been an active Communist since 1930. He has written for the New Masses and the Daily Worker. He has also been prominent in the League of American Writers, which was branded by the Attorney General as a subversive organization.

Henry T. Hunt, special assistant to the general counsel of the Federal Works Agency at a salary of \$5,600 a year, publicly protested against the ban upon Communists which was adopted by the American Civil Liberties Union. Hunt was also officially connected with the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, one of the organizations which the Attorney General found to be subversive. Hunt also has numerous other affiliations with Communist front organizations on his record.

Here is the case of Mary McLeod Bethune who is employed by the National Youth Administration at a salary of \$6,250. Mary McLeod Bethune was publicly and prominently affiliated with four of the organizations which the Attorney General branded as subversive. She was national vice chairman of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The other three subversive organizations with which she was affiliated were the American Youth Congress, the National Negro Congress, and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

Harry C. Lamberton, head attorney of the Rural Electrification Administration at a salary of \$6,500, was chairman of the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy which the Attorney General branded as subversive. It has been almost 4 years since our committee exposed Lamberton and his 581 fellow Government bureaucrats who were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Today we see some of the fruits of the administration's policy of extreme hostility toward and ridicule of our exposure of the American League. As a result of that policy, the radical and crackpot bureaucrats have become more and more bold in their contempt for the Congress of the United States. Furthermore, their number has increased alarmingly. Harry C. Lamberton was also counsel of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, an organization which Attorney General Biddle found to be subversive.

T. A. Bisson, principal economic analyst in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$5,600, was affiliated with the American League for Peace and Democracy. He also contributed numerous articles to the Communist publication, Soviet Russia Today. He was a speaker for the American Student Union, whose former head, Joseph P. Lash, has

assured us was a Communist-controlled front organization.

Katherine Kellock is employed in the Board of Economic Warfare at a salary of \$3,800 a year. In 1938, our committee exposed the Communist infiltration of the Federal Writers' project. At that time Katherine Kellock was field supervisor in charge of 4,600 Government employees who were at work on the notorious series of Federal Guide Books. The Congress broke up that project, but, like Henry G. Alsberg, who was head of the Federal Writers' project, Katherine Kellock has slipped back into Government employment.

Here is Jay Deiss, senior editor writer of the Federal Security Agency, at a salary of \$4,600. Also Milton V. Freeman, Assistant Solicitor of the Securities and Exchange Commission, at a salary of \$6,500. And again, George Slaff, principal attorney for the Federal Power Commission, at a salary of \$6,000. Here also is A. C. Shire, Director of the Technical Division of the Federal Public Housing Authority, at a salary of \$7,500. And to these add the name of Edward Scheunemann, assistant attorney in O. P. A., at a salary of \$3,800. Deiss, Freeman, Slaff, Shire, and Scheunemann were all leaders of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action. I hope no one will rise to say that these men's names simply appeared on a mailing list of the organization. Such was not the case; they were officially and publicly identified as leaders of this organization which Attorney General Biddle has branded as subversive.

Mr. Speaker, to read each and every one of these names would impose too much upon the generosity of this House. I could stand here for day in and day out and read you the records of men who have no place in our Government; men, Mr. Speaker, who have gone on record against the kind of thing that the people in your district and in my district believe in with all their hearts and with all their minds. There are many people in my district this afternoon, plain folk; they are not economic experts; they are not learned in all of the philosophies that grace our great universities. They believe in certain fundamental principles. Those people that I have had the honor to represent for seven terms in this House believe in this Constitution that our fathers purchased with their blood and our mothers by their tears. They believe in the preservation of this country, for they know that it is the only country under which every man can be free. If I stood before those people, and took a poll there would not be one hundredth of one percent in my district who would support and sanction the employment of men like some of these holding positions in our Government.

What, then, is the answer?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We all had on our desk this morning a copy of a statement from the Lawyers' Guild. I wonder if the gentleman is going to discuss that?

Mr. DIES. The National Lawyers' Guild is an organization of radical lawyers, many of whom are employed by this Government. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the figure, for I have not checked it closely enough, but I have been informed by those in my office that fully one-half of the members of this guild are employed by the Federal Government. It was so rotten that Adolf Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, withdrew from it, saying that it was a Communist organization. It was so rotten that Judge Ferdinand Pecora withdrew from it because of its communistic nature. It was so rotten that Robert Jackson, Attorney General, withdrew from it because of its un-American character.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in this speech, it is a shrewd tactic for those who really do not believe in democracy to wrap the cloak of democracy and liberalism around themselves and to pretend to go forth to battle for democracy when the thing that they believe in is the very thing that has brought curse and destruction to the republics of other countries and other ages.

So they would like to create the impression that those who expose them are pro-Fascist or pro-Nazi. Since the beginning of this committee, Mr. Speaker, every member of this committee knows there has been but one definite aim and that is to fearlessly expose every form of un-American activity. Three and one-half years before the Government moved against the German-American Bund this committee pointed out to the American people that it was an espionage organization, that its leaders were disloyal to the people of the United States; and in a letter which I addressed to the Attorney General 2½ years ago I called upon him not only to prosecute the German-American Bund, but also the Kyfhauser Bund and numerous other Nazi organizations. With few exceptions, there has not been a conviction in the United States obtained by the Department of Justice, which was not obtained by information from our committee's files. Let us read the record, and I do not do so as a special plea for the committee or in the role of one who is asking you as any favor to me to continue this committee. The committee has been under pressure from the beginning by those who would like to brand everybody as Communists simply because of their progressive views. Thousands of names of people have been submitted to me with the earnest and almost peremptory demand that they be branded as Communists simply because of their radical views. There have also been many people who have demanded that our committee brand as pro-Nazi everyone who has expressed conservative views.

Let me make myself clear, Mr. Speaker; I believe in America, and believing in America, I believe that everyone in America, whether Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Catholic, is entitled to his fundamental rights as a man; and because I believed in that I stood on the streets of Orange and defended a handful of Jews and Catholics who had few friends at that time to defend them and to champion their right to be freemen in

a free country. But there have come repeated demands that this person or that person be branded as pro-Fascist or pro-Nazi simply because he expressed intolerant views. I do not hold with those who condemn anyone on account of his race or creed but there is no law against a man's being intolerant as much as we deplore intolerance; there is no law against a man's denouncing the South. God knows I have heard southerners denounced as viciously in certain quarters of this country as I have ever heard Jews denounced. Only a few days ago a Member from Texas read an editorial here which stated that southern boys had joined the Army because of the low standards of living and because they could make more money in the Army than they could at home. That is typical of what I have encountered during the past 4½ years. I have seen people boycott meetings at which I was scheduled to speak because I came from the South. Talk about intolerance. What is intolerance? How can any minority invoke the name of tolerance and Americanism when it itself is guilty of the same intolerance it decries in others. Tolerance in America means that Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, southerner or northerner, all of us must unite unhesitatingly and without qualification in the support of the Bill of Rights, the chief cornerstone upon which this Republic was established.

Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the RECORD so that this House may know the truth? And I read an excerpt from the report of our committee as evidence of this service to Government agencies. This committee reports to the House:

As evidence of this service to Government agencies, the committee reports to the House that during the past 14 months, some 1,600 agents from the various intelligence units of the Army, the Navy, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service, and others have called at the committee's office in Washington alone for information. Hundreds of agents from the same agencies have called at the committee's branch offices in New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Chicago for similar information.

In addition to the above, the following agencies have detailed liaison agents to work daily at the committee's offices checking and obtaining information from the committee's files: Civil Service, Intelligence Unit of the Treasury, Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, State Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Work Projects Administration, Secret Service, and Office for Emergency Management. The branch offices of the committee have been used in a similar manner.

Numerous requests for information which the committee has received from Government departments have involved the committee's turning over large files of documents. For example, the committee on February 3, 1942, supplied the Office of the Coordinator of Information with 210 documents on Nazi propaganda. Somewhat earlier, the committee turned over to the Department of Justice hundreds of original documents which provided the Department with the basis of its cases against Auhagen, Zapp, and Tonn.

On August 15, 1942, the committee forwarded to the President a list of approximately 17,000 individuals who had been identified or affiliated with the Nazi movements in this country and suggested at the time to the President that some form of surveillance should be kept over these people.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years before there was any vigorous attempt made against un-American elements our committee had seized and exposed practically all their records and we sent to the President of the United States at one time the names of 17,000 people who were pro-Nazi, names this Government could not have obtained from any other source in the United States except this committee. Last year we received over 138,000 requests from Federal agencies for information which we gave. I say this in justification of the committee's work, because there is a well-organized attempt being made for the purpose of creating the impression that this committee has neglected the Nazi angle and that the committee has devoted all of its attention to the Communist angle. When they say "Fascist" what do they mean by "Fascist"? They mean people who believe in simple, fundamental Americanism, people who believe in preserving our Constitution, people who believe that America shall not fall a victim to the maudlin internationalism which characterizes a few people in this country. They mean people who are opposed to opening wide the gates of this country and permitting immigration to flood into our midst; consequently they have chosen from this House Members of Congress who oppose their views, who oppose their objectives, and with the money of Marshall Field, Cochran, Arthur Goldsmith, and others, they are seeking to play the old Hitler trick of propaganda that if you tell a lie often enough some people come to believe it as the truth. They are seeking by that technique to defame and besmear the honest names and reputations of men in this House who have no other purpose on earth except to protect America and preserve it for their children and their children's children.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I shall wind this speech up, because if I attempted to elaborate upon the many phases of it, it would be an imposition upon your time. Let me, however, as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, say to the House that on account of the importance of many of the matters that I hold here I shall recommend to our committee that a special report be filed for the purpose of documenting the evidence which shows the efforts that were made against Members of this House by these same forces, the lies that were disseminated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in a fair fight, I believe in standing up face to face and fight, but I do not believe in these blows below the belt; I do not believe in insidious organizations spreading propaganda that is false. I want to know why the Robert Marshall Foundation, which I exposed on this floor on September 24, 1942, is not taxed when they use funds for political activity in this country. Thousands of dollars have been contributed

by Gardiner Jackson and the other trustees to other organizations that are busily engaged in an attempt to smear Members of Congress. If that is not political activity, what is political activity? If it is such, why should not this great foundation of wealth be subjected to the tax laws of the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, because I do not have time to read all these names, I ask unanimous consent to place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I come now to the question of what Congress can do about it. The people of this country, make no mistake about this, are demanding of the Congress a few simple things. One is that we support in every possible way the war effort, that we devote all our energies, all of our abilities, to the one task of winning this war at the earliest possible date. On the other hand, they are equally insistent that we preserve this Government so that when our boys return they will not find that their sacrifices have been in vain. They are demanding that the Congress assert its independent role as a member of the tripartite government under which we live.

They are demanding that while co-operating in the war effort we act in a constructive and helpful way, not as haters of the administration, not as bitter critics of anyone, but as Members upon whose shoulders there devolves a special responsibility and a special function as sacred as that responsibility that is imposed upon the Chief Executive. This Congress can and will meet that challenge in a helpful and constructive way. It will meet this challenge by demanding that bureaucracy shall be curbed, that authority given to the Executive must be safeguarded by every possible provision and clearly defined and that the heads of bureaucratic government must come before the Congress and account strictly for their acts and their conduct.

We have no right to interfere with the conduct of our international affairs or by speech or by action to embarrass those who are charged primarily with that responsibility. We have a right to assume that those who are directing the international affairs on behalf of this country are jealously guarding our future interests. We have a right to assume as Members of Congress that those who are conducting the war effort are keeping constantly in mind that when this war is over the American people must face the gigantic task of reconstruction with the largest debt ever imposed upon people in the annals of time. We and the people have a right to expect that there be no commitments to any kind of internationalism which involves the destruction or the security of our sovereignty as a free people.

We believe that will be done. We have no right as Members of Congress to embarrass the President or State Department in the conduct of international affairs. But as Members of Congress we

do have the right to demand that every dollar we vote from the pockets of the American taxpayers shall be wisely and usefully spent, not in order to achieve some social idea of a crackpot, not for the purpose of trying to build up this theory or that theory of government, not for the purpose of entering into alliances to further strip the States of their authority and jurisdiction under the Constitution; but that this money shall be used as the money of a free people to be devoted to winning this war.

We also have a right to expect that when this war is over we shall have the courage and the determination to occupy Germany, Italy, and Japan with our soldiers and to say to them: "There will not be another war. We will not rely upon your treaties, nor upon your written or spoken word."

We will go into Germany and into Japan and there with our soldiers we will stay until such time as we may be certain that there will never be a recurrence of totalitarian aggression. To that end members of both parties can dedicate themselves without stint. To that end let us all work.

There must be national unity, but it must be a national unity cooperated in as much by the executive branch as by the legislative. There can be no national unity when bureaucrats are linked up with the effort to smear Members of Congress. In the report which I hope our committee will print, I shall give the names of men in the Government who behind the scenes have actively engineered this whole campaign to smear Members of this House who are exercising their God-given and constitutional right.

Bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker? I hold here a folder of evidence so outrageous that I wish I had the time and the occasion was appropriate for me to read you the telegrams. This evidence came quite accidentally to our committee in the course of its investigation of the Union for Democratic Action. We came into possession of many telegrams, bank records, and telephone slips relating to a matter not directly under our jurisdiction.

I am going to turn this entire file over to the Committee on Appropriations. Here are the telegrams and records of Government officials showing that some 10 Government officials were involved in a conspiracy by one business concern to smear and destroy another business concern; telegrams showing that officials of the Government seized the files and the records of an American business concern and turned them over to its competitor so that the contents could be used by the Union For Democratic Action in a campaign of smearing that business concern; evidence showing the extent to which irresponsible bureaucracy will go when men become so partisan in their feelings and in their beliefs, so called upon to usher in the new order by their own efforts, so fanatical in their zeal for the cause which they mistakenly confuse with democracy and liberalism, that they use their office in order to do what common decency and ordinary honesty forbid, to

take the files and records of one American taxpaying business concern and deliberately turn them over to its competitor to be used by a filthy agent of lies for the purpose of smearing and blackmailing and besmirching the other business concern and its officers.

While I shall not at this time disclose all these telegrams, for the simple reason that we have no jurisdiction over them and it would immediately be charged that the committee was stepping out of bounds and engaging in something foreign to its authority, I shall turn these telegrams over to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] in the hope and the certainty that he will take the telegrams and bring before him the Government officials concerned and ask them to explain their outrageous conduct. Congress does have a remedy. If we cannot obtain relief from one source, then we as Members can say, "If you do not get rid of these people we will refuse to appropriate money for their salaries."

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that that is what the great majority of the people of this country want. That is what 85 or 90 percent of the Democrats want, and that is what 85 or 90 percent of the Republicans want. If the people want it and it is our duty to do it, then I submit it is now in order that the Committee on Appropriations take immediate and vigorous steps to eliminate these people from public office.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion upon the conclusion of last year's work of the committee to express my deep gratitude to the members of that committee for their cooperation? May I express gratitude to the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle for their unswerving loyalty to a committee that has consistently fought the enemies of this country during a period when many people in America were asleep?

Mr. Speaker, if we had been as well informed by our diplomats and our commercial attachés about what our enemies were doing in Germany and Japan as this committee has kept this House and the country informed about what they have been doing in the United States, there would not have been a Pearl Harbor. That is spilt milk, but the future lies ahead, the future in which all of us must break a lance in the defense of constitutional government. We must say to the bureaucrats and the crackpots and the Communists and all of the disciples of totalitarianism, Americanism must live, America shall live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have just had an oration delivered in the more classic vein. I should like it to be known that at least one Member of this House disagrees; that I disagree with the sentiments expressed, the flamboyant manner of expression, and the use of this great public

forum as a means of what we in Hollywood would call personal publicity. I disagree.

[Here the gavel fell.]

"HORSESHOES IS HORSESHOES"—PART II

Mr. FLANNAGAN. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday, January 23, edition of the Washington Evening Star the information man of the W. P. B. attempts to set me right on my horseshoes. Well, if this information man—his identity is not divulged—does not know anything more about horseshoes than his answer to my remarks would indicate, I do not blame him for using a *nom de plume*—"information man."

If, however, I knew his identity, I would, in charity, recommend him for membership on the popular radio program, Information Please. Adams and the rest of the Information Please staff would have to strut their stuff to keep up with him. To begin with he states:

The prose style of the letter led Mr. FLANNAGAN to conclude that its author was E. R. Gay of the War Production Board, vice president of the St. Regis Paper Co., and son of the late Prof. Edward Francis Gay, of Harvard * * * but the spokesman for the Board today said the letter was not written by Mr. Gay, who is chief of the industrial branch, Office of Civilian Supply, but by one of his subordinates, Verne V. Gregg, in charge of farm machinery, a man born on a farm, graduated from Missouri College of Agriculture, one time manager of a 2,700-acre farm and until recently an employee of the Agricultural Department. Yes, said the spokesman, there were horses on the big farm Mr. Gregg managed.

My colleagues, there is nothing prosy about the style of the letter. It was not written in a dull or commonplace manner without regard for its metrical structure. Why, I think it should be set to music. Read it in my remarks that appear in the RECORD on page 397, and I think you will agree with me that the style is distinctly poetic, and clearly shows that the writer is not only endowed with imagination, but possesses the power of rhythmical expression. Far be it from me to accuse a distinguished alumnus of Harvard and the son of the late Prof. Edward Francis Gay of Harvard of having a prose style. Why in my remarks I conceded that he was a master of syntax and rhetoric. And to allay the suspicion of the W. P. B. information man that I was so dense as to consider the style of the letter prosy, I hasten to state that from beginning to end the letter clearly indicates a Harvard accent, rather than the farm flavor one would expect from a renowned graduate of the Missouri College of Agriculture.

But, my colleagues, why speculate on the authorship of the letter? I did not have to resort to either style, or accent, or flavor, to determine its paternity. The author was so proud of his learned treatise on horseshoes that he signed his name in black ink. The letter is signed:

"Edward R. Gay, Industrial Program Branch, Office of Civilian Supply."

I am indeed surprised that the information man now informs us that Mr. Verne V. Gregg is attempting to literally steal Mr. Gay's masterpiece. If I were Mr. Gay, I would not permit a subordinate in my office to steal my brain child.

And if I were Mr. Verne V. Gregg and had been born on a farm, graduated from Missouri College of Agriculture, and managed a 2,700-acre farm, I would deny with my dying breath that I ever entertained such thoughts about the lowly horseshoes as are expressed in Mr. Gay's letter. But if, as a matter of fact, Mr. Gregg did compose the horseshoe masterpiece, he played a dirty trick on Mr. Gay in allowing him to daddy it.

Now, just a word as to the management of the 2,700-acre farm. Probably the reason Mr. Gregg lost out as manager and had to seek employment with the Department of Agriculture was because he did not know his horseshoes. "There were horses, you know, on the big farm Mr. Gregg managed," says that information man, and probably Mr. Gregg fell down on the job of keeping them shod.

Continuing, the information man has this to say, and I again quote from the Evening Star:

What Mr. Gregg meant, it was explained, was that it would be a good thing for farmers to remove the shoes from horses at the end of their annual work period before turning them out to pasture. Otherwise, the horses cast the shoes in the pasture and when they are recovered by little boys they do not go into the scrap drive but are hidden under their pillows or nailed to the barn door.

Well, what Mr. Gay, not Mr. Gregg, said in the letter was this:

Horse owners can, in many cases, save shoes by removing the shoes immediately after a period of necessary road work or other work where shoes are necessary only during certain periods.

But now, lo and behold, it appears that the necessity for removing the shoes is to keep little boys from picking up the worn-out horseshoes and hiding them under their pillows or nailing them to the barn door, and thus diverting them from the scrap drive. As to nailing them to the barn doors: Horseshoes are supposed to bring good luck, and if, perchance, they do, the good Lord knows that they should be nailed above every barn door in America until we get rid of some of the wonder boys that are trying to run the farm program. As to little boys hiding them under their pillows, let me say that at one time I was a little boy on the farm, and I remained on the farm until I grew into a big boy, but neither as a little boy nor a big boy did I ever put horseshoes under my pillow. When night comes on the farm the little boys, and the big boys, too, are usually tired and worn out and ready for the "hay," and I cannot imagine that any of them would put horseshoes under their pillows to disturb their slumber. While I confess that as a boy on the farm I used to sleep with my dog, when it comes to sleeping with horseshoes I deny the charge, not only for myself but for every farm boy in America. Usually old Morpheus has very little trouble with the

country boy. But, my colleagues, would not old Morpheus have a time trying to nurse a country boy who had horseshoes under his pillow back to sleep?

As the information man does not attempt to answer my observations on the elimination of nonessential styles, I presume that what I said about the pointed toes and open toes and the high heels and low heels and the zipper styles stands good. This is indeed comforting, because the zipper style which permits you to zip them off and zip them on solves the whole problem.

In conclusion the information man reaches a new high in horseshoes. Old Dobbin is really going places according to the information man. Listen, and I quote:

What surprised Mr. Gregg, the board spokesman said by way of a return shot, was that a rural Congressman like Mr. FLANNAGAN did not understand this instruction in the letter: "more resets to get more wear out of available shoes." "Resets" do not mean changing the shoes from one foot to another, it was explained, but mean resetting the same shoes on the same foot. Unless the horse is manicured under his shoe periodically the hoof deteriorates (military term) and the shoe is cast while working.

Well, this return shot was a hot one and came high unto paralyzing me. Under the new rules of the game, I now observe, we are not only going to give old Dobbin the choice between pointed toes and open toes, high heels and low heels, black and tan, low quarters and high quarters, but we are going to open up beauty salons and give dear old Dobbin a manicure. And I suppose when the winsome lassie gets through manicuring old Dobbin that she will put on some hoof polish, to be selected to match up color, and then direct him to the next chair where he will get a permanent, mane and tail.

Holy smoke, "where," Mr. Information Man, "do we go from here?"

Let me again tell you a story:

Years ago I represented a 6 foot 2 farmer, who weighed around 250 pounds, in a lawsuit. It took a lot of cornbread, hog jowl and cabbage, and other foods rich in muscle building, to keep him going. In the course of the suit we had to make a trip into the cabbage country around Rural Retreat to take depositions. When we boarded the train to return home we found the car rather crowded, and my farmer friend took a seat by a nice looking old gentleman who, from his appearance, it was evident was a stranger to the countryside. I secured a seat immediately behind them. We had only gotten a short distance from the station when we commenced to run through one cabbage field after another, and so naturally the conversation between my farmer friend and his new acquaintance drifted into cabbage.

Said the stranger to my farmer friend: "Now, the way to cook cabbage is with cream," and he went ahead and told in an appetizing way how his wife creamed cabbage.

I saw that the new cabbage recipe was not registering with my farmer friend. He sat mum and looked bored. No doubt he was thinking about trying to do

a hard evening's work on creamed cabbage.

Finally the stranger said:

"Now, my friend, when you get home get your wife to fix you up some creamed cabbage."

And all my farmer friend said, and I could see by the expression on his face that he was disgusted, was:

"A little hog jowl won't hurt them."

And so say I; "a little hog jowl" complex won't hurt some of the bureaus handling the farm problem.

Moral: Give us a few more men in the farm program set-up who know more about cabbage and hog jowl and less about cabbage and cream.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on next Monday at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered recently.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks there have been a

good many rumors going around in reference to the number of airplane accidents in continental United States. Only last week I took cognizance of one of these rumors when I had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air. If the Members have read that letter, which appears in the RECORD, they will find that insofar as the Air Transport Command is concerned, a marvelous record of efficiency is being maintained in that service. That letter indicates, Mr. Speaker, that for the preceding 6 months' period, of the planes delivered to the Transport Command for flight to the 10 theaters of war throughout the world, only 1 fatal accident occurs out of every 500 planes received for transport. Over the 12 months' period, the Members will see when they have read the letter, that the record of efficiency of the Air Transport Command is so high that during that period, out of every 333 planes which were placed in the hands of the Transport Command for delivery to the 10 fighting fronts of the world, only 1 sustained a fatal accident.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I will be glad to yield when I have finished my statement.

Mr. HINSHAW. I just want to get one point straightened out.

Mr. BROOKS. I should be very glad to answer the gentleman's question later. Mr. Speaker, that should cover record of the Air Transport Command, but it does not cover all figures as to all Army aviation. I read the Nichols committee report, and there are a great many accidents which are covered by that report. The committee report states clearly the reasons for the accidents, and gives its conclusions and findings as to what action should be taken to prevent a recurrence of accidents of the kind investigated. But this report omits reference to the over-all figures as to the accident rate existing in the Army at the present time, in a comparative sense. Accordingly last week I addressed a communication to the Assistant Secretary of War for Air and asked him if it were possible to give me the figures down to date covering all Army air accidents in Continental United States. As a result of this communication, I am in receipt of a letter from Assistant Secretary Robert A. Lovett, which letter is as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1943.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: In reply to your inquiry about accidents involving Army airplanes, I am glad to give you below figures obtained from the Directorate of Flying Safety, Army Air Forces.

The expansion of the Army Air Force activities in the United States in the past year has been enormous and has reached a scale far greater than is realized by even well-informed officials of the Government. In the first 8 months of 1942 (the latest completely tabulated figures available) 74.3 percent more hours were flown than in the whole 10-year period 1930-40; 98.5 percent more miles were flown from January to August 1942 than in the entire 10 years 1930-40.

This 8 months' mileage is equivalent to over 48,000 trips around the world.

In spite of this extraordinary expansion, the rate of accidents per 1,000 hours flown was lower in the 1942 period than the 10-year peacetime average.

Accident rates fluctuate from month to month and from year to year. Hence an average is used to obtain a reliable comparison. For purposes of comparison and to establish a peacetime average against which operations can be fairly measured, the 10 years 1930-40 have been used as a norm. The figures for the first 8 months of 1942 show that the accident rate per 1,000 hours during the period was actually eleven one-hundredths lower than the rate for the 10-year peacetime period from 1930 to 1940. The rate of fatal accidents per 1,000 hours flown is up only fourteen one-thousandths compared with the 10-year average.

The increase in fatalities results primarily from two factors: (a) The great increase in speed and weight of modern combat planes as compared with peacetime planes; and (b) the very great increase in the size of the planes and the number of persons carried as crew. Since a large number of men are frequently involved in a single accident today, the rate of fatality per 1,000 hours has increased five one-hundredths compared with the 10-year peacetime average.

These figures are particularly striking when it is realized that our training schools and operational training units are operating under pressure of war. Furthermore, before sending combat crews into combat theaters located all over the world and in widely varying climates, it is necessary to train them in a variety of weather conditions so that when they meet the enemy in life and death combat they will not have the added hazard of running into flying conditions and weather with which they are not experienced.

The military airplane is a weapon—perhaps the most powerful one in existence. Such planes are very fast, heavily armed, and carry explosives. Nevertheless, in the face of these facts, it is notable that the frequency rate of accidents is still actually lower per hours flown than the average of the peacetime years mentioned above.

It is well to point out at this time that the number of accidents has increased and will increase in some proportion to the tremendous increase in the number of planes flying and the number of hours flown. This is so for the same reason that there are more accidents in a State with 1,000,000 automobiles than in another one with 100,000 automobiles. As time goes on and our air force grows toward its goal of becoming the most powerful one in the world the number of airplane accidents will inevitably grow. However, the important criterion is whether the rate of accidents in relation to the number of hours flown has increased disproportionately.

The Army Air Forces are understandably determined to maintain the fine record which has resulted from unceasing attention to safety measures and control. The directorate of flying safety is continually improving safety techniques in order to keep accidents at the lowest rate consistent with the hazards necessarily involved in the primary task of the Army Air Forces, which is to make our pilots the best combat pilots in the world.

We feel sure that the public is prepared for unavoidable accidents, but they are entitled to know all the facts which can be given short of disclosing information which would be useful to the enemy. Accordingly, as a matter of policy, the Army Air Forces do not withhold from the press news of accidents. In consequence the publicity such occurrences receive has created in the minds of some people the wrong impression that accidents are increasing at an alarming rate and that perhaps proper measures are not being taken to reduce them. The facts given

at the outset of this letter prove that the opposite is the truth.

A knowledge of the true facts and of the determined efforts which are constantly made to protect the lives of our men in training and give to them a better fighting chance against an enemy seasoned by years of combat experience should result in continued confidence by the public in the carefully planned and supervised program of the Army Air Forces.

If, as indicated in your inquiry, you intend to make this letter public, I trust that you will agree with me that it is best to have it published in full rather than in part.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Assistant Secretary of War for Air.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BROOKS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The important thing to remember from this letter is that the ratio of accidents per 1,000 hours flown is being reduced and the rate of fatal accidents per 1,000 hours flown is up only fourteen one-thousandths as compared with the 10-year average between 1930 and 1940. When we contemplate the fact that 98.5 percent more miles were flown in the 8 months from January 1942 to August 1942 than in the entire 10 years from 1930 to 1940, we can say that this record of efficiency is truly remarkable. Especially is this the case when we find that the mileage flown during this 8 months' period is equivalent to 48,000 trips around the world, or a total of 1,200,000,000 miles.

The Army is training pilots in tremendous numbers and is developing very rapidly the largest and most powerful air force in the entire world. Greater speeds, more powerful engines, larger bombing and transport planes, and the necessity for training under sub-Arctic conditions as well as under typical tropical conditions those who fly the ships—all are conditions which place a greater strain upon the efforts to keep down the rate of accidents and prevent unnecessary crack-ups and casualties. In spite of all of these factors, the letter of the Assistant Secretary for Air presents some facts and figures which should be of intense interest to the families of the men who compose our air force as well as the public at large. It is truly a magnificent wartime record of a great air force.

To those of us who are especially interested in the standing and efficiency of American aviation, I invite your study to the report of the Military Affairs Committee, No. 2515, dated October 2, 1942. This report shows the same trends as early as October 1942 as are shown in the letter of Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary for Air. The report was accompanied by a box score showing the actual number of American planes lost in combat to those lost by the enemies of this country. At that time the ratio of losses in combat with the Japs was from five to seven Jap planes to every American plane lost. The ratio as to the Germans at that time was three Nazi planes lost for every one of our own; and for the entire war on all fronts the ratio at that time was between two and three enemy planes lost to every

American plane brought down. It, therefore, appears that we are more than holding our own on every combat front in the world, and that our pilots, mostly trained hastily under wartime conditions, are more than the match in courage, ability, and skill of those of any other nation.

In conclusion, I quote from the last paragraph of the report of the Military Affairs Committee, to which I have already referred:

There is an old saying, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof." In the final analysis, it is the box score that counts. It is idle to compare the speed, performance, and maneuverability of one plane against another when engaged in war. These in actual combat are academic questions. It is only common sense to say that our planes and our pilots are performing exceptionally well when they are knocking down two or three enemy planes to every one of ours that is lost. Your committee finds that our planes are not inferior to those of Germany and Japan. We also find those in command of our Army Air Forces fully alert to the lessons in combat that are being learned and ready to make such changes as experience dictates. The American people may be justly proud of the record of the Army Air Forces, their achievements, and their will to bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

I yield now to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I was wondering if, in referring to the Air Transport Command, the gentleman was referring to the command which transports troops, or the ferry service, or the Air Service Command, which transports freight, or to the whole thing altogether.

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the Transport Command is a part of the Air Force.

Mr. HINSHAW. To which part was the gentleman referring?

Mr. BROOKS. I refer to the aviation that the Assistant Secretary of War refers to in his letter of January 27, which the gentleman no doubt read in the RECORD.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that the Ferry Service that the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. BROOKS. It is more than the Ferry Service. It is also the Transport Command. It transports not only troops, but freight.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then it includes all of these branches?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; and naturally transports combat planes and transport planes to the fronts all over the world.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized for 1 hour.

MEAT RATIONING IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak today to explain as nearly as I can a subject about which many of us have perhaps given very little thought.

Beginning in November 1942 we had some rules and regulations set up by the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture with regard to our supply of meat. There was a quota placed on animals slaughtered. There was a ceiling price placed on the dressed meat.

In many areas in the State of California people have not had meat on their table for a period of 3 or 4 weeks at a time. In one community of 9,000 people in my congressional district for 4 consecutive weeks there has been no bacon or ham for sale in any of the stores. I am wondering how long we as American citizens can continue to wait while some bureaucrats down in the departments sharpen their pencils, wear them out on paper, trying to figure out some new scheme or theory while somebody back home who is working in agriculture, a defense plant manufacturing airplanes, or working in the shipyards trying to produce material for our armed services goes without food.

Departmental officials have told me and other Members from the State of California that as of January 1, 1943, meat rationing would be in effect. January 1 has come and gone. The month of January has gone. What do we find this morning? A committee from the Department of Agriculture, a committee from the Office of Price Administration, members of the Lease-Lend, and a member of the Quartermaster Corps spent 2 hours in my office, together with three other Members of the California delegation who were named by the dean of our California group, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], to try to work out this problem. They told us this morning it would be April 1 before we could expect any assistance in the State of California in securing meat.

So I have asked for this time to try to give my viewpoint as I see it. If we are going to have a meat shortage in the United States, if we can foresee additional meat needed other than what we hope to have in the year 1943, certainly we should not sit around here as Members of Congress and let somebody in the Departments set up rules and regulations to continue to slaughter female animals which we hope may produce more meat. That has happened in the dairy industry.

Last year, in January, I spoke in the well of this House and again in the fall of 1941, pointing out what would happen to the dairy industry. Not only I, but other Members spoke on that subject. We were ignored and we awakened to find that dairy cattle are now being slaughtered. Now we are going to have rationing of milk and dairy products. So I think this situation is serious. Our farmers could produce amply if only they were left alone long enough without somebody injecting a lot of red tape to strangle the businessman or the farmer

who is doing his utmost to produce in large amounts what the civilian population will use, plus what our armed forces will use.

As I told you, I began studying this problem in November. I had meetings in my home State in the month of December with the officials of the Office of Price Administration. Information was set forth at that time and given to the officials of the Office of Price Administration, but they have undoubtedly ignored the solution set up by their own man in the State of California to assist in this program of providing additional meat for that State. Here is his letter of recommendation to his official.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Fresno, Calif., December 5, 1942.

To Bert M. Green, acting district manager,
Fresno district office.

From John J. Gallagher, chief price attorney,
Fresno district office.

Subject: Restriction Order No. 1.

On December 4, 1942, at your request, I attended a meeting held in Tulare, Calif., at which meeting were present the secretary of the Retail Grocers' Association of this district; three or four retail meat dealers; Congressman ALFRED ELLIOTT, Congressman for that congressional district; the manager of the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce; the manager of the Kern County Chamber of Commerce; and representative of the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co.

Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. have their headquarters in Kern County, and have been supplying retail meat dealers throughout the counties of Kern, Kings, and Fresno, approximately 25 percent of their business being in these outside counties.

Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. informed their retail dealers located outside of Kern County that beginning December 7 they would no longer be able to supply them with meat. Most of these retail dealers have depended exclusively on the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. for their supply, and now would be unable to go to any other meat packing company for their meat since these other meat packing companies have all they can do to supply customers they have been supplying under their quotas.

The reason for Kern Valley Meat Packing Co.'s action is as follows:

Kern County has a population of approximately one hundred and thirty-five to one hundred and forty thousand people. A year ago there were between 8 and 10 meat-packing companies supplying retail meat stores. Among these meat-packing companies were Armour, Cudahy, Swift, Hormel, etc. They shipped their meat in from Los Angeles, and accordingly, when restriction order No. 1 became effective, these outside packing companies stopped supplying meat to Kern County, and, despite the fact that their quotas were determined on people whom they had supplied in Kern County, they no longer make deliveries to Kern County. The result of this is that the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. is the only slaughterer and supplier of Kern County and vicinity at the present time.

If Kern Valley Meat Packing Co.'s quota is not raised immediately, beginning December 7, 1942, all the retail dealers that have been buying from the Kern Valley Meat Packing Co. outside of Kern County will have no meat at all for their customers.

I believe some method should be set up in which the meat quotas should be determined by territory and population rather than by giving packers quotas when these packers' quotas can move out of a district, take their quotas with them, leaving the people of the district meatless.

This problem is true at the present time in Kern County and vicinity, and we shall have the same problem throughout this whole valley in the immediate future. Unless something is done, the result of the present restriction order will be that packers residing outside of districts and furnishing these districts will take their quotas with them and move to their home districts, with the result that these home districts will have much more than their share of the meat, under the quota system, whereas the territories these packers have left will have practically no meat at all.

Some people ask why should there be a shortage just in the State of California. At the present time that State has had an increase in population estimated all the way from 750,000 to 1,000,000 within the last 9 or 10 months. In addition to that, we have in round figures almost a million armed forces in the State of California, of whom perhaps one-third are released each week end, so that they consume in the restaurants and hotels meat that the Government thought would be used for the civilian population. Certainly we do not want to tell the men in the armed forces when they are away from camp that they cannot purchase a sirloin steak or a juicy hamburger.

I am going to give you some figures to prove my point. The estimate given by the Department of Agriculture in 1943 of the production of meat in the United States was 25,700,000,000 pounds. Lease-Lend and the armed forces will receive of that amount 8,500,000,000 pounds, leaving 17,200,000,000 pounds of meat available for the use of our civilian population. On that basis, estimating 125,000,000 people in the civilian population, there would be provided for each and every person, considering the babies who may be eating meat, 2.6 pounds of meat per week. Yet in 1941 the people of the United States consumed 18,900,000,000 pounds of meat. On the quota of our civilian population at that time we had 2.8 pounds of meat per person per week, only two-tenths of a pound difference.

I will agree that a majority of civilians have more money today with which to purchase meat, especially those who are working in the manufacturing plants and who have jobs that they did not have in 1941. But here we are with a rationing program, when we have an estimated amount of meat available for 1943 of 25,700,000,000 pounds of meat against meat actually consumed in the United States in 1941 of 18,900,000,000 pounds.

How does this thing operate? There is a ceiling price placed on slaughtered animals but not on animals on the hoof; so the slaughterhouse man, the packing-house man, in order to operate, has got to get enough to pay his overhead, but the ceiling prevents this. To illustrate how this works out, let us assume that a heifer on the hoof weighs 800 pounds. This heifer will dress out 55 percent of her liveweight, or 440 pounds. The packer pays 13½ cents on hoof for that animal, which is \$108; but there is a ceiling on the meat after it is dressed of 23.75 cents a pound, so, after he dresses the animal, he gets only \$104.50, immediately losing \$3.50 in the operation. Certainly, he has the hide and the tallow, but also he has his operating costs. So

the average packer today for every animal he kills, because of various rules and regulations, is losing from \$8 to \$10. How long can the packer operate under such a program? The man in the feed yards is not doing his utmost to fatten more animals, because he is wondering how long it will be before the packer will have to go out of business because of losses.

Who is responsible? Certainly nobody should be working for our Federal Government who has facts that in some localities people have been without meat from 3 to 5 weeks, yet wants to wait an additional 60 days in order that he may push a pencil around some more blueprints, set up more strangling rules and regulations and red tape, instead of approaching this thing on a businesslike basis.

As a result of what has been done, a black market has grown up. This is not a healthy situation. We are forcing people to be crooks in order that they may operate. No quota or ceiling has been placed on the restaurant or hotel operators. They can buy a steak for 50 cents and charge \$1.50 for it, take it or leave it.

No rules or regulations have been set up regarding the cold storage units all over the United States. In many places in the West, not only the State of California but in many other Western States, we have a supply of meat stored away. If it is not used before warm weather sets in perhaps it will spoil because the plants are not equipped to continue to operate and protect the meat in warm weather.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I remember it, the gentleman has stated that the total consumption of meat in the United States in 1941 was 19,000,000,000 pounds; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Eighteen billion nine hundred million pounds.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is very close to 19,000,000,000.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman also stated that the civilian consumption in this calendar year has been fixed at 17.2 billions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Since 1941, close to 10,000,000 men have been taken out of the civilian population, and these 10,000,000 men are now assigned a quota under military authority. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, perhaps 10 percent of the 1941 consumption has been removed from the civilian consumption quota. Is it correct therefore to say that in assigning 17,200,000,000 pounds for civilian consumption today there is no actual reduction in the amount of meat over the normal consumption of 1941?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, can the gentleman assign any reason whatsoever for the rationing of meat today when the meat already assigned for ci-

vilian consumption is practically identical with the amount we normally consume without rationing and without restriction in 1941?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The bureaucrats' answer to that is that they want to force into the channels of lend-lease and our Army quartermaster department more meat. More meat for the armed forces and more meat for lend-lease. We are all agreed that the armed forces must come first regardless of what we have to do for our civilian population, but the armed forces and lend-lease can use only 8,500,000,000 pounds in 1943, according to their own figures, so we still have 17,200,000,000 available for the civilian population, which will give them two-tenths of 1 percent of a pound less meat for 1943 than they actually consumed in 1941.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, if we were permitted to go ahead and slaughter and consume meat today on a perfectly normal level there would be no shortage whatsoever and consequently no need of rationing, not only in California but elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think we shall have to go back to practically the old formula, the law of supply and demand and proper distribution. Part of our difficulty and one of the reasons this has bogged down is distribution. They are trying to put these new schemes into effect without making any allowance at all for the problem of proper distribution. No matter how much meat is available for consumption, unless it can be distributed to the point of consumption the program is bound to bog down. For instance, in my valley area we had 10 slaughterhouses serving the territory. When this program went into effect all but 1 of them left.

The quota provides for 70 percent of the slaughter for civilian consumption and 30 percent for the armed forces. That would have been all right had the 10 slaughterhouses continued there, but when 9 moved away they took their quotas with them and the result is we have but 1 slaughterhouse to supply the area that 10 formerly supplied and that 1 slaughterhouse is allowed but 70 percent of its former quota for civilian use.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is perfectly true, but the thing I am getting at here is that if there is no actual shortage of meat allocated to the civilian population what is the purpose in going into a difficult and complicated rationing scheme in order to distribute this meat among the people? In other words, even if there were no rationing of meat at all that in itself would not bring meat to the people if they do not allow the animals to be slaughtered? Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. And under the present schedules that have been set up the animals are not to be slaughtered. Is not that right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right; the animals are not to be slaughtered, especially not if the packer is to be forced to take a loss on every animal he slaughters at the present time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course not. Therefore, the whole scheme from beginning to end is a farce.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me that the figures the gentleman has given, and to which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] referred, are extremely important and should be the basis for our consideration. I do think it is important to remember that the point which was brought out many times in our meetings by representatives of agriculture and O. P. A. was that there was a great deal more buying power throughout the country that has to be taken into consideration. Personally, I would disagree with what seems to be the expression here that rationing would be a mistake. On the contrary, it seems to me that only if we have a program of fair and just rationing will we be able to get meat into those parts of the country that need it the most. Without that I do not know how in the long run we are going to get it. The point the California delegation made, and the committee, as I get it, is that we have not been content to see our State with such short supplies of meat for such a long time while they were getting ready to introduce a program of just rationing. We have taken the position here, and I agree with what the gentleman has said in that respect, that there were some barriers against full production on the one hand and perhaps some false prices that should be removed; and in the second place there should be efforts made so that right now there might be a more equitable distribution into our State of the supplies that are now available. I do believe that we should make our position plain. What we are after is a just distribution of the supplies that are available, so that some sections of the country will not be without meat.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman. When part of your slaughterhouses and packing houses are not killing their full 70 percent quota owing to the program that has been set up, the other houses cannot afford to deliver it to the areas they did in past on account of the distances from market with such a small amount of meat to deliver, and naturally that makes a shortage of meat in that area.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman's point that wherever that exists that quota should be taken up by somebody else immediately and not left lying idle.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The committee has asked the Department to increase the quota where a slaughterhouse might be in that area and where other slaughterhouses have moved out of the area. I agree with the gentleman; and, as was stated by the group, until they are ready to put this rationing program into effect they should permit the slaughterhouses to slaughter their full 100 percent at the present time so nobody will go hungry for meat and this to continue until they

are able to put this rationing program into effect.

Mr. HINSHAW. If we have as much meat per capita for the civilian population today as we had in 1941 under free market conditions, what is the purpose of reducing the slaughter to 70 percent? It seems to me there is no excuse for it. It ought to be 100 percent based on the population.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. The number of people is the same and the number of pounds of meat is the same, but the people are not eating the same amount that they were eating in the year the gentleman quotes. They are eating a lot less for the moment. The whole population is eating a lot less per capita. It seems to me that the gentleman who is speaking has called attention to the real difficulty in the whole situation and that is that the Department charged with the distribution, if we may call it that, of the meat supply has made these announcements prior to any ability to put rationing into effect and that the same thing has happened here as has happened with sugar, with coffee, and with the other commodities which were rationed. All of the elements involved have not been taken into consideration, and as the gentleman from California said, the difficulty is that we will not get this properly solved until these other elements are taken into consideration and until we get actual rationing and distribution on a proper basis per person. The gentleman who is speaking has recited the fact that certain of these slaughtering houses and packers have ceased delivering in the areas which were entirely dependent upon those packers. I would like to hear the gentleman develop that point a little further.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROLPH. I do not know anything about these statistics the gentleman speaks about, but I do know very definitely that my community, San Francisco, is really right up against it for meat. I received this morning copy of a telegram that the Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco sent to the President on January 29, setting forth the conditions in San Francisco. With the gentleman's permission I would like to insert this telegram in the *RECORD* at this point, because it states in a very clear and concise manner the situation in my State. I also want to take this opportunity of complimenting and congratulating the gentleman on his devotion, not only in looking out for the interests of the people of his own district but also the people of California, and I want to say that we are back of him 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the telegram referred to at this point, with the gentleman's permission.

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

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, January 29, 1943.
To His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES, FRANKLIN DELANO
ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D. C.:

Fully aware of your many and trying difficulties and appreciative of your great leadership we turn to you for succor and relief in a matter of great moment in effort to win the war. Metropolitan San Francisco defense area suffers direly from meat shortage. Daily hundreds are waiting for hours for frugal supplies that are far too fresh for healthful consumption, and thousands of disappointed people are turned away when meager stocks are exhausted. More astonishing is fact of ample slaughter cattle available. Ceiling prices for slaughtering payable and receivable have hamstrung the industry and created black market and havoc. Hundreds of butchers unwillingly forced to leave jobs account shortage of work. Shipbuilders' restaurants are deprived of supplies that could be available. For weeks our citizens are meat hungry and distressed. High Washington officials on recent visits here recognized this deficiency and newspapers daily record promises of relief which is not forthcoming. Can you not with your great power and wisdom so often successfully employed alleviate this unusual intolerable condition. Representative of progressive and greatly expanded San Francisco we earnestly appeal to you.

CIVIC LEAGUE OF IMPROVEMENT
CLUBS AND ASSOCIATIONS,
DR. OTTO G. FREYERMUTH,
President.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, May I go further? If we propose to use more meat in 1944, now is the time for us to accept some kind of a program to produce more meat in 1944. For instance, a gilt that was farrowed in the spring of 1942 will have a litter of pigs in the spring of 1943. A gilt that was farrowed in September 1942 will have a litter in the fall of 1943. That same gilt that farrows the spring litter in 1943 will farrow another litter in the fall of 1943.

We can immediately increase the production in hogs more than anything else. Today in the State of California we are slaughtering practically all female animals in beef. Very few steers are being slaughtered. Why? Because of the rules and regulations set up by someone who does not know what he is doing, thus working hardships on the man who is in business. It resolves itself down to one thing after another. There were seven of these men before the California delegation here the other day. I asked them finally, "How many of you men know anything about the meat business or was ever in it before? Those of you who were, hold up your hands." One out of the seven held up his hand. Yet those same gentlemen have set up the rules and regulations which tell us how many we can kill, where we can send it and what we can do, disregarding people who have millions of dollars invested in their own business. I say that until we erase some of those conditions it will still be hard for

the men in the cattle business to keep on producing, not knowing what they are going to face.

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

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

Mr. POULSON. How many of those seven men had been in California and knew first-hand of our problems?

Mr. ELLIOTT. None of them.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Has it ever occurred to the gentleman that the quickest way to increase the supply of pork would be to pay premiums for heavier hogs? Today it pays a man better to sell his hog at 180 pounds, although the price could just as well be stepped up to make the 300-pound hog popular. That could apply to beeves, too.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Last Monday on the Lancaster market I sold a load of cattle, well-finished shorthorn steers weighing over 1,200, that brought only \$1.50 a hundred more than cows, because of the price ceilings put on meat. The packers chose the common, half-finished stuff. Common steers with just a little bit of flesh brought \$14.50, and these well-finished steers of mine brought \$14.75.

It is a matter of this thing not being managed right. If there were a premium paid for weight this stuff would quickly go ahead. If all the hogs in the country now coming at 180 were marketed a month or three months later at 250, can the gentleman see what that would mean?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman said he sold a carload of cattle at 14 3/4 cents a pound. Does the gentleman believe the packer who bought his cattle at 14 3/4 cents a pound can stand a ceiling of 24 3/4 cents a pound on his dressed meat?

Mr. GROSS. He said he could not. That is why he was buying the other steers. Bulls brought more than my steers did. Lean bulls brought more last Monday on the Lancaster market than my well-finished shorthorn steers.

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

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

Mr. OUTLAND. The question has sometimes been raised that perhaps the matter of transportation enters into it; that the problem of transporting both troops and equipment into certain sections like California has helped to cause this situation. According to the testimony the gentleman's own committee has developed, there is a sufficient supply so that if the regulations permitted it there would be not an adequate but certainly a comparable supply for areas like that State.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. OUTLAND. In other words, the problem of transportation is not causing the shortage in California?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I live in the State of Texas, which produces more cattle than any other State in the Union, yet we are faced with exactly the same situation you are of being unable to buy beef right in the heart of the cattle country. A large part of it goes to just the same situation that we have, a system of prices set up that makes it impossible for anybody to carry anything along that will produce more meat next year. We are able to get more for cows than we are for steers. We are able to sell calves for more than we can get for well-fed cattle.

I myself sold some calves just a short time ago which I had no intention in the world of selling, but the boy down on the place wrote me saying, "I was offered so much for those calves and could not afford to turn it down." Of course, he could not, because we got as much for those calves in December as we could get for them by carrying them over until next spring.

We now are faced with the same thing I am sure you are faced with. I know it is the rule in Texas that you cannot buy feed for more than 2 weeks in advance. If you are going to put steers in the feed lot, you cannot contract for your feed for more than 2 weeks at a time. As long as I have known anything about the cow business, I have never known anybody who could afford to go to feeding steers without knowing where he was going to get his feed and knowing whether he was going to be able to have feed enough to finish them up. If we stop a lot of these rules and let the cowmen of America go to raising beef, they will raise beef. If you let the hog people of America go to growing hogs, they will put pork on your table, if you will simply give them an opportunity to do it and pay them a price for doing it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This is what is happening. In the State of California today hay is at \$40 a ton. On the 1st of January it was from \$28 to \$32 a ton. Now it has reached a point where it is \$40 a ton. Cottonseed cake jumped from \$25 to about \$45 a ton. Yet here is a man feeding cattle, and he does not know what minute someone will come along and slap a ceiling on these animals he is proposing to have fat at a certain date. The present program is keeping a lot of cattle from being in the fat yards that are not there at the present time. The remarks of the gentleman are absolutely correct.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not hear all of the gentleman's able speech, but the situation in my district is probably similar to that in Los Angeles and San Francisco. When I left my district it was my understanding that one of the main

reasons they issued this regulation of which the gentleman speaks was that our quotas on the Pacific coast, particularly in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle, were based upon the 1940 census.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, anybody who has been out in that area would know that San Francisco, for instance, probably has half a million more people, Seattle 300,000 or 400,000, and God knows how many there are in the Los Angeles area now.

Yet the people making the quotas here, if you tell them that, look at you with blank amazement as if to say, "We set the quotas, and there you are." That is one of the problems.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have commented on that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Has anything been done to correct that or are they still looking at us as if we did not know our own districts?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They told me this morning they doubted very much whether we had an increase in population on the west coast, but in the city of Los Angeles itself, there has been an increase of over 300,000, and every week-end there are from 150,000 to 250,000 men in the armed services that visit that city, and they do not eat bread alone while they are there, they eat steaks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If those officials would go out to the coast cities and try to get a place to sleep some night, they would know how crowded they are.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Is it not a fact that in the conferences held between the California delegation and the representatives of the O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture, it was admitted that a greater beef shortage exists in California than in any other State?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. And also that the State of California has increased its population faster than any other State in the Union?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They agreed on that also.

Mr. WELCH. The population of San Francisco alone has increased nearly 100,000 since war was declared, and still they do not see fit to increase our meat quota. Workers performing the hardest kind of labor in the shipyards and other defense plants are going as long as a week at a time without sufficient meat to sustain men performing that kind of labor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to give now some figures that prove my contention of wondering whether or not we should be going into the meat rationing program at all until we have a proper formula. In the 10-year period 1931-40 there was a slaughter average in the United States of animals, cattle, 14,200,000; calves, 9,200,000; sheep and lambs, 21,900,000; hogs, 64,400,000. In 1941 we slaughtered 16,400,000 more cattle, a 2,000,000 increase over the average of the 10-year period; calves, 9,300,000; sheep and lambs, 22,300,000; hogs, 71,400,000. Then take the estimate for

1942 as contained in the last month for which they have made an estimate for that year. There is an estimated slaughter for 1942 of 18,300,000 cattle, an increase of approximately 2,000,000 over the previous year; calves, 9,600,000; sheep and lambs, 26,000,000, an increase of 4,000,000 over the previous year; hogs, a jump from 64,400,000 in the period for the 10 years and then from the 71,400,000 in 1941 to 82,000,000 for the year 1942.

Mr. Speaker, that definitely shows that we are producing more meat all the time, and I repeat again that we should have definite information if it is expected that we will use more meat in 1944 than is being used at the present time. Further, I suggest that we should slow up on the slaughter of heifers in the various slaughterhouses, and we should stop the slaughter of a lot of the veal calves being slaughtered. Let them grow into more meat, and let those heifers produce a calf possibly the next year. We have to put this on some sort of a business basis. No one knows how long this war is going to last, and as for after the close of the war, we should give consideration at this time to the many countries that will need meat, and we should protect the female animals we have in the United States so that they will be available for breeding purposes to be sent abroad, so that those people in those countries may be able to start to produce something in the form of food for themselves, instead of having this country continue on the lend-lease basis. I am for the lend-lease program and I think that we will have to do something about it perhaps after the war is over to help some of those countries, but certainly we cannot go on continuing to slaughter our animals at the present time in the way we have, but we should start in and try to get an abundance of meat produced not only for our own people, but for many other countries that will be in the market for meat after the war is over.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. ELMER. I would like to ask if the gentleman knows who was the fellow appointed to put a restriction on how many little pigs the old sow might have out in the barn lot?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; I could not tell you.

Mr. ELMER. Mordecai Ezekiel.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about being in favor of lend-lease. I presume we are all in favor of it, because we are in this thing and there is no way to get out of it now. While you California people are complaining, you heard the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. O'TOOLE] last week make the same complaint that you are making today. That is, virtually the same complaint, the shortage of meat in Brooklyn and in New York. You are complaining on the other coast about a shortage of meat. How far are you going with lend-lease? There is a limit to the number of heifers, as you suggested a moment ago. How much will you send across and how

much will you keep at home? In the olden days we always kept a little seed corn and a little seed wheat. We kept something to start with.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the proposed amount of meat that will be used for the armed forces and lease-lend in 1943 is 8,500,000,000 pounds.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is all right to use it for the armed forces. People are willing to go without any meat at all if it is for the armed forces, but when you are speaking of giving it to the civilian population in other lands, that is a different question.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Meat going under lease-lend today is not going for the civilian population in other countries. I asked the direct question. Practically all of it is being sent to the men in the fighting lines, to the Russians and to the English on the African front.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The fighting men, you mean?

Mr. ELLIOTT. To the fighting men. I asked the same question you asked of the Department on two different occasions. They assured me that as far as meat was concerned, lease-lend meat was going to the men in uniforms. As long as it is going there, I think it is good judgment for you and I to agree that that is the proper place for it to go, for it will save thousands of our own boys being placed on the fighting line.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No one has any objection to that. Now you were speaking about killing so many heifers. In our country at least, and I am sure in some of the other Northern States, like Wisconsin, a great dairy State, they have to have equipment in their barns. They have to have drinking cups. The water must be warmed and all that. They cannot get drinking cups. They cannot get piping to carry the water. They cannot get wire for the electricity. Until we can get those things those heifers are not going to do anything. They cannot. How are you going to help that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. As I said, some of this red tape must be erased in order to take care of many of these various things we are discussing, to correct them to the point where we can produce more, no matter whether it is beef cattle or hogs or other commodities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not so critical of some of these people who are administering the program as some others, because I realize we are asking for three or four times what they have. There is something to be said along that line. But my point is that unless you keep the foundation here at home so that we can produce this stuff, it would not do any good to talk about sending it over there.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Poulson].

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true, in line with the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] concerning the fact that cows are selling at a better price than steers, that this condition exists in Los Angeles County? Los Angeles County is considered one of the

largest dairy counties in the United States. Even the distinguished professor from Wisconsin will admit that. They are discouraging the dairy industry there; in fact, encouraging the sale of dairy cows by having a lower ceiling price on fluid milk than in San Diego and in San Francisco. As a result the latest figures show that they are only milking the cows for 10 months, and then selling them on the butcher block. Of course, this not only discourages the dairy industry, but in the long run it will be very disastrous, because it is recognized that a cow is not at her height of production until she is 4 years old. I think that is another one of the short-sighted things that has been brought out in this O. P. A. program.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman. I might add that in 1942 in Los Angeles County you had 88,000 dairy cows, and you had an average kill of 5,000 head a month. In the county of Los Angeles that is what you killed. Those were top dairy cows that were brought in out of the valley. After they had reached the point of production it would not pay the farmer to feed the high-priced feeds they were compelled to feed, and those animals were slaughtered.

To bring out my point that we are still increasing livestock, the figures show that in 1941 in the United States we had all cattle, 71,461,000 head. Of that amount beef cattle amounted to 45,983,000.

Stock sheep, 54,283,000. We had stock hogs, 54,256,000.

In 1942, of all cattle in the United States, we had 74,607,000. Beef cattle, 48,304,000, or an increase of 3,000,000 over 1941. Hogs jumped from 54,000,000 to 60,000,000.

On January 1, 1943, we had over 76,000,000 head of cattle in the United States. Sheep dropped from 55,000,000 to 53,000,000. Why? The reason that sheep dropped was because the sheep herders were taken away from their herds and in order to comply with that issue, they were forced to sell a part of their flocks. So we have a loss of 2,000,000 sheep in the United States in the fall of 1942, owing to the fact of taking away the men who herd the sheep.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the gentleman agree that in all of these programs, price ceilings and everything else, there are two factors that the people in charge of them have to be required to take account of? On the one hand is to prevent the cost of living from spiraling, but on the other hand to make certain that it is possible for the producers to maintain maximum production of those commodities. Upon that almost everything depends. So would not the gentleman agree that every price ceiling regulation, all of the matters that will affect the manpower of agriculture and everything else, should be reviewed by somebody who knows something about that production angle?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. It might be well to recall that when the Executive message was sent to Congress on September 7, with reference to price ceilings on agricultural products, it set forth four objectives, and it placed as the first objective controlled prices, and as a second objective, or secondary thereto, ample agricultural production. It has never been the policy of the Price Control Administration to use their powers and prerogatives to increase the production of food; it has not even been their foremost objective to feed the people.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that O. P. A. has changed hands does the gentleman have any reason to believe that Mr. Brown can do any better than Henderson, whose administration we did not like, unless Brown or we get rid of some of Henderson's understudies?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not in position to say at this time; but I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that if I were in charge of this program, I would do something different. They have operated this program or proposed to operate it in one form or another for the last 60 days. We have pointed out to them how serious the situation is on the west coast, that in some areas meat is not available for men working in shipbuilding plants and airplane manufacturing plants to the point that there may well be strikes on account of improper food. Notwithstanding that they tell us they can do nothing until after April 1. In other words, we have got to wait 4 months until they can work out a formula. If I were in charge of such an organization and 2 months had gone by without their being able to work out any kind of program but asking still another 2 months, I would begin firing people and employing others who could do something about the situation.

Twenty-three members of the California delegation, entirely unanimous as to the situation, 100 percent in accord on the situation, have told them as a delegation that the condition is very serious and that we expect them to do something about it whereby these workers can have some kind of meat made available for their tables whether it be 2 pounds, 2½ pounds, or some other quantity, but to date nothing has been done. It is a serious proposition.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has made a very careful study of this situation. I ask him if it is not a fact that there is no shortage of animals in California available for slaughter at the present time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. A representative of the packing industry came here and made the statement that animals were available for slaughter. Then it was

brought to my attention that California did not produce more than the meat it consumed. I have here among my papers a table that shows 1,545,000 head of cattle slaughtered in California in 1941; we imported only 362,000. That is very different from saying that 50 percent of the cattle slaughtered in California were shipped in. The truth of the matter is that the percentage is much smaller.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do they not ship in cattle from Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Texas, and even from as far as Kansas City?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; but after the animals are slaughtered, the processed meat is then shipped back into those States, Arizona particularly, to provide meat for those people.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there is no reason for the statement that there is a shortage of cattle at the present time, is there?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Many things are involved in answering that question. I personally believe there are plenty of cattle available. I feel that distribution is the main consideration, proper distribution, to see that everybody gets his just share; but what has this program done? It has brought about the black market. They are killing cattle, hogs, everything, any place they want to, practically. The people in the restaurant business and the hotel business can afford to pay twice as much as ordinary civilians can for it. He buys it, puts it on his menu, and charges just what he wants to. No ceiling has been placed upon him. The result is that the little fellow is being robbed right in the very start of the program. I cannot see what this thing is designed for, unless it is to put out of business practically every little slaughterhouse or packing house. I sometimes wonder if that is not what they are trying to do at the present time; drive the little fellow out of every business in the Nation. It is beginning to show up now in the packing industry.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. In accordance with what the gentleman has just said, the evidence seems to be that there is either in California or nearby States a supply which would guarantee to the people there an amount at least comparable to what people in other States have, would the gentleman say that the situation could be partially solved by two steps:

First, increasing the percentage, the quota allowed for slaughter in California by some designated percentage, 10 or 15 percent out of the total amount made available; and, secondly, by limiting the proportion that could go to restaurants and hotels, thereby increasing the proportion to the individual buyer? Would these two steps be of value in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. ELLIOTT. They would be helpful; but remember that of the slaughter 70 percent is allocated for civilians, 30 percent goes to lend-lease and the armed services. All the slaughterhouse gets out of the animal is the ceiling price of 23.75 cents per pound allowed by the

O. P. A., and which operation results in a loss. So he is in the position that when the lend-lease and the Army come along and want their 8,500,000,000 pounds of meat, the price is reduced 75 cents per 100 pounds, as those agencies buy in carload lots. Yet he has already lost \$10 a head on every animal. Little by little the small packers are going out of business. He is not killing his 70-percent quota. I have a telegram here before me showing that in California 25 percent in some instances of the 70-percent slaughter is not being slaughtered at the present time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman has commented on this particular point, but I would like to hear him discuss it just a little further. I have in mind some of these small independent packers. There are two in the agricultural district that I represent which, of course, is not primarily a livestock area. Its principal interest in the past has been cotton and other crops, but in the last several years these little independent packers have come in there and have encouraged the people to grow livestock which they in turn bought from them.

In the last couple of years, where plants have come into that area, there has been a considerable increase in population. I have in mind, however, the area of one of them where I dare say the population has increased 25 to 30 percent, yet the amount of slaughter that that independent house can indulge in is cut down to this percentage which is set by the O. P. A. I have had the matter up with them and tried to get them to give an increase which would take care of the increased population, but they say, "No; we will let the slaughterhouses away from there ship in." Now, your independent house cannot buy the animals that have been grown right in that area, so the farmer is required to ship his stuff 150 or 200 miles away, have it killed, then that packing house ships back the meat.

Mr. ELLIOTT. By rail or on tires?

Mr. SPARKMAN. What difference does it make?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We are saving rubber, are we not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Any way they can get it there. The inevitable result will be that that farmer is going to quit growing that stuff because he cannot ship it to market and make anything out of it. In addition to that, this is at a time when transportation facilities, regardless of whether it is by truck or train, are in great demand, and there is a great shortage. The O. P. A. forces that condition upon us, and I think it is wholly unreasonable. Another result is going to be that the big packer is going to be made bigger and the little packer is going to be wiped out of business.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I want to state an instance to the gentleman from Alabama. In my congressional district we at one time had eight or nine bakeries operating in the valley. The O. P. A. set up their rules and regulations on the

amount of sugar a bakery could have, and because those bakeries were not in a defense area they could only produce so much in the way of pastry and bread per day. But in Los Angeles the bakeries down there are in a defense area, and they can get all the sugar they want. So up over the mountain and around the hills come bakery wagons every day delivering bread into this valley in which the bakeries are shut down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps the gentleman stated this or I perhaps misunderstood him. What was the element of time involved that the gentleman stated to the House relative to the possibility of the readjustment of the present condition that exists in California as it pertains to the meat problem?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will go back to that. The first time I talked to the Department they told me and every other Congressman it would be about January 1. We met again, I think, about the second week in January; that is, the California delegation, and we had before us seven members of the various agencies. They told us that the following Monday they would come back with some kind of a solution. On the following Monday they did come back but no solution. They agreed at that time that in a few days perhaps something would be worked out without fail. I was told last week that on Monday of this week they would be in my office and to have my committee there, that they thought they had something worked out that would be helpful. They told us this morning that it would be April 1 perhaps before they could give us any relief. In the meantime, going back to December, I asked early in December that an invitation be sent out to the packers and slaughterhouse men to come to Washington, sit down around the table and try to work out a solution that would give relief not only in our State but in many other States that are beginning to have trouble.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the gentleman feel that he cannot expect any responsive reaction from that specific department under 8 months?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is the way it begins to look.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I represent a district that has some packers in it. Before I came up here, I talked to some of them about the seriousness of the situation and their inability to supply the local demand for meat. I apprehend that that is what is taking place in California and other sections of the country.

Some of these gentlemen told me that a low limit has been placed on the slaughter. In other words, a packer who slaughters from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 pounds will be restricted to a certain percentage of his previous slaughter. It seems to me if they would list the number of pounds a packer could put up before they put a quota on him that would enable these men to take care of the local situation and supply the meat to the people of many sections where they are not now getting meat.

The truth of the matter is that the large packers are getting Government orders and they are catering to that alone and not giving as much concern to the local communities as they should. If something is not done to help these small packers, as the gentleman says, they are going out of business and the local people are not going to have any source of meat supply.

Mr. ELLIOTT. One of the reasons is that even our armed forces cannot get meat at the present time. The Quartermaster General sat in my office this morning with representatives of various other Government agencies and made the statement that he is way behind in his Government purchases of meat for the armed forces. Why? There is a ceiling placed on meat of 23½ cents a pound, yet the price of the live animal continues to rise. The packer is losing money. Today the animal hanging on the hook costs the average packer 26 cents a pound. The people in the O. P. A. say, "If it costs him 26 cents a pound, how can he operate?" The reason he can operate is that he has a large investment and he is hoping some formula will be worked out to remedy the situation, so he is taking a loss every day on each animal he kills, because if he stops his operations the men in his plant will get jobs in manufacturing plants some place producing airplanes or tanks or munitions, and when he comes to open up again he will have no men in his slaughterhouse. This situation is daily growing more serious.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that unless something is done to help the small packers we are going to have a really serious shortage of meats?

Mr. ELLIOTT. You have to help both the small ones and the large ones.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The large packers think that they can supply the Army. They have proper inspection and they meet the requirements. The Army will buy from some of the large packers when it will not buy from the small packers.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true, but the Army and lend-lease together use only 8,500,000,000 pounds of meat a year. That is the estimate for 1943.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is no doubt what the gentleman says is true about the price they have to pay for the meat and what they can get for the finished product.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have here a statement from Mr. Claude L. Safstrom, who is in the packing-house business in Los Angeles, which I should like to read:

1. SEVENTY-FIVE CENT REDUCTION ALLOWED ARMY

The meat packers desire that this reduction be eliminated for the reason that cattle costs so much more than the ceiling price on Grade A cattle in California that to allow this 75-cent reduction means an absolute net loss to the packer. In areas where the meat shortage is so acute there is no reason for the packer to be forced to allow any discount at the present time because the buyers are willing to go to the various plants for the purpose of picking up their meat purchases and pay cash for them at the top ceiling prices.

2. FIFTY-CENT DISCOUNT TO WHOLESALERS

The Vernon packers have been supplying these various wholesalers who operate refrigerator trucks through the outlying suburban sections of southern California where the big packer's truck did not previously make deliveries. These hundred or more wholesalers have been supplying approximately 1,500 little individual retail and grocery markets in metropolitan Los Angeles for years. Therefore, the 50-cent reduction which the Office of Price Administration forces the packers to give these wholesalers is working a great injustice at the present time. It has already caused practically all of the small individual markets to be completely out of stocks of meat for the past 6 weeks.

3. MEAT SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

The meat shortage in California has been so acute that it has fostered the development of two kinds of bootleggers in the meat industry: One, the jobber who purchases live cattle in the stockyards at an exorbitant price and has them slaughtered by some local packer through the payment of an advance premium and then the dressed cattle are taken to his jobbing house, or retail markets, where he has to pierce his own ceilings to a great extent in order to obtain a return on his investment. Two, the operator who has a few retail stores and who bribes the cooler salesman in amounts ranging all the way from 5 to 10 cents a pound to secure a carcass of beef. These are concrete and substantiated facts, not mere hearsay.

4. THE LIVESTOCK PROBLEM

Wholesale cattle prices have risen to such a great extent that the present dress ceiling does not approach the cost to the packers of producing dressed animals for the Army or civilian trade. At the present time the packers are suffering considerable losses on their operations and the outlook is for a continuation of these losses unless the bootleg operators are stamped out of business. The most effective way that they can be stamped out, in the view of the packers, would be through the lifting of the quotas on meats throughout the United States for approximately 1 week or even 2 weeks and the subsequent application of general meat rationing. The packers believe this would solve the bootleg problem very quickly.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that earlier in my remarks I pointed out that although there was a ceiling of 23½ cents a pound on dressed meat, 75 cents a hundred is taken off the price of the meat the Army and lend-lease purchase. So the small packer, although he is losing money, in view of the fact that he has to take off this 75 cents is not very happy about furnishing meat for the armed forces during the present meat shortage and limitation of slaughter to 70 percent, when he has a market for his meat and can get the full 23½ cents a pound for it. That is one of the things that is happening today that should be corrected immediately.

You can talk to the Quartermaster Corps and they will say that they are short millions of pounds of meat they should have at the present time, due to the fact that it is not available. The small packer is losing money and does not want to go further into the hole \$15 on every ton of meat he actually handles, and that is what he loses selling to the armed services and lend-lease.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It seems to me somebody down at the O. P. A. ought to get busy and do something to relieve the civilian population of our country. If that is not done, we are going to be confronted with a very, very serious situation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a telegram which pertains to meat deliveries to our armed forces:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., January 31, 1943.
CLAUDE SAFSTROM,
Care Mayflower Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Have delivered 400,000 pounds of meat to Army in January. Have 150,000 pounds to deliver first 10 days February. Losing average \$10 head. Cannot assume future contract obligations under present market conditions. Also have cut down civilian quota. Cannot compete with black-market bidders. Last month's results disastrous.

QUALITY MEAT PACKING Co.,
HYMAN ROSEN.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. I understand that in spite of the conferences that the delegation has had with the Office of Price Administration, and the late conference even this morning, the result is that they have no program and do not now intend to take any particular action.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. COSTELLO. And all that we have to do is to wait until rationing begins sometime later in the year, in April.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. In other words, between now and April the people of that part of the country must suffer for want of food, and the armed forces of the country will not be able to get enough food, adequate for the Army. It seems to me that is rather a pitiable condition, that after a full month's deliberation we have not made any progress with these officials, and that they are still unwilling to take any course whatever to alleviate the situation. It seems to me rather ridiculous.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say in closing that I believe that the time has come when Congress should act and not sit around here and do nothing, when we have a serious condition affecting one or two States at the present time, and that we should move in force and correct the situation. We should not go along here and continue to wait for a bunch of boys down there who are pushing pencils around a table, who seem to know all of the answers to everything and who at the same time do not want to do anything to correct the situation. We have suggested many remedies and we certainly should get a release of the quotas at the present time and give the people

plenty of meat until their rationing program goes into effect. When they refuse to do that, they are refusing the American people proper cooperation.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. BUFFETT. The California delegation, as I understand it, spoke of having lower rates on dressed beef. I come from a large stock-producing area, and those people out there try to find ways and means of shipping more meat to California and they find that an unfair situation results from much higher rates on dressed beef, as opposed to beef on the hoof. And, of course, they are interested in the shipping of the most meat with the least cost of transportation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is from Nebraska?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Last week cattle was shipped on the hoof from Nebraska to California.

Mr. BUFFETT. That the gentleman will agree is a poor method of shipping beef to get the maximum amount of meat for the minimum amount of transportation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. An Army officer said that they would purchase beef in Kansas City and Chicago and Omaha if available, but at the present time beef there is not available, because the packing-house men do not want to sell at a reduction of 75 cents a hundred they have to take. That is one of the difficulties at the present time.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain letters and telegrams that I referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for 10 minutes.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have long taken pride in our ability to produce. We have especially emphasized the productive capacity of our mills, our mines, and our factories. We have awarded the Army and Navy E to plants all over this broad land. Industry has spent millions of dollars for newspaper advertisements, patting itself on the back over its productive achievements. Organized labor has crowded the largest hotel lobbies and convention halls of America with meetings to proclaim the outstanding contribution of its members in bringing about this great industrial production. High officers of the Army and Navy, from Cabinet Members down, have given public recognition at ship launchings, plant openings, and on regular holidays to the debt that our country owed to industry and labor. I find no fault with this deserved recognition of a job well done. It is, however, most unfortunate that there has been no corresponding public recognition of the vital contribution that has been made to our war effort by the

third of our population who till the soil. On the contrary, the Army, the Navy, big business, and big labor organizations have all assumed that the farmer, himself, like the farmer's mule, could be expected to toil from sun to sun without recognition and with most meager reward.

Mr. Speaker, I was reared far out in the country, 30 miles from the nearest railroad. I have been closely associated with agriculture all my life. I represent one of the great farm districts of the Nation. I think I can fairly say that I know that the farmer will, to the absolute limit of his ability, contribute to the needs of his Nation, but even as the mule must look to the farmer he serves for adequate food and shelter if he is to be able to pull the plow, so must the farmer look to the Nation he serves for adequate economic sustenance if he is to perform the vital task assigned him. This Nation has not given the producers of food, fiber, and feed the economic sustenance that they must have if they are to meet our war needs. We have recognized the importance of giving every other class in this Nation adequate financial return for the work they do, but we still seem to assume that the ordinary laws of economics do not apply to farmers, or else we are dangerously deceiving ourselves as to the farmer's true condition.

Some years ago we decided that the men working in the coal mines of America were not receiving an adequate wage. About the same time it was recognized that those who worked on the railroads must receive a higher wage to enable them to maintain a proper standard of living. Having decided that the wages of those groups should in justice be raised, we followed our decision to its logical conclusion. We recognized that neither the coal-mine operators nor the railroads could pay the higher wages unless we increased the income of the mine operators and the income of the railroads. We therefore established the Bituminous Coal Commission for the avowed purpose of raising the price of coal, to enable the mine operators to pay the miners a higher wage. The Interstate Commerce Commission deliberately raised railroad freight rates all over this Nation to enable the railroads to pay higher wages. Thus the people who buy coal and the things that are made through the use of coal paid the increased wages of the miners. The people who ship goods by rail and the people who buy those goods—and that is everybody, including the farmer—paid and are still paying the increased wages granted to the railroad workers.

After all, that is the only logical way in which those raises of wages could be given. But at the very time that we allowed those raises the agricultural workers of America were working for a wage far lower than any man in any mine or on any railroad received; they were in fact the lowest paid group of workers in all this broad land—then and now. They were neither organized nor skilled. At that time there was no particular demand for their labor anywhere, and the result was that agricultural la-

bor received no consideration whatever. Today this labor on the farms of this country is in demand. There is competition. Our great war industries want this labor. They are beginning to offer a higher wage for the so-called unskilled labor from the farms. These laborers are often highly skilled in the production of food, but they are leaving the farms today, leaving the farms to go into industry, to go into the factories, to go into the mills; doing the same thing that you and I would do if we were in the place of that fellow who is trying to make a living for his wife and six children, struggling along on some farm. You and I would do the same thing, but it is the very thing which the Nation cannot afford to see done.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have just received a telegram from my district saying that the employment office of the Government was, down in that great agricultural section where farming operations are just getting under way and where we are going to need all of the manpower possible to produce what the rich soil down in that alluvial valley will produce, recruiting men and taking them to San Francisco, Calif., or to Oakland, to work in a shipbuilding plant out there, at a higher wage than our farmers can pay down there. That is the inducement they are offering—higher wages and ideal housing conditions, and they are recruiting hundreds of farm laborers from that section. We are going to be left down there to try to produce an all-out crop to meet this war emergency, and our manpower depleted, taken to another section of the country. I wonder if the gentleman can suggest what can be done to stop a foolish practice like that?

Mr. POAGE. I can only suggest that in the first place it is but another evidence of the stupidity of the bureaus and commissions, that has been so well discussed on this floor during the preceding hour. It is but another evidence of the unwillingness of some of those who hold high positions in this Government to recognize that agriculture is the most vital industry in this Nation today. You cannot stop the submarine menace by making the American crews that man the cargo vessels go hungry. Nor is there going to be much need to stop the submarine menace if you do not have any food to send in the ship that those submarines are trying to sink.

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

Mr. POAGE. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I notice in the noon edition of one of the Washington papers the following:

Expected demands by 450,000 bituminous coal miners for a one dollar-a-day wage increase without regard for the War Labor Board's Little Steel formula.

Would the gentleman explain to me how the administration—and you will probably be branded and so will I as a

labor baiter—but will you explain how the administration is going to continue to raise the wages of coal miners and all of the other workers in industrial plants, and keep the farms operating and still get food?

Mr. POAGE. No. I will not explain it to the gentleman because I know, as the gentleman knows, that it cannot be done. There is no administration that can pull those sleight-of-hand stunts and still feed the Nation. Of course, this country has had enough to eat in recent years because there was not any opportunity for that fellow out on the farm except simply to stay there with his mule and plow from daylight to dark.

But when he has the opportunity to go, as the gentleman from Missouri has so well pointed out, not only the opportunity but has an invitation extended to him by his Government to go, and work under ideal labor conditions in sunny California, of which we have so recently heard, and draw what seems to him to be fabulous wages—more in 1 week's time than he has made sometimes in a full year—of course that man who has been growing the food for this Nation is going to accept the position. Millions of them have already gone and the tragedy of it is that we apparently never awoke to it until the horse was stolen and those whose labor is necessary to make next year's crops have already left the fields and have gone to the shipyards and airplane factories and munition plants.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. POAGE. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Last week came a letter from a farmer in one of the agricultural counties in my district in which he asked me this question. He said:

My neighbors are going down to Benton Harbor and St. Joe—

That is less than 20 miles away—

to work in the factories and the shipyards there. What do you think I should do for my own best interest, stay with my wife on the farm, go out in the snows and tend the cows and the chickens, or go with my neighbors to take a job in the factory? What would you do if you were in my place?

What is the answer to that letter?

Mr. POAGE. The answer is the same as the answer I have to make to my own people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are thousands of them doing the same thing.

Mr. POAGE. And doing it all over the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then how are you going to feed the Army?

Mr. POAGE. The answer is evident, that we are not going to feed either the Army or the civilian population unless we change our ways. Those who seem to think we can secure increased farm production have ignored the most serious problem this country is facing; nor can it properly be answered by saying as so many would like to say that we will simply "freeze" the labor on the farm. I cannot believe that any Member of this House with elemental justice in his soul would advocate compelling some man to

stay on a dairy farm up in the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], getting up at 3 o'clock these cold mornings, going out, doing the milking, and staying out till long after dark for a wage amounting to only a small fraction of what he might secure working in some well-heated pleasant factory for 8 hours a day. No, we have no right to say to the farm boys that they must put up with all those inconveniences, that they must accept a lower standard of living than their brothers in the city; this Congress has no right to say it. We owe it to those boys to say to them that we will treat them the same as we treat the others who toil for the Nation in our factories, in our mines, and in our mills.

We should pay the man on the farm a fair wage. I know there are those of you who are going to say: "But, Mr. POAGE, I want him to be paid a fair wage." That is all right, but, after all, the farmer who employs him must pay him his wages, and, of course, as a practical matter every worker on the farm must be paid, directly or indirectly, out of the products of the farm on which he toils. In many cases however the farmer for whom the laborer works is hardly making a living himself and simply cannot pay a higher wage no matter how just the worker's demands may be or how willing the farmer may be to increase his wages. If the farmer does not have the income he can no more increase the wages of that farm laborer than could the railroads of this country raise railroad wages without an increase in their freight rates.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In connection with the subject the gentleman has been discussing, while we received the news that the Federal Employment Agency is down in our section recruiting some of our farm labor and taking it out to California to work in the shipyards, we are advised from a responsible source that the Farm Security Administration, an agency of the Department of Agriculture, is down there now inaugurating a plan to move people from the submarginal sections at the expense of the Government back into that section to supply farm labor. In other words, one agency of the Government is moving the people out while another agency is moving them in from other sections of the country temporarily to do this work. What does the gentleman think about a program like that?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is exactly like the story of the grand old Duke of York, who had 10,000 men. He marched them up a very steep hill and then he marched them down again. I think that is exactly what our Government is trying to do. The quicker we get to marching on level land in a straight direction the quicker we shall reach our destination. I think that at the present time there is altogether too much disposition to overlook the fact that all agricultural wages must come out of the sale price of products of the farm; that regardless of whether the worker is a day laborer, a

sharecropper, a tenant, or the landlord, his wage must be paid from the price that the products of that farm bring in the market and that economically there is no other way whereby wages can be paid.

Therefore, we must recognize that all wages, including the wages of the farm operator and his family, must be included in the price of the farm product. That is a thing that so many would like to overlook or pass over lightly without consideration. We should recognize that the wages of the farm operator and his family must, if we are to have an honest calculation of prices, be included in the price of the farm products.

At this time we do not include any wages. We seem to assume that the farmer can do what no other producer has ever been able to do, that is to ignore the cost of production. To correct this situation your Committee on Agriculture has just reported a bill, which I trust will be before the House in the next few days, providing for the inclusion of all wages, the wages of the operator, the wages of all who toil on the farm, in the calculation of parity prices for the product sold from that farm. This bill should be passed without a moment's delay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, unless we abandon our entire economic philosophy, which I have understood was based upon the theory of private property and actuated by the profit motive, then we must recognize that fundamental justice requires us to include in any fair estimate of a price level for farm products the wages payable to those who toil to produce the goods. If we are unwilling to accept—and for my part I am unwilling to accept—the communistic doctrine that we should not look to private property or profit, then we must grant our farmers this consideration or we must face a most serious food shortage. As a matter of fact, I think that we all recognize that we have already waited too long—that no matter what we do at this late date we are going to be faced with a serious shortage of certain items of food. The hour is late, but it is never too late to do justice, and we can prevent an even more serious shortage during the coming years if we act now.

When the American people recognized that they had to produce ships, that they had to produce guns, bombs, and airplanes, what did they do? Acting through the War Department and other agencies of Government, they took steps to make the production of these items attractive to both industry and to labor. We applied the fundamentals of the profit system. It may well be charged that there was very little democracy in the way this was handled, because, as I understand it, the negotiations were carried on with only the big corporations

and the big labor groups. But there was a sound application of the profit system, and it got results.

Just as an illustration, let me take an illustration from my own district. We have a shell-loading plant. What happened? The Government went to the National Gypsum Co., which was simply a large manufacturer. It had never manufactured shells. The Government said, "Mr. Gypsum Company, how about making shells for us?" The company said, "Why, we have never made shells; we are not in that business and we do not know anything about that." "Oh, that is all right. The Government will teach you how to make shells."

The company said, "We have not any plant in which to make shells. Our plants were established for an entirely different purpose and we do not want to convert or rebuild them."

"That is all right. The Government will build you a plant and the Government will pay for it."

"But we don't want to buy a shell plant. We would not want it after the war is over."

The Government answered, "The Government will never make you pay for it, and if you want it after the war you can have it at salvage prices."

Still the company demurred: "But we do not know what it would cost us to make shells. We do not know how we can make an intelligent bid."

Said the Government, "That does not make any difference. We will give you a contract and guarantee you a profit regardless of what it costs you. Do not let that bother you."

Well, the company might have one more objection. "We do not know about the labor question. Can we get the labor?"

"Oh, you can pay any price that is necessary to get the labor and the Government will let that be included in your cost."

With that kind of proposition, those people could not turn it down. Neither could you nor I or any other businessman. So they took the contract. The same thing has happened all over this country. You could not expect industry to reject that sort of proposition.

When they went to get labor they faced the proposition that the Government had already been competing in the labor market to build camps and other structures around over the country. How was the company to handle the situation? Pay enough to get it. Make a contract with one of the big labor organizations to get their members to pay them wages that will be attractive, no matter how high the going scale is. That was done. Why should industry bother? The Government was going to pay the bill. Why should the labor organizations bother about it? Some of those men did not know a saw from a hydraulic jack, but they all paid their initiation dues into the union, the Government paid the wages, the corporation got its profit, and shells were made.

We are getting industrial production, through a rather expensive method, a rather undemocratic method, but nonetheless an effective method and we are

getting results. We are paying the bills, but we are getting industrial production. I do not mean to be critical of what happened in the way of industrial production because we are getting production and that is the big thing.

What happened then? After big business got all the contracts it wanted, after big labor got all the work it needed to supply employment at good wages to all of its members, then big business and big labor got together and said, "Now, then, we want to freeze the situation right where it is. We want to freeze prices."

Whose prices? Not the prices big business gets. Those prices are fixed by Government contracts that take care of all cost factors. Not the prices big labor got. They had contracts taking care of their people. They had Government boards to allow increases. They had exemption in the law. Whose prices were they going to freeze? Why, the farmer's prices, the man who is producing the food and the raiment, and the wages of the man who works for him, and the prices of little businessmen all over the country. That is who they froze. That is who has been affected by your ceiling prices.

If you want to get production on your farms, may I suggest that there is one way in which we can get it, and as far as I know, only one way; that is, to treat the farmer like you treat any other businessman in this country. Farm prices today are little more than half what they were 23 years ago, yet industrial wages are three times what they were during that period. At the same time, they tell us that farm wages must not go up or more accurately they say that while farm wages should go up that farm prices out of which these wages must be paid, if they are paid, must be held down. There is no way of letting farm wages go up without letting farm prices go up, too.

If we are to continue to pursue this short-sighted policy, it is my firm conviction that this Nation is absolutely certain to find itself within the course of another year unable to feed not only our allies but our own people. I do not believe the Members of this House realize the desperate seriousness of the situation or we would be demanding as one man that this legislation to do justice to our farmers and give us an opportunity to produce the feed and food and fiber that we need be brought out on this floor so that we might give it a unanimous vote, to do justice to our farmers and to assure our people of a reasonable supply of food in the months to come.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose we had proceeded on the theory that we should have had a reasonable price for tanks and airplanes and guns first, and adequate production of those implements afterward; would we have produced many of them?

Mr. POAGE. I doubt it. I want the gentleman to understand that I have not criticized the fact that we have pur-

chased the tanks and the airplanes and the guns at a high cost.

Mr. CURTIS. Neither have I. Is it not true that the reverse has been true with food? We have said we must have reasonable prices first and adequate production afterward.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We have emphasized price rather than production. It is just as important to emphasize production of food as to emphasize production of industrial products.

Mr. CURTIS. Should not the Price Control Act be an instrument to produce food rather than to destroy it?

Mr. POAGE. In my opinion, it fails of its fundamental purpose if it is not so used as to encourage the production of food. It is surely much more important to have plenty of food, even at a higher price if necessary, than it is to keep the legal price of food low but have no food to buy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RENT CONTROL

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1943, I addressed this House on rent control. On January 19, 1943, I submitted certain correspondence regarding rent control. Now I want to quote herewith resolution 3128, adopted January 13, 1943, by the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco:

Whereas there exists in San Francisco at the present time an acute housing shortage due to an influx of war workers; and

Whereas we are informed by Federal and industrial authorities that increasingly large numbers of war workers will come to San Francisco during the next few months; and

Whereas, due to exigencies of wartime, new housing accommodations are not being erected; and

Whereas additional housing space to be made available by the National Housing Administration will probably be insufficient; and

Whereas there are thousands of apartment units in San Francisco which are not accommodating the maximum number of occupants; and

Whereas San Franciscans will undoubtedly be called upon to share their housing facilities wherever possible; and

Whereas, under present Office of Price Administration rental regulations, tenants are not permitted to pay nor landlords allowed to charge for extra occupants within a rental unit; and

Whereas a modification of the existing Office of Price Administration regulations with respect to additional occupancy will bring about more cooperation between tenant and landlord, thereby creating additional shelter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, on behalf of the people of San Francisco, realizing and recognizing the vital importance of this problem, does hereby memorialize the Rent Control Division of the Office of Price Administration to amend this regulation in order to permit a reasonable charge for additional tenant occupancy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper Federal agencies, our congressional and senatorial representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PRODUCTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the dairy

business is appreciated when we realize that it represents some 20 percent of the national farm income. It is not necessary to call your attention to the fact that the low prices received for manufactured dairy products from 1930 to 1940 were even lower than the 1909-14 prices. This is not the time to try to correct any injustices of the past. Even in 1941 when the program to increase production for lease-lend was launched, cheese was only 16-plus cents per pound and butter only 32-plus cents per pound.

The question today is, what are the facts as to the possibility of producing 122,000,000 pounds of milk—the goal for 1943. The goal was 125,000,000 pounds in 1942 and 119,000,000 pounds were produced—the only agricultural goal that was not attained.

WHAT IS THE STATISTICAL PICTURE? BUTTER

The production of butter from 1930 to 1942 is listed in the following official table:

TABLE A.—Creamery butter: Production in factories, United States, 1930-41¹

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.
1930	108,382	102,252	115,679	133,271	184,385	189,788	167,559	137,420	122,580	120,247	101,974	111,694	1,595,231
1931 ¹	118,354	109,596	126,792	145,367	183,783	194,256	161,296	140,395	120,936	126,569	117,035	123,073	1,667,452
1932	124,320	124,894	133,095	141,741	186,607	190,644	163,370	149,625	127,386	121,819	109,790	120,841	1,694,132
1933	130,245	122,322	133,266	138,306	191,098	201,969	176,829	166,562	140,038	130,454	115,215	116,384	1,762,688
1934	119,775	111,381	127,476	136,482	177,980	185,396	174,943	165,190	143,761	133,817	112,577	105,930	1,694,708
1935	106,056	100,512	110,166	129,482	179,879	199,696	184,161	159,285	141,786	119,748	96,462	105,147	1,632,380
1936	110,666	108,744	121,543	133,290	177,847	190,699	156,463	141,556	133,021	135,493	111,535	108,550	1,629,407
1937	107,957	102,963	121,074	131,396	181,700	198,191	171,687	147,069	128,266	118,878	103,242	111,548	1,623,971
1938	116,122	112,340	128,735	147,628	197,259	202,528	185,069	168,688	151,081	136,999	116,841	122,852	1,786,172
1939	130,671	124,650	142,550	147,525	197,089	202,549	182,151	167,038	133,755	123,243	112,251	118,265	1,781,737
1940	129,558	128,143	140,730	153,628	195,392	206,555	187,687	167,704	146,247	136,812	117,783	126,647	1,836,826
1941	135,178	129,839	147,542	162,525	214,241	210,285	194,646	168,823	146,465	133,731	112,601	116,730	1,872,606
1942 ²	119,825	118,020	135,920	149,585	203,360	203,860	188,665	169,620	140,130	126,265	107,480	119,500	1,782,230

¹ Beginning 1931 includes whey butter.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from agriculture statistics, 1941.

² Estimates, subject to revision.

Please note that the above table indicates the total national production has been rather well maintained in spite

of the diversions of milk to cheese, evaporated milk, and for fluid-milk consumption. The cold-storage holdings

or stock piles, for the years 1931 to 1942, are shown by the following official table:

TABLE B.—Creamery butter: Cold-storage holdings, United States, 1931-41¹

Year	Jan. 1	Feb. 1	Mar. 1	Apr. 1	May 1	June 1	July 1	Aug. 1	Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Nov. 1	Dec. 1
	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.
1931	63,401	46,792	30,672	18,010	17,195	35,155	89,172	115,121	104,678	80,152	56,229	42,242
1932	26,643	22,506	15,243	9,094	10,394	29,160	84,269	110,247	107,259	89,490	66,828	37,207
1933	22,043	17,833	11,580	9,255	9,398	35,159	106,378	150,934	175,476	174,713	160,463	138,166
1934	111,249	75,995	36,853	15,351	11,838	27,161	70,148	108,748	120,467	125,047	111,073	81,034
1935	47,175	18,907	8,110	5,341	5,676	33,096	96,392	149,628	156,855	148,822	120,210	71,948
1936	40,117	21,502	8,217	5,346	4,997	21,157	73,816	103,259	112,106	108,835	105,368	88,866
1937	61,234	42,734	20,678	6,700	4,997	22,904	83,119	123,863	134,885	118,697	98,624	66,191
1938	42,953	31,211	21,167	14,947	10,144	55,266	121,467	173,257	201,252	210,703	195,263	160,632
1939	128,770	111,354	92,780	78,909	70,909	84,437	131,609	165,183	172,825	154,594	128,111	89,783
1940	55,462	29,189	18,366	8,875	9,504	25,463	81,005	123,628	134,266	128,087	105,106	67,598
1941	41,497	29,715	16,462	8,983	17,795	56,792	120,246	178,493	200,228	202,957	186,635	152,484
1942	114,436	83,106	63,701	45,045	37,228	64,720	117,111	148,504	152,168	123,599	86,981	45,937

¹ Quantities given are net weights.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from Agricultural Statistics, 1941.

² Preliminary.

On January 1, 1943, there were only 25,154,000 pounds in storage, or, as you will note, the least for many years.

CHEESE

American cheese production has come into greater prominence for lease-lend,

for domestic consumption, and now for Mr. Lehman's program.

It is estimated that 500,000,000 pounds are needed for lease-lend, and 100,000,000 pounds for Mr. Lehman. This would leave about 300,000,000 pounds for do-

mestic consumption, or considerable reduction in the per capita consumption.

The following official table shows the annual production for the years 1930 to 1942:

TABLE C.—Cheese, whole-milk American Cheddar: Production in factories, United States, 1930-41

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.
1930	23,666	23,031	28,502	34,143	48,545	53,887	45,582	33,555	26,705	23,581	18,781	18,838	378,816
1931	21,941	22,018	27,571	32,940	44,439	49,513	40,595	32,956	29,139	30,470	23,016	20,050	374,648
1932	20,805	21,993	25,484	29,706	41,933	48,534	40,205	34,796	31,510	29,267	23,061	22,819	370,743
1933	24,877	23,868	28,571	32,356	43,564	54,653	48,206	42,857	35,620	29,864	21,016	23,179	408,631
1934	24,573	24,867	30,915	36,546	48,858	55,610	51,126	45,211	37,983	33,987	24,824	20,991	435,491
1935	22,197	21,919	26,014	32,825	48,926	60,560	55,238	53,101	49,053	42,114	28,811	27,341	468,999
1936	28,881	26,211	30,804	35,324	53,008	64,145	51,029	45,228	44,933	45,629	33,088	29,296	487,576
1937	28,515	27,765	32,262	39,061	56,268	64,454	55,706	48,824	42,701	38,875	30,209	27,401	492,041
1938	30,535	30,670	38,884	48,469	70,263	74,363	65,881	55,682	44,277	43,069	30,173	28,276	560,542
1939	29,575	28,900	36,311	43,649	62,189	70,739	61,884	54,895	46,046	40,687	31,662	30,761	537,298
1940	32,280	33,945	41,704	48,996	67,702	77,343	68,321	59,776	53,460	47,923	36,073	35,267	602,790
1941	38,329	37,830	47,086	56,155	81,900	85,022	78,050	75,972	70,824	66,996	56,347	58,551	753,122
1942 ¹	62,350	62,505	77,215	88,810	117,085	110,430	97,005	87,225	70,675	58,800	43,170	45,200	918,470

¹ Estimates, subject to revision.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from agricultural statistics, 1941.

Please note that the production of American cheese has shown the remarkable increase of about 50 percent in the last 2 years. In addition, the United States produced about 50,000,000 pounds

of Swiss cheese, 25,000,000 pounds of brick cheese, and a large amount of Limburger, Italian, blue, and other foreign types of cheeses. These producers of the foreign-type cheeses have been

called upon to fill the demands of the domestic market formerly supplied by imports. The following table shows the cold-storage holdings, or the stock piles, of cheese from 1931 to January 1, 1943:

TABLE D.—Cheese, American: Cold-storage holdings, United States, 1931-41¹AMERICAN²

Year	Jan. 1	Feb. 1	Mar. 1	Apr. 1	May 1	June 1	July 1	Aug. 1	Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Nov. 1	Dec. 1
	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.
1931.....	67,599	58,516	52,304	45,277	44,792	46,764	63,156	73,693	73,740	70,940	69,611	66,053
1932.....	60,804	54,360	47,106	42,009	38,951	40,461	53,922	63,667	66,721	68,555	66,813	62,392
1933.....	57,749	53,532	46,992	41,625	37,321	41,336	67,456	82,771	94,394	99,326	95,831	85,146
1934.....	77,773	65,476	54,934	49,856	52,217	58,073	79,925	97,018	103,805	108,624	102,832	96,688
1935.....	89,878	71,007	60,943	54,769	46,593	48,320	64,395	82,397	92,767	102,661	100,670	92,912
1936.....	86,537	78,197	68,363	62,261	55,756	56,946	70,282	80,735	90,471	98,206	102,847	98,975
1937.....	95,418	88,091	80,713	73,822	70,584	71,603	89,191	100,418	105,026	101,178	97,160	93,633
1938.....	89,258	80,479	73,815	66,361	65,767	79,345	99,676	114,607	127,862	121,423	115,351	109,738
1939.....	102,563	90,401	77,270	68,812	62,866	64,750	81,805	98,659	104,524	98,419	94,694	91,035
1940.....	87,601	75,678	66,070	61,983	65,386	73,603	96,920	116,847	126,315	128,104	124,783	119,331
1941.....	113,074	109,820	105,153	97,496	94,602	102,869	121,064	139,568	151,906	156,746	157,468	158,238
1942.....	171,869	137,276	133,140	165,704	182,613	200,460	228,478	261,535	243,596	224,861	169,913	³ 134,332

¹Quantities given are net weight.

²The term "American cheese" is intended to cover only those varieties known as twins, flats, daisies, Cheddars, longhorns, and square prints. It does not therefore include all kinds of cheese made in the United States.

³Preliminary.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from Agricultural Statistics, 1941.

There were 112,716,000 pounds in storage on January 1, 1943.

EVAPORATED MILK

The following official table shows the production of evaporated milk from 1931 to 1943:

TABLE E.—Production: Evaporated milk, case goods, unskimmed

Year	Jan. 1	Feb. 1	Mar. 1	Apr. 1	May 1	June 1	July 1	Aug. 1	Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Nov. 1	Dec. 1	Total
	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.
1931.....	104,038	108,929	128,276	147,243	181,982	177,078	128,842	95,205	83,254	99,355	85,949	88,842	1,428,993
1932.....	99,843	105,308	128,058	149,255	191,116	191,592	157,894	134,797	113,025	105,594	92,513	101,617	1,570,612
1933.....	116,947	109,622	145,706	176,195	213,174	220,253	179,204	154,595	129,399	113,258	73,592	84,755	1,716,700
1934.....	97,752	97,669	127,279	148,674	189,096	208,978	192,643	173,260	146,883	134,189	101,183	93,964	1,711,570
1935.....	113,393	121,134	146,500	177,264	236,512	252,831	202,274	160,522	134,809	105,710	86,337	101,604	1,838,890
1936.....	117,253	113,951	148,174	178,657	235,361	254,858	200,279	181,209	184,136	186,141	129,736	114,004	2,043,759
1937.....	119,152	126,509	153,290	184,829	239,136	252,535	205,752	162,506	138,376	124,126	92,322	104,012	1,902,545
1938.....	127,302	131,765	171,440	203,249	285,673	278,601	227,443	185,808	151,122	125,000	102,056	114,739	2,104,198
1939.....	131,320	139,717	179,848	203,867	263,215	268,840	226,600	190,902	158,271	144,568	123,664	139,759	2,170,601
1940.....	158,212	171,125	201,286	225,606	273,824	293,173	259,114	229,696	197,991	171,881	134,192	148,568	2,464,698
1941.....	172,262	169,493	208,296	254,215	353,803	350,073	310,791	308,855	290,634	281,683	250,758	280,684	3,246,547
1942 ¹	313,517	300,003	339,552	358,443	449,330	402,584	317,007	277,969	225,695	208,445	163,648	² 174,000	³ 3,531,163

¹Preliminary.

²Approximation.

Please note the 40-percent increase in production during the past 2 years. The manufacturer's total stocks from 1931 to January 1, 1943, are shown in the following official table:

TABLE F.—Evaporated milk (case goods): Manufacturers' total stocks, 1931-41

Year	Jan. 1	Feb. 1	Mar. 1	Apr. 1	May 1	June 1	July 1	Aug. 1	Sept. 1	Oct. 1	Nov. 1	Dec. 1
	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.	1,000 lb.
1931.....	202,670	157,152	136,896	150,931	177,754	230,739	275,280	275,931	181,745	136,408	129,802	139,844
1932.....	132,011	127,883	110,859	101,388	117,687	164,421	212,431	225,897	190,912	176,197	146,204	139,957
1933.....	100,082	107,154	101,085	50,571	36,975	48,127	104,088	131,987	177,536	208,493	234,665	225,040
1934.....	210,407	168,502	112,836	99,176	117,115	151,691	153,149	205,545	167,864	175,129	215,700	203,402
1935.....	156,793	59,791	28,914	39,993	74,145	179,684	287,359	339,978	358,780	343,132	229,065	91,250
1936.....	72,916	66,094	45,375	42,597	61,775	141,774	186,359	99,638	102,021	160,682	251,751	278,511
1937.....	258,904	208,911	176,912	152,575	161,208	242,380	302,435	227,696	263,324	227,710	244,766	218,372
1938.....	151,686	156,894	132,663	123,801	151,669	261,703	350,780	392,641	419,142	398,287	344,316	284,375
1939.....	205,073	150,311	120,397	109,882	134,625	209,044	292,393	341,686	355,071	335,135	175,646	188,290
1940.....	186,081	156,253	150,458	173,378	207,740	287,778	288,565	321,332	349,433	380,545	358,244	226,266
1941.....	187,652	189,246	176,624	136,073	126,160	173,858	189,711	261,559	289,804	339,716	382,605	417,643
1942.....	328,475	252,532	218,410	213,550	222,485	292,558	331,571	290,875	210,140	136,626	97,706	90,678
1943.....	¹ 82,672											

¹Approximation.

Source: Dairy and poultry separate from Agricultural statistics, 1941.

There are some 17,000,000 cases owned by the Government, 2,000,000 cases of which are now being released to supply the domestic demands last month, and according to the announcement on the radio 3,000,000 cases are to be released for February consumption.

THE PICTURE

The official tables above show the production of the past and what the stock

piles are at the present time. In addition to the above dairy production figures, we also have fluid milk but this is immediately consumed and does not enter into the picture of stock piles. The per capita consumption is being rapidly expanded. We must realize that the production of fluid milk is one manpower problem but to convert this milk into cheese, butter, and other manufactured

dairy products involves additional manpower. This work requires efficient men and their production is an art. A comparatively small number of men are capable of making these high quality products.

Under normal times, out of every 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States, 42 pounds went into butter production, 29 pounds into city milk dis-

tribution, 6 pounds into cheese, 5 pounds into ice cream, 5 pounds into evaporated milk and the remainder into other dairy products, fed to calves, wasted, or lost in manufacture or distribution. It is readily seen that, in the past, butter has been the single product that has required the largest volume of milk. However, these percentages have changed. As you can see, the butter production of the United States has remained rather stationary while the evaporated milk and cheese production has been increased 40 and 50 percent, respectively.

There is one fact evident in all the production tables A, C, and E which really merits your attention. Please note that in table A we have a smaller production of butter beginning September 1942 and that there was considerably less butter produced than during the corresponding months in the year previous. You will note that there was an upswing in production in December 1942, no doubt due to the reduction to 19 percent in the butterfat content of cream. This increase in production may also have been due to the regulations as to the butterfat in ice cream and also the curtailment in sales of this product. The first two January 1943 weekly reports show a 4- to 7-percent increase in butter production over the year previous, and last week 1 percent below last year. We could be on the way to ample production of this great food if viewed only from a statistical standpoint.

In table C you will find that, beginning in September 1942, there was a monthly reduction in cheese production in comparison to 1941. This decline in cheese production still exists. The January weekly reports show a decrease of 17 to 24 percent in the national production from the corresponding weeks last year.

The table showing the production of evaporated milk shows that, beginning in August 1942 and continuing up to January 1, 1943, there was a much lower production of evaporated milk than the corresponding months of the previous year. These are not seasonal reductions; they are reductions from the amounts produced for corresponding months of 1941.

WHAT CAUSED THIS REDUCTION?

There are many reasons advanced for this reduction.

First. Many people think that the comment by the metropolitan press, some radio announcers, and some administration officials was largely responsible for this reduced production. As you no doubt remember, the criticism was directed at the farmer in general and at the dairy farmer in particular when the second price-control bill was being considered by Congress.

Second. Others think that the fluid-milk demands due to the increased buying power of the people were a contributing factor. In southern Army camps no doubt the fluid-milk supply comes from plants formerly engaged in the manufacture of butter and cheese.

Third. Others, like the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, an organization whose members produce over a billion pounds of milk a year, appear to believe

that the administration has not kept faith with its members and that the results of having the prices drop from \$2.25 per hundred to \$1.80 per hundred was the contributing cause.

Fourth. Many cheese men believe that the reduction in the price of cheese from 24 cents to 21 cents a pound by the administration, after they had asked for increased production was also a contributing factor in this reduction. Whatever the causes, and whether they were of omission or of commission, the fact remains that 376,000,000 pounds less of evaporated milk, 35,000,000 pounds less of cheese, and 18,000,000 pounds less of butter were produced than the corresponding months a year previous. In terms of fluid milk this would represent a reduction of about one and one-half billion pounds of fluid milk. This reduction occurred during one of the most favorable milk-production seasons that the dairy sections of this country have ever enjoyed. The following table shows the number of dairy cows in the United States for the years 1920 to 1942, inclusive:

Milk cows 2 years old and over	
Year:	
1920-----	21,455,000
1925-----	22,575,000
1930-----	23,032,000
1935-----	26,082,000
1940-----	24,926,000
1941-----	25,478,000
1942-----	26,303,000
1943 (estimated)-----	27,000,000

This table shows that we still have plenty of dairy cows, if well fed, to furnish the 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk, or the goal for 1943.

The national average production per cow for 1942 would be 119,000,000,000 ÷ 26,000,000 or 4,600 pounds per cow per year. This amount can easily be increased by proper feed and care. There is an abundance of young dairy animals—we still have the stock pile. The January 1 estimates of the number of dairy cows in the country show a further increase in numbers regardless of the numbers which may have been sold as a result of public auctions.

We have been talking about past history. We must all agree that Donald Nelson must have had these dairymen in mind when he told our country that the farmers of our country had done a job not excelled by any other group.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IN 1943?

In 1943, the dairymen of this country are confronted with greater problems than they were in the previous years. These are:

First. Additional difficulties as to manpower. This does not only involve the farm work but also the men engaged in the manufacture and processing and distribution of the products.

Second. More difficulties in obtaining concentrated feeds. The demand for high proteins has been so extensive. Millions of cows have been fed grain during the pasture season the last couple years that had never had a mouthful before. We might have had a stock of these high proteins sometime in the past but they have passed out of the picture. Not

only the increased production of milk but also the increase in the production of eggs and pork have made the demand for these protein feeds.

Third. Problems of machinery and equipment for the farm as well as for the plants that are manufacturing these dairy products.

Fourth. Transportation. This is becoming more and more of a serious problem. It is not going to be reflected only in the production, procurement, and accumulation of feed but also in the accumulation and transportation of the manufactured product itself.

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

First. It would be well to follow the suggestion of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative and ask the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a specific statement to the dairy farmers to the effect that all their products will be taken at a reasonable price and for a definite period of time.

Second. Fulfill this promise. The Secretary has given the pork producer a time table with a \$13.25-per-hundred floor until September 30, 1944.

Third. With all due respect to lease-lend and its objectives, we must realize that we must have a proper consideration for our own food producers. We cannot constantly be changing the product and the marketing of an industry based upon the change of mind of our lease-lend friends. We must, in fairness, do some forward thinking in order that our own industries are not ruined in order to fulfill the wishes of our lease-lend friends. If we continue to follow the footsteps of the past we will really harm the war effort. Hauling milk halfway across the State with its waste of tires and gas to make one dairy product is an example. The recent O. P. A. order on cheese is most assuredly another.

Fourth. Develop a more cooperative spirit between the Department of Agriculture and the legislative committees of Congress and also a more cooperative spirit between the Secretary's office and the farm organizations of our country. Within the past few days, we have had an example of bureaucrats' announcements of huge expenditures without evident knowledge or consultation with the chairman of our Appropriations Committee.

Fifth. A greater use of the educational forces of our country could be realized. This will include our country and city schools, extension service, Coagts, Smith-Hughes teachers in high school, and boys and girls club work. There is an opportunity to broaden the program with education from sources recognized as reliable.

Sixth. A little clearer understanding of the fact that we cannot have a control that prevents all possible production. For all many of these controls are supposed to be out for the duration, there are still many catches in most legislation that do not make for 100-percent production. We cannot have our cake and eat it and we must control the controls so that they do not prevent the maximum production. There are many many examples but the recent cheese

order is sufficient. Were the men that milk the cows and make the product ever asked as to how the order would affect them? The 17 to 24 percent lower production may be part of the answer.

I have endeavored to discuss this subject fully from a factual standpoint and trust that the facts as presented may give you a picture of the dairy situation at this time, and I am sure you all know the clouds that are in the skies and want to do your part to continue the production of the greatest food known to man.

CONCLUSION

The demands of war may denude our forests and they may drain our mines of much of our precious metals but the land of our country will be the source of restoring happiness and contentment to our people. No country in history has ever achieved greatness that did not have within its borders large areas of rich, productive, and fertile land. It bids well for the future that our country is blessed with large areas of this type of land. Though it may not be worth but \$35,000,000,000 as it was on January 1, 1940, it can, if properly handled, increase in productivity and be a source of protection for our future generations. It can improve with time and this is most assuredly a source of comfort. Let us ask these fertile acres for abundance and ask of it the best crop in 1943 that we have ever witnessed. If these acres are to continue to furnish the food for our armed forces, for our allies, and for liberated peoples, all factors of production must have their merited consideration or we will not be helping these acres to fulfill their mission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Mr. Pegler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts and statements on three subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] for 10 minutes.

PROTECTION OF DOGS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the

RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday afternoon I had the temerity to take up the time of this House to discuss a couple of pieces of legislation I introduced seeking the humane protection of dogs. A few minutes after that, after I had left the floor, to enjoy my luncheon late in the afternoon with a couple of constituents from my district, my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] took occasion to criticize me for having taken up that time of the House of Representatives. He made several rather caustic remarks which appear in the RECORD, and to which I take some exception. In the first place, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Oklahoma, personally. He has been very kind to me during my service in the House. He is a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations, and as such, as is true of every other member of that committee, his time is very valuable. I have a very warm political friendship for the gentleman because I owe him a debt of gratitude. Back in 1940 when I was campaigning for reelection, it was reported to me that the gentleman from Oklahoma had been detailed to my congressional district, among others, to bring about my defeat. I am glad to see the gentleman here this afternoon, because our paths have not crossed since he came to Cheboygan to help defeat me. Up until that time I had never been able to carry Cheboygan County, but I did that year, and in the last election I carried it by twice the majority I did before.

But I do not want to take up much of the time of this House today. It is late, and we have heard some very interesting things here on the floor this afternoon. I do not want to take up too much time discussing dogs, but I do point out to the gentleman that while he censored me for taking up the time of the House, it was after the distinguished majority leader had asked unanimous consent and had received unanimous consent for this House to take a 3-day vacation. Therefore I think I might be pardoned for taking up 10 minutes of that time in the manner in which I did, and I may say that during the ensuing 3-day vacation, and despite the bad weather, I have not been entirely idle, nor have I been spending my time on dogs. It so happened on Friday afternoon that a newspaper photographer called at my office and asked to be permitted to take a picture of myself and my dog. I hold that picture before you right now. Some time later this same gentleman called back and asked if I would permit him to take another picture, because the Office of War Information would not permit any picture to be published showing snow on the ground in the Capital; that that is a very serious thing, notwithstanding the fact that every daily newspaper throughout the city for days has been broadcasting comment on the weather conditions in the Nation's Capital. They were commenting upon the fact that we were

enjoying the worst storm that we had had for years.

Now, during the very time that this picture was being taken, a pilot was approaching one of the surrounding airports of Washington, flying a very hot plane, and one of these pursuit ships is worth about \$150,000—though a fighting plane cannot be measured in terms of dollars—he was approaching one of these airports and he sought to learn the weather conditions on the ground. He wanted to find out whether there was any snow on the airport. He was not permitted to have that particular information as to the conditions on the ground, with the result that when he brought in this super hot plane he nosed over and smashed it up. I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the Committee on Appropriations might carefully consider many such similar wastes of the taxpayer's money as that, and among other waste of the taxpayer's money, this morning, just this morning, right before my eyes, and within a block of where I stood, on one of the nearby airports in Washington I saw another crew bring in a bomber that I was told cost about \$250,000, and they attempted to land that bomber on one of these particular airways, still covered with snow, on which not a plow has been put since the storm started last Friday. On an airport charged, among other things, with the defense of this Capital. Probably because of the fact that the man could not see the number on the particular runway that he had been told that he must use to come in, he attempted to make a down-wind landing. I saw that airplane completely destroyed right before my eyes, due to a mistaken bit of judgment perhaps on the part of the pilot or a misunderstanding of the signals. Those things are serious. We cannot judge the value of an airplane in terms of dollars and cents, but we can judge the fact that that fighter plan, that bomber, because of some mistaken ideas or instructions is at present permanently out of the war picture.

I might suggest to the gentleman on the Appropriations Committee that he might seek a reduction in the appropriation for some of these various New Deal agencies and bureaus that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] mentioned in his admirable address a few minutes ago.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I was present when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] made his statement with reference to the gentleman from Michigan. If I understood him correctly, he said it was because of the interest shown in such subjects as dogs that the public esteem for Congressmen and for Congress generally had fallen so low. I hardly think that is true, and I would like to make this observation: That it was the voting away repeatedly of the powers and prerogatives of this Congress to other agencies that caused the American people to look with disfavor upon Congress and not because some of them happened to be lovers of dogs.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I may say that in the several hundred letters I have received since I took up the time of the House last Thursday, I have been rather roundly applauded for the fact that somebody took an interest in dogs even under present circumstances. One man said that in this cockeyed world thank God somebody had time for the most sensible animal that we have in the world today, the dog.

But I wanted to make this further observation to the gentleman from Oklahoma. I suggest that the Appropriations Committee drastically limit the funds which have been assigned to the Farm Security Administration. Let me tell you what they are doing up in my district, which goes right back to Cheboygan County again. Government bureaucrats, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] referred, have been going around that district drumming up a farmers' cooperative association among the farmers of that district. There are three bureau chiefs in Cheboygan County that have been organizing this farmers' cooperative. They said originally it was to be a cooperative simply to warehouse and dispose of their farm produce in that area. The farmers have been asked to buy shares of stock or bonds in the organization, with a \$10 contribution. Then they announced, after they had organized, that they were going into a general merchandising business of all descriptions, competing with practically all the merchants in Cheboygan County. They are getting their working capital for that project from the Farm Security Administration. I have a petition, signed by practically every merchant in Cheboygan, asking why Congress does not wake up and put a stop to such practice on the part of these Federal bureaucrats. Here we have men sweating blood night and day figuring out how they can meet their pay rolls, how they can buy War bonds and War stamps, and so on, yet we have the Federal Government bureaucrats running around deliberately subsidizing farmers' cooperatives in order to put these same individuals out of business.

I would suggest that perhaps the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, might find out that they can considerably reduce the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission. I have always understood it to be against the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission for anybody to swear over the radio. Yet last night if you heard Walter Winchell, he said your constituents and my constituents who voted to return any of the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists last fall "were plain damn fools." How much longer are you going to permit this man Winchell to get away with that stuff and violate the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, with impunity?

Those are some of the suggestions I want to make at this time. There are some others. There are some splendid suggestions in this letter which I will include at this point in the RECORD, which

I received from the editor of a small weekly paper in my district, a paper published in Gaylord, Mich. It is as follows:

GAYLORD PRINTING CO.,
Gaylord, Mich., January 23, 1943.

HON. FRED BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: Your letter regarding the outcome of your interview with Major Canning, re the removal of the Ordnance Service Command repair shop here, received, and personally, as well as for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, want to thank you for prompt action.

We did not hold out much hope of retaining the present set-up, or expect another group to come in. Our purpose was to acquaint you with the situation here in the hope that being cognizant with the situation, its central location, advantages of rail and road transportation, and a general understanding of the situation not only Gaylord, but other small towns within your district, are faced with.

Our ability to buy stamps and bonds is necessarily greatly curtailed as well as our general business, which is going to materially reduce our effort to do our civilian job of helping win the war, and Fred, we are consecrated to that big job. Our sons and brothers and fathers, and our sisters too, are in there pitching. In a small community you know everyone. And when one is called, it is a personal loss to the rest of us as individuals.

It is disgusting to hear official Washington talk about our lack of war consciousness. They don't know anything about it. We in these small communities are cutting out, voluntarily, many items that have been regarded as necessities, because we want our boys and girls on the front, to have them or other things to make their jobs easier.

We do not spend for pleasures, consciously remembering that when we have a desire for a soda, a dinner party, a show, and so forth, that if we do not go, or do what we have in mind, we will be able to put that much more money in stamps and bonds.

We have cut down in employment, and are working longer and harder hours, so that it will release more for the armed forces and defense plants, and provide more money for bonds. We are getting along without many essential things in our businesses because by not getting them it will release that much more to the war effort.

Is official Washington doing as much?

We are in this fight with all we have. We kick and complain, not because we must get along without some things, but because all we get from Washington is free advice as to what we should do, then the next day read of where Washington has done this or that which retards, rather than advances our war aims.

Our Government is making us all very socialistic minded, and this will undermine our so-called democracy unless there are some changes. We don't want it, as a people, but it is being forced upon us, and before the threat of losing our individuality, so apparent in all the actions of Washington in the past few years, Mr. John Q. Public is going to use his franchise to defeat bureaucracy, and this spells defeat to democracy.

But enough of that, so referring back to our subject.

It is our hope that with the knowledge you now have of our situation, you will use your good offices in watching developments so that if anything breaks you have the information that may make it possible for you to assist us in making use of the fine buildings that will soon be idle, and which are surely needed for some type of war or peace work.

With every best wish for your success, and again thanking you in the name of the

Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the people of Gaylord and Otsego County, I am
Very truly yours,

PAUL MACDONALD.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would not ask for the indulgence of the House for this brief time at so late an hour had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY], who has just addressed the House, not taken so serious exceptions to remarks made by me a few days ago, with reference to his proposed dog-security legislation. The gentleman reminds me that I spoke in one of the splendid cities of his district during the campaign of 1940. I am sorry if my appearance in Michigan offended him. The people of Michigan were very kind, courteous, and hospitable to me then. I did not criticize the gentleman in his own district merely because I do not agree with him politically. Incidentally, I spoke in 15 other States of the Union during that memorable campaign and I am glad to say I did not say an unkind word personally against any sitting Member of Congress.

I want to assure the gentleman from Michigan that I certainly hold no ill will toward him. He as a very affable gentleman and I have a high regard for him personally. Nothing that I said on the floor of the House could possibly be construed as reflecting on his character, integrity, or reputation as a gentleman.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield, gladly.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. One remark to which I took exception was the suggestion of the gentleman that if I sought the protection of dogs I should go to the city council. Now, what is the city council of Washington if it is not the District of Columbia Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say to the gentleman that had he gone before the District of Columbia Committee it would in my judgment have been a little more in keeping with the dignity of this House rather than to introduce a couple of bills that seem to me more for the mutual welfare of dogs of the District of Columbia and the United States than for the protection of the public.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be pleased to again yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that I discussed the matter in advance with the chairman of the committee and several other members, and with the corporation counsel, and that they had advised me to introduce a bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Very well. That may be sufficient explanation to the gentleman's constituents for having introduced the dog legislation in question in the Congress of the United States, but frankly, I am afraid the corporation counsel and others have gotten my friend out on the proverbial limb.

Today the esteemed gentleman from Michigan, who spent his entire 10 minutes last week talking about dogs in general and his own dog in particular, side-steps the issue to discuss airports, airplanes, the Dies committee, and the splendid speech of the gentleman from Texas today, with whom few Members of this House could possibly disagree, and the fact that undesirable bureaucrats have infested some of the departments of Government. Permit me to compliment the gentleman on his speech today. I must say in all frankness, it was much more statesmanlike and constructive than his address of last week for the uplift of dogdom.

Can it be possible, however, that the gentleman would like for the Congress and his constituents to forget about his speech on canine activities and the security of dogs by side-stepping the issue? After all this little friendly argument started when the gentleman introduced his two bills for the relief of dogs, rather than for the relief of the public.

In my previous remarks I did not criticize the gentleman's bill at all. I did not read the bill at that time and I would not wish to embarrass the gentleman by reading all of it into the Record now, but I have one of the gentleman's bills here, and I am sure he would like for me to call special attention to some of its provisions. I see that there are three provisions in his bill. Provision No. 1 makes it a crime, punishable by 30 days in jail or a fine of \$100 or both, to injure a dog. But the gentleman's bill is strangely silent with reference to protection for the man, woman, boy, or girl who might be injured by a vicious dog. As I walked nearly a mile through the snow this morning to catch a bus to come to the Capitol there were three large, vicious dogs that ran for a block after, and almost attacked, a little girl. A very elderly lady came along. The same dogs followed her for a block. Under the provisions of the gentleman's bill, had anyone taken a club and clubbed one of those vicious dogs, unless he immediately reported it to the police, they would be a criminal and be liable to 30 days in jail or \$100 fine or both for kicking a dog that might bite a child. After all there are a few bad, vicious dangerous dogs as well as a lot of good faithful ones.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There are laws on the statute books at the present time that provide for the legal relief of those people. The owners of the dogs are criminally liable if they let such dogs run loose. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. But the point is there are too many such vicious dogs running loose here, but apparently the gentleman is not as deeply concerned about them as he is about protecting the dogs of the District and Nation, judging from his pet bills. Under the provisions

of the gentleman's bill, if a stray dog should come to your house, whether or not you have a telephone—and there are thousands of good people who have no telephones in Washington—you would be liable if you did not call up the dog catcher and report it, did not give the number of the dog's tag or whatever identification there was on him, if there were any—you would be made a criminal under the provisions of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Within 48 hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Within 48 hours. Even then you would have to have a telephone. A young man came to my office this afternoon and said he had been trying to get a telephone for 6 months, but had been unable to get one. Now, I submit that is going pretty far, and I again respectfully suggest that it is beneath the dignity of this House to discuss, much less seriously consider, such an absurd proposal.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman knows what the practice is today right in the District of Columbia: People will call up the poundmaster and say, "Have you had a call for a brown and white dog about 14 inches high?"

"Who is calling?"

"It is none of your business. Have you had a call for such a dog?"

Many dogs are stolen that way. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I must confess that I am not familiar with what the public says to the dog catcher over the telephone. But the gentleman also knows that I made it plain in my first brief remarks that I am fond of good, faithful dogs. As I stated heretofore, my own little boy has a dog that he loves very much. But let me again respectfully suggest that there are far greater issues here than the protection of dogs, good, bad, or indifferent. Every day we are reminded that there is a real crime wave in Washington. The police and the F. B. I. are overworked here in our Capital City. Last night a man was murdered with a few blocks of this Capitol Building. With the F. B. I. and the police undermanned and begging for additional help to enforce the law and run down saboteurs, then the gentleman would not seriously contend that Congress should make them dog catchers.

Moreover, there are some fine boys from Michigan and other States who are fighting for this country, for what we like to call the American way of life. The present world situation is entirely too serious for Congress to "fiddle while Rome burns" by going off on little side issues.

This is a war Congress, not a dog Congress nor a canine show. Let's not have it said of us that we got there too late with too little.

So much for the gentleman's proposed dog legislation that the Corporation Council or someone suggested he introduce. Now the gentleman comes along and offers some very appropriate suggestions with reference to some

things that he thinks the Appropriations Committee ought to do. As a member of that committee and as chairman of the subcommittee of that committee, I welcome his valuable suggestions and I am willing to discuss them for a moment in order to help the gentlemen get from off that limb with as little damage as possible. Concerning the gentleman's suggestion that all appropriations be cut, I will say that even though the Interior Department is more closely connected with the war effort save and except the War and Navy Departments, that last year I brought that bill to the floor of the House, reduced more than \$18,000,000 below the budget estimates after the Secretary of the Interior had voluntarily cut his own department \$10,000,000 below the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. I feel that I can say with all modesty that is a record for which my committee has a just reason to be proud. May I also add in that connection that early in our hearings a year ago, we inquired of the Secretary's office about the alleged subversive activities, or activities of any other crackpots that might be in that department. Our committee was assured by officials in position to speak with authority, that the F. B. I. had combed the Department of the Interior, as it were, with a fine comb and that anyone even suspected of advocating the overthrow of the Government by force, had been weeded out by that department. I can assure the gentleman that no money in any of the appropriation bills will become available if I can prevent it, by any bureaucrat who would bite the hand that is feeding him and who advocates the overthrow, by force, of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he is suggesting that when the gentleman from Michigan showed interest in a local matter or local ordinance in the city of Washington relating to dogs he was neglecting the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces from the State of Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am giving the facts as I see them. I am casting no insinuations. The record will show whether or not the gentleman from Michigan has expressed the same interest in the human beings of his district as he has in the dogs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The voters of my district seemed to think that I showed enough interest in them to be reelected, and also in the boys in the armed forces from the State of Michigan, and I yield nothing to the gentleman from Oklahoma in reference to my votes for the war effort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. Again I suggest that the record speaks for itself.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like an answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman wants to make a speech, he can make it.

Mr. CURTIS. No. I am asking the gentleman a question and I am trying to get an answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will answer it.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to know if the gentleman feels that the gentleman from Michigan has neglected his duties, or did he have some other reason for making answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman is attempting to side-step the issue. But again I desire to make it very plain that I have no ill will toward the gentleman from Michigan, and that I have a very high regard for him personally. Let us not befuddle the issue. I did not start this dog business. If it has embarrassed the gentleman, I submit in all candor that is not my fault. I again say that the legislation proposed by the gentleman, important that it evidently appears to him, might wait until after the end of this terrible war which is going to settle the future of this generation and generations yet unborn.

HAS CONGRESS VOTED AWAY ITS POWERS AND PREROGATIVES?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Nebraska does not leave because I want to make a suggestion about a statement that has often been made about Congress voting away its powers and prerogatives. I wonder if the Congress has been voting away its powers and prerogatives?

Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress has the lawmaking power. We make the laws. We do not execute the laws. Obviously, we must leave the execution of the laws to the Executive. Under the Constitution the executive department of the Government executes the laws.

This being true, it is within our rights and it is our duty to pass the laws and leave the execution of the laws up to the President. I know there have been many mistakes made in the execution of the laws that have been passed by the Congress. I think though the people keep in mind—I am sure we do as we are elected by the people of our respective districts and States to serve in the House and Senate—that the President of the United States is also elected by the people of this Nation for the purpose of executing the laws that we pass.

Obviously the President himself cannot execute all these laws. He must delegate this power to others, and if he delegates the power to someone who is not a good administrator, it is true that the Congress is criticized, and if the Congress should be criticized, well and good. But should the Congress be criticized because some poor administrator is selected? I know that in the case of a war like we are in now, with a

huge program involving tens of billions of dollars a year, mistakes will be made, and serious mistakes will be made. I think the people expect mistakes to be made. I am sure that the Congress expects the Executive to make a reasonable number of mistakes. But I feel that the Congress has the right to expect and the people have the right to expect that those mistakes will be quickly corrected when discovered.

Congress has been blamed for the poor administration of the price-control law. Our critics doubtless favor such a law in order to prevent runaway prices and inflation. What they object to is the manner of its enforcement, which is something over which we do not have control.

I think the greatest criticism that has come to the administrators in the executive department recently has been because of their failure to correct their mistakes quickly. I do not think Congress should assume all the responsibility, because we merely pass the laws; we do not execute them. I seriously invite that to the attention of the gentleman and others for consideration, because, as we have our duty and responsibility, so the Executive has a duty and responsibility. It is our duty to work with the executive department as much as we can. If a law is not properly administered, I think Congress should deal with it not by putting somebody out of office—because Congress does not have the power to put him out of office in the absence of grounds for impeachment and did not have the power to appoint him in the first place—but by either repealing the law or changing the law by amendment. To that extent only our power is granted to us under the Constitution.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot quarrel with what the gentleman says. I am very much in accord with his statement that the Congress suffers because of the sins and errors of the administrative branch.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas read in tomorrow's RECORD the remarks of one of his colleagues from Texas, because I am sure they will show that if anyone in this House is a little bit critical of the things that have happened, that criticism comes from the gentleman's side of the House.

May I further say to my colleague that I agree with what he has said because many of our troubles are our own troubles. We passed the price-control bill but voted against the Wolcott amendment, which would have ironed out a lot of the kinks in the price-control bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that mistakes have been made. The criticism I have of those administrators is that they have not quickly corrected those mistakes when discovered. I know some of the errors

of these administrators have remained uncorrected, and I regret that very much. In a huge program such as we have now under way, certainly a number of mistakes will be made; but let us hope they will be reduced to a minimum and quickly corrected when discovered.

The main point I want to make is, Why should we say we are voting away our powers and prerogatives? I do not agree with that statement at all. We are merely passing the laws. It is not within our power to enforce them. The criticism comes from enforcement of the laws, but it is not our power to enforce them, and we cannot enforce them. So, why say we are voting away our powers and prerogatives?

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT
MARINE AND FISHERIES,
January 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SAM: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1943: Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN.

As chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex-officio member of the Board.

I notice in the RECORD that you have appointed Mr. FORAND and Mr. STEFAN.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, Chairman.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing to the National Assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 2, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be an organization meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 3, 1943.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 2, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 1012, "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 649, "For the organization and functions of the Public Health Service."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

109. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$13,182,000 (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

110. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, Office for Emergency Management, War Manpower Commission, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$2,454,000 (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

111. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

112. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to \$9,242,200 (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

113. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations of \$427,096 for the fiscal year 1940 and 1942, and supplemental estimates of appropriations of \$470,000 for the fiscal year 1943, in all \$897,096, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

114. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Conciliation Service, Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of \$425,000 (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

115. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supple-

mental estimate of appropriation for the Selective Service System, War Manpower Commission, for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of \$21,160,000 (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

116. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$770,000 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

117. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board, Executive Office of the President, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$200,000 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

118. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency amounting to \$787,400, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for said Agency, all for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

119. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for traveling expenses for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943 in the amount of \$175,000 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

120. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, War Relocation Authority (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

121. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to \$1,437,000 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

122. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to \$7,997,000 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 72); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

123. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$200,000 (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

124. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1943 amounting to \$250,000 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, amounting to \$5,494,000 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for 1943 and prior fiscal years, amounting to \$682,100 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

127. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations, totaling \$5,730,300, for the Department of Agri-

culture for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

128. A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting report covering the operations of the Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

129. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of funds received by Bureau of Census to defray cost of special statistical studies, compilations, etc., covering the period from January 1 to December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

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

131. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of the United States courts and United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting a letter that its report for the period ended September 18, 1942, was delayed and the report will be filed not later than April 1, 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

133. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

134. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

135. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

136. A letter from the president, Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting a report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

137. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States; to fix their duties; to provide for their compensation; and for other purposes; 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. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 839. A bill to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 87. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1446, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for

other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 702. A bill to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER. Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 75. Joint resolution to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 1294. A bill to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 80). 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. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 535. A bill for the relief of Donna Pittel; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio, and Jasper and Pauline Cuccio, minors; with amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 598. A bill for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward; with amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1153. A bill for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea; with amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin and Mattie Baldwin; with amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1538. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as the result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 265)

granting a pension to Mrs. Dorothy Murphy, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1604. A bill to authorize the erection of the United States veterans' hospital in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 1605. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to farm-acreage allotments, the farm marketing excess of wheat, the use of excess corn as silage for feed to livestock on the farm, to provide for the adequate supply of peanuts for oil and other uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 1606. A bill to provide that service subsequent to July 25, 1918, in respect of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Cape Cod Canal shall be included in computing length of service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1607. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1608 (by request). A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims with right of Appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in all claims which the Miami Indians of Indiana had and have against the United States under treaty of June 5, 1854, ratified August 4, 1854 (10 Stat. L. 1093), and as to lineal descendants, or issues of said Miami Indians, pursuant to said treaty of June 5, 1854, and so forth ratified and promulgated August 4, 1854; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 1609. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve and safeguard the financial integrity of the Farm Credit Administration by effecting a better coordination of Federal lending and marketing activities; to provide a permanent formula for arriving at parity prices for farm commodities; to provide for the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing the means to stabilize the purchasing power of money, to protect them and their property from the recurring evils of inflation and deflation and to promote the greatest normal exchange of goods and services among themselves and with the citizens of other nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 1611. 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. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1612. A bill to extend the terms of judges of the district courts in Alaska, Hawaii,

and the Virgin Islands to 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 1613. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1614. A bill to amend sections 72 and 85 of the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, so as to deny Members of Congress, and certain other officers, after their respective terms of office have expired, the right to dispose of public documents and the use of the franking privilege; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 1615. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which the President may enter into foreign-trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 1616. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1617. A bill to restore certain disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment who were disabled in line of duty to pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1618. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to widows of recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 1619. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1620 (by request). A bill to grant civil-service preference to wives and widows of certain veterans; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 1621. A bill to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1623. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548-555); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1624. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1625. A bill to aid small independent business of the country by the collection and dissemination of knowledge of business management and its application to specific problems and opportunities, that the American system of free enterprise may be strengthened and that individual small business may be continued at a profit both to the businessman and the community; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1647. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937, in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 11 to 17, 1943, as National Humane Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 89. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate activities of various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. Res. 90. Resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate and study rent control in the city of Akron, Ohio; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Res. 91. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the acquisition by the War Department of certain land in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Doherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Vida B. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of John Hirsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1629. A bill granting a pension to James William Westerfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1630. A bill granting a pension to Albert E. Akins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1631. A bill granting a pension to Jesse L. Fisher; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 1632. A bill granting an increase of pension to Essie M. Pursell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1633. A bill granting an increase of pension to Estella Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1634. A bill granting a pension to Martha E. Lumley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of William E. Search, and the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of B. B. Stringer; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Fred Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Isobell Shanks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schoenbach; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1642. A bill with reference to certain loans made under the Agricultural Marketing

Act of 1929 and to grant certain relief to Florida Citrus Exchange, the Growers Loan & Guaranty Co., and the Guaranty Operating Co.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 1644. A bill to authorize the presentation of the Medal of Honor to John C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Edward Gillam; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 1646. A bill for the relief of James W. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

57. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution from the Buffalo Fur Merchants' Association, Inc., favoring the adoption of a pay-as-you-go plan for collection of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

58. Also, petition from employees of the Consolidated Packaging Machinery Corporation of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring enactment of a pay-as-you-go tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

59. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of 44 citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., protesting against recurrence of strikes during war, and urging speedy correction of situation; to the Committee on Labor.

60. Also, resolution of Washington State Cooperative Council, urging that rationing of gasoline and other farm necessities be left to local rationing boards who understand local conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

61. Also, resolution of the Washington State Cooperative Council, urging inclusion of labor cost factor in determining agricultural parity price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

62. Also, resolution of the Washington State Cooperative Council, urging a definite clear-cut program assuring an adequate supply of skilled farm labor to insure adequate food supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

63. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Buffalo Foreign Trade Association, favoring appropriations to support the field service of the United States Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

64. By Mrs. NORTON: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to place income-tax collections from individuals on a current or pay-as-you-go basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

65. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of B. W. Brown, president, County Court of Marshall County, Moundsville, W. Va., protesting against the inclusion of the western part of West Virginia in the gasoline-rationing program set up by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

66. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Assembly concurrent resolution of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to place income-tax collections from individuals on a current or pay-as-you-go basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

67. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of the Michigan State Legislature, asking the creation of a War Labor Board office in Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, close as the air that wraps us round, for breath and work, for success and hope, and for the privilege of sharing in human joy, we praise Thee. At all times, in every hour of stress, help us to realize that Thy wisdom never errs and Thy judgment never fails. We ask not for ease, nor for the approval of men, but for Thy blessing upon every task that it may have a place in Thy eternal purpose, steadily driving its roots into the nourishing earth of the will of Him who feels and hears our appeal on the other side of silence.

Thou hast taught us that the highest joy of existence is in the renouncing of self that we may help others. Our debt to this sorrowing world, dear Lord, is not discharged by a trifle of silver or gold, nor by the garment of praise. We give thanks to our Saviour who paused over the call of human need with a lowly spirit of self-renunciation. Oh, let us forget all things in the preciousness of His example.

"Greatly begin; though thou have time But for a line, be that sublime— Not failure, but low aim is crime."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Executive Office of the President (National Resources Planning Board).
5. Executive Office of the President (Office of War Information).
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
8. National Housing Agency.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution: