

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 1683. A bill for the relief of Clay Long Edwards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1684. A bill for the relief of Frank P. Hoyt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estate of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

73. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of sundry citizens of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

74. By Mr. SCHWABE: Petition of Roscoe Enloe Post, No. 5, the American Legion, Jefferson City, Mo., urging that funds be appropriated for the resumption of medical and hospital obstetric and pediatric care for the families of the men in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

75. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Joseph Gotkin and 37 other citizens of Tucson, Ariz., asking support of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, such as proposed in House bill 7432 and Senate bill 2690 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

76. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the State of California, relative to petitioning Hon. Claude E. Wickard to alleviate the food shortage resulting from increased population in the State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1943

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

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain.

Help us to be valiant pilgrims on life's dusty and dreary way, mindful of the fret and jar which any words or deeds of ours may bring to fellow travelers by our side. Deliver us from unlovely self-conceit. Make us forgiving and forbearing, gentle with others' failings and grateful for others' favors, remembering that the time for loving and serving is so short as the night cometh and swift to its close ebbs out life's little day. Teach us to toil and ask not for reward save that of knowing we do the things that please Thee. So upon our passing days may there rest the benediction of a faith that dares, a love that cares, and a service that shares, until by Thy grace we find ourselves by hands familiar welcomed into the Father's house, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to an order of the Senate, the Chair designates the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d instant.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to section 5581 of the Revised Statutes, the Chair reappoints the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] as a regent of the Smithsonian Institution.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Senate Resolution 66, authorizing the appointment of five additional members of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, the Chair appoints as additional members of that special committee the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK].

DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA—NOTICE OF HEARING OF NOMINATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Friday, February 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT—NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Charles D. Lawrence, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Friday, February 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII—NOTICE OF HEARING OF NOMINATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Friday, February 12, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

OPERATIONS UNDER FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION BY EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACTS, 1942 AND 1943

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943, I present herewith a report of the operations under funds appropriated to the Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, fiscal years 1942 and 1943, to the end of the calendar year 1942.

This report is supplemental to that portion of the report presented by me to the Congress on January 11, 1943, which is related to operations to the end of the fiscal year 1942 under funds appropriated to the Work Projects Administration by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and for fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1943.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report giving all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 234 aliens whose deportation he suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspensions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST INCIDENT TO EMERGENCY EVACUATION OF UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC SERVICE EXPEDITION'S EAST BASE, ANTARCTICA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the chairman and members of the Board of Investigation and Research, Washington, D. C., stating that circumstances

had delayed completion of its study and report on interterritorial freight rates and that the report will be submitted at a later date; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

IDA F. BRAUN ET AL. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 270 (75th Cong.), a certified copy of the findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion in the case of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually, and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased, versus the United States, Congressional No. 17749 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the President of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1942 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE—PETITION OF JOHN RANDOLPH NEAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of John Randolph Neal, Knox County, Tenn., praying that the Senate allow him to contest the election of TOM STEWART to the office of United States Senator and to produce proof substantiating the various charges and allegations made in the petition; that TOM STEWART be not allowed to hold the office of United States Senator, but that the petitioner, John Randolph Neal, be declared rightfully entitled to such office, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of pending legislation for the preservation of the home of George Washington Carver as a national shrine; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas war and world conditions have placed upon all industries a great challenge, involving maximum production to meet the needs of our armed forces and those of our allies; and

"Whereas the production of food is of the greatest importance, and because of depleted manpower on our farms, lack of farm ma-

chinery, unfavorable priority rulings, and inability to compete in labor markets, agriculture is unable to meet the demands now made upon it;

"Therefore we respectfully submit the following facts setting forth the position of agriculture:

"(1) Milk, butter, cheese, meat, poultry, and vegetables are vital war foods of which there is now a shortage;

"(2) These are the foods which require a comparatively large amount of manpower in man-hours of work to produce;

"(3) They require skilled labor on a year-round basis as contrasted to peak harvest time and seasonal demands;

"(4) The manpower on the farms of Minnesota has already been seriously depleted;

"(a) Thousands of men have gone into our armed forces;

"(b) A considerable number of Minnesota farm laborers have gone into defense industries;

"(c) This transition of labor has been brought on in part by the prevailing high wages and overtime paid in these defense industries;

"(d) Farmers cannot compete with the prevailing high wages thus paid;

"(e) This automatically results in shortage of farm labor as well as a reduction in man-power hours for the Nation as a whole;

"(5) Since we are collectively engaged in a common struggle of winning the war, we urge that we share the sacrifices of the soldiers at the front, by foregoing special privileges whether we be laborers in the war industries or producers on the farms; that our loyalty and patriotism should find expression in a willingness to work longer hours, to the end that production may be intensified and the war quickly won;

"(6) Inasmuch as farm labor must be experienced and specialized, the general solution of the farm labor problem, therefore, can partially be solved by the release of men from our armed forces and defense industries who are experienced in farm labor;

"(7) The farm-labor problem can be further solved by release of essential farm machinery, repairs, and repairing material, which is a direct step toward replacing necessary man-hours on the farm. Much of the red tape now required by the Government at Washington should be eliminated and more authority delegated to the local agencies to handle these problems;

"(8) Electricity being a fundamental factor in increasing production on our farms, we urge that the War Production Board modify existing regulations that will permit the use of materials supplying electricity to farmers along existing lines;

"The above analysis of our farm problems coupled with a profound desire to do everything in our power to aid our Government in promoting policies most urgent to achieve victory in war, and after the war, to aid in reconstruction, prompts the Legislature of the State of Minnesota to urgently resolve that the Congress of the United States give immediate attention to these most pressing problems involving agriculture as well as the well-being of our entire Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States and all other national agencies concerned, to immediately correct these existing conditions as set forth in this resolution, adversely affecting agriculture in Minnesota, and thus hampering our efforts to sustain our Nation with food supplies; be it further

"Resolved, That we do earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States specifically to bring to the attention of the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service the existing plight of agriculture, to the end that the present policies of these agencies be immediately modified so as to prevent further depletion of skilled farm labor

and the consequent impairment of necessary food supply."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Hardtner, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas hospitalization has been provided for veterans of all wars regardless of origin or nature of the disability; and

"Whereas veterans discharged from the present world conflict are eligible to hospitalization only in the event they are discharged for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for disability incurred in line of duty; and

"Whereas discharged veterans of the present conflict are being denied necessary immediate hospitalization because of the requirements of the present laws under which the Veterans' Administration now operates: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to take such action as is necessary and required to correct present inequities in Federal statutes pertaining to the hospitalization of war veterans to the end that a veteran of the present conflict discharged on or after December 7, 1941, be considered a veteran of a war and entitled to hospitalization for treatment as indicated or care of any disease or injury, regardless of the nature of origin, when such treatment is required; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the dehydration of Idaho potatoes on a large scale is essential in order to supply necessary food for our armed forces overseas; and

"Whereas the War Department is prohibited from purchasing dehydrated potatoes from any plant unless and until such plant is approved by the Joint Dehydration Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration; and

"Whereas the dehydration plant facilities in the State of Idaho are inadequate for processing all of the available supply of Idaho potatoes for such purposes; and

"Whereas said Joint Dehydration Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration has made an arbitrary and unjust ruling in which approval of any additional dehydration plants for the processing of Idaho potatoes is being withheld on the ground that the present plants are using as much of the total production of Idaho potatoes as such Committee deems proper to be diverted to that use, notwithstanding that there is an abundant supply of suitable potatoes available for such use and much time, effort, and expense have been put forth for the establishment of additional plants for processing such potatoes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to immediately take such action as may be deemed necessary to broaden and liberalize the administration of the duties of the Federal Joint Dehydration Committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration so as

to permit the orderly establishment and development of dehydration plants and facilities in order that there may be an increased production of dehydrated potatoes, thus providing a more adequate supply of such product for our armed forces as well as developing a profitable market for Idaho potatoes and increasing the income of the growers of such potatoes and those who may be engaged in the work of processing the same; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send copies of this memorial to the Honorable John Thomas, the Honorable D. Worth Clark, the Honorable Compton I. White, and the Honorable Henry Dworshak, members of the Idaho delegation in Congress assembled."

FARM MACHINERY—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a concurrent resolution which has been sent to me by the Legislature of North Dakota, and which, at their request, I read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

Whereas the farmers of North Dakota are preparing to cooperate in the war effort by planting the largest acreage of wartime crops in history; and

Whereas the farm machinery in this State is more than normally in need of repairs and replacement because during the decade of the thirties the financial condition of the farmers did not permit purchases and what crops were raised were used to pay debts, and with plenty of cheap labor available machinery was allowed to wear out, with the result that new machinery purchases in the State of North Dakota in 1937, 1938, and 1939 were less than 50 percent of new machinery sales in the State during the years 1927, 1928, and 1929; and

Whereas restrictions on sales during the past 2 years and the drafting of farm labor has created an urgent need for labor-saving machinery especially for cultivating, haying, and harvesting purposes; and

Whereas there is a shortage of blacksmiths and mechanics as well as welding materials and supplies; and

Whereas the manufacture and distribution of labor-saving farm machinery is a slow process; and

Whereas farmers of this State must have immediate information on the harvesting facilities that will be made available before they dare plant 1943 crops on the scale needed for winning the war; Be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota assembled at Bismarck that, Congress and the appropriate Federal agency and directors should take immediate action as follows:

1. That farm machinery manufacturers who are equipped to build and distribute large labor-saving farm machinery be immediately ordered to proceed to construct additional quantities of machinery, particularly the cultivating, haying, and harvesting types.

2. That the present program of accelerating the release of repairs and parts be continually stressed.

3. That the remaining blacksmiths and mechanics be allowed adequate iron, steel, and welding supplies and materials for repairing farm machinery.

4. That the farmers of North Dakota be given immediate, definite, and final assurance of just what they may depend upon in the way of machinery for 1943; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent immediately air mail to Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; Henry L. Wallace, Vice President; Donald L. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; George L. Gillette, chairman of the

Farm Equipment Machinery Division of the War Production Board; to the Secretary of Agriculture; and to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of North Dakota.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

A DECLARATION OF WAR BY THE UNARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—PETITION

Mr. BROOKS. There has been presented to me by Mr. Edwin B. Moran, president of the Rotary Club of Chicago, a petition containing the signatures of 9,154 Chicago citizens. It is stated that other Rotary Clubs have secured hundreds of signatures. The Kiwanians of the United States have also obtained 50,000 additional signatures.

These signatures are not only those of Rotarians and Kiwanians as employers but those of many thousands of employees and executives, both men and women, who are not members of service club organizations. They are a cross section of citizens from labor, management, and the professions. They have all signed as citizens.

This petition and accompanying declaration is the idea of the son of a Chicago Rotarian. His father promised, when the lad left for war, that he would do what he could to keep the home fires burning toward maintaining the liberties of the American people. The ideas of his son and himself are embodied in "A Declaration of War by the Unarmed Forces of the United States of America."

I request that the petition or declaration be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred, because I believe the subject to be of importance to members of this body.

There being no objection, the petition or declaration was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

More than 2,000,000 American young men have gone to war. They have set aside their hopes and dreams. They have left comfortable homes. Postponed careers. Declared a moratorium on life.

Turned abruptly from the ways of peace—they are now digging ditches, building roads, peeling potatoes, swabbing decks, emptying garbage, drilling, training, learning to shoot. We may thank our lucky stars they don't have to learn to die. They are Americans. They just don't like being kicked around.

They went cheerfully—went where they were sent, and no questions asked. Rich and poor. Republicans and Democrats. Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Gentiles, white and colored. Wealth, position, religion, color, politics—these don't matter when the question is one of freedom or slavery.

There are no limitations on the hours these boys work now. No rules decide their pay. They've got a grim, tough job to do, and they're doing it like men.

They're learning things every day—these boys we say we cherish. Learning a lot of things we should know, but stupidly refuse to admit.

They're learning that courage alone is a thin weapon against Axis planes and tanks.

They're learning the tragedy of losing for want of a few extra bombers in the right place at the right time.

They're learning the brutal, bloody cost of haggling and arguing and debating and stalling while our sons die.

We stood on the curb as they left. We cheered. We went with them to the station and shed a few tears. We drove home in our cars to warm firesides. Then in a week or two we stormed the stores when the demand for cloth to clothe them removed the cuffs from our pants.

In God's name, America, let's be men at least as big as our sons.

We are the unarmed forces of the United States. No one of us is without responsibility or duty.

While we haggle over an hour of overtime our sons are being slaughtered.

We live our comfortable lives back of the ramparts they watch. If they fail, there will be no life, but slow, living death.

Our supreme duty—our only duty—is to deliver to these young men the planes, tanks, guns, and ships they need. Deliver them at top speed and work as many hours making them as they willingly work using them.

They are out there now. Waiting with the coming of each dawn. And for their courage, their bravery, their sacrifice, they've asked just one thing of us—"Don't let us down."

This is our unequivocal answer—we whose names appear below. We declare war. War on partisanship. War on all political intrigue. War on special privilege. War on blindness and bickering.

We demand that every citizen of the United States, in or out of Government, in or out of management, in or out of labor, shall exert every human effort toward the production of war munitions and supplies in maximum quantity at maximum speed and at minimum cost.

As a sacred duty to our armed forces and to the Government and the people, we, the unarmed forces, declare war on all swollen salaries, dividends, bonus payments, or profits on war contracts for munitions or supplies in excess of profits made in peacetime under conditions of full and free competition. And we demand full and detailed public exposure of all violations.

We declare war on all rules, regulations, or agreements which may prevent any worker on any war contract for munitions or supplies from working as many hours, or as many days, or as he or she is willing to work, or doing as much work as he or she wants to do to increase production so long as normal health safeguards are maintained. And we demand full and detailed public exposure of organizations and individuals responsible for obstructing production.

We declare war on all acts, or failures to act, by Members of the United States Senate or House of Representatives which permit or encourage representatives of either capital or labor to increase costs or obstruct production on war materials. And we demand full public exposure of any Member of Congress guilty of failure to protect our armed forces and our people against saboteurs of production in either group.

The signers of this declaration of war are not concerned with political partisanship. We are neither for nor against any employer or group nor any group of employees.

We are concerned with action—full, unbridled, speedy action. And we propose to devote ourselves to these tenets as a sacred trust. We promise that when men die needlessly the responsibility shall be firmly placed insofar as it is within our ability to place it.

To our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States—to the armed forces and the people—we pledge ourselves to this unalterable view for the duration of this war.

RESOLUTIONS OF COMANCHE COUNTY (KANS.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of resolutions

adopted by the Comanche County (Kans.) Farm Bureau, at its twenty-fourth annual meeting at Coldwater, Kans. Inasmuch as these resolutions are written and approved directly by farmers themselves, they may be regarded as actual farmer sentiment. I believe the Senate may find them of interest for that reason.

These resolutions point out that—

First. Farmers will have to have prices allowing them to compete, comparably, with war industries if they are to obtain necessary help to produce needed foods.

Second. Farm boys should be encouraged to remain on the farm until drafted, and feel they are performing as patriotic service there as in what are called "essential war industries."

Third. Farmers need new farm machinery and, even more, they need repair parts, and need them now.

Fourth. Immediate steps should be taken to release materials for needed wire fence staples, nails for minor but necessary farm repair and maintenance jobs.

Fifth. The meat shortage is going to be much worse unless protein supplement for livestock feeding is made available. "The need for this feed is now, and not a month from now," say the Comanche County farmers.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD in full at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the duly appointed resolutions committee, after having considered the general letter of G. M. GILLETTE, United States Senator from Iowa, and GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator from Vermont, dated January 6, 1943, in which they discuss what they term several major questions that are still unanswered and that must be answered before farmers generally can obtain the maximum of production on their individual farms, state that the sentiment of this committee with reference to said questions is as follows:

1. It is the sentiment of this group that we express an appreciation to the President of the United States for his interest in farm mobilization and setting a date for same. We also express our appreciation to Senators GILLETTE and AIKEN for sending out their letter of inquiry concerning farm mobilization.

2. As to the labor problem, we feel that we as farmers must receive such prices for our marketed products as will enable us to compete with the wages offered in industry and other defense work. One way to accomplish this would be to raise the price ceilings on farm commodities. We feel that this will not materially tend to inflation as labor prices increased 113 percent from 1935 to 1939, while living costs for the same period increased less than half of this figure.

3. We think the farm-labor situation could be greatly helped if the boys now on the farm of the ages 17, 18, and 19 years could be convinced that they are rendering just as patriotic a service by remaining on the farm and supporting the men already in the service as they would be if they themselves were in the service. We feel that this frame of mind would be greatly cultivated if the farm boys had the assurance that they would not be drafted in some line of the service

that does not appeal to them. Or to be more specific, if when they are given a deferred classification they would be assured that it would continue and we suggest that some form of formal recognition should be given to such boys.

4. We think that in the matter of farm machinery, we need some new machinery but the drastic need is an increased supply of repairs to be made available immediately. The amount of repairs made available should be at least 100 percent more than in former years. In this part of the country the demand for increased livestock production makes it absolutely necessary for us to have new machines, such as binders and field cutters, for harvesting our feed crops which must be produced and harvested with this equipment if we are to meet our livestock—the drastic need is an increased supply of equipment for this purpose is entirely inadequate.

5. We further state that immediate steps should be taken to release sufficient material for the production of wire-fence staples, nails, and other minor farm repairs needed every day on the farm and used only for necessary repairs. These products have never been and will not be hoarded if the farmers know they will receive sufficient quantities to keep their fences and other equipment in repair to meet their production goals. This lack of fencing materials and other repairs is definitely hampering our agriculture production and immediate steps must be taken to relieve the situation.

6. We also state that the lack of protein supplement for livestock feeding is our most urgent and immediate need. Unless protein feeds are released and placed in the hands of livestock feeders at once our production goals will not be met and our livestock will not be wintered with the usual gain in weight but will go on grass weighing less than normal. The need for this feed is now and not a month from now. These protein feeds must be obtained in the winter when grass and other green pastures are not available. With the big increase in the production of protein feeds in 1942 we feel that some steps can and should be taken to force the release of these feeds for livestock feeding where needed. At the present time it is impossible to purchase these feeds through the regular trade channels.

7. We endorse in full the Kansas State Farm Bureau resolutions as passed at its annual convention in Wichita, Kans., November 5, 6, and 7, 1942.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF OKLAHOMA—DISTRIBUTION OF GAS, FARM MACHINERY, TRUCKS, AND SO FORTH

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I present a memorial from the State Legislature of Oklahoma. I ask that the memorial be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The legislature resolution presented by the Senator from Oklahoma will be appropriately referred and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the United States is now at war with Germany, Japan, and Italy; and

Whereas the farmers of America produce in the main, the goods, food, and clothing—three of the outstanding fundamental essentials necessary to carry on and win the war; and

Whereas agriculture is of vital importance to the United Nations as a whole; and

Whereas the President of the United States has declared that the United States shall be-

come an arsenal of democracy and the United States must furnish the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the nineteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma and the House of Representatives concurring therein, That we respectfully petition and memorialize the Congress and the President to enact a sane farm program containing the following pertinent provisions:

First. That the ceiling price of all farm products be set sufficiently high to enable farmers and producers to secure labor at a wage comparable to the wages now being paid common laborers employed in defense and industrial work.

Second. That Congress, the President, and the authorities in control of the manpower program take into consideration the necessity for farm labor and arrange, as far as possible, deferments for draftees called from the farms, to prevent a shortage of farm labor.

Third. That gas rationing and rationing of farm machinery and parts and repairs of farming machinery, including trucks, be furnished liberally to farmers and producers in order that the marketing of products and the other transportation items essential to the farming industry shall not be handicapped nor the production of farm products be curtailed.

Fourth. That the Congress and the President be memorialized and requested to call in representative dirt farmers from all parts of the country and consider with them in order that they may obtain a comprehensive and representative picture of the needs of agriculture; that a like and similar program be established for the livestock industry and for each branch of essential agriculture to the end; that a speedy and all-out victory be won for the United States and United Nations in 1943 or as soon thereafter as possible; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Oklahoma.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library:

S. 319. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes; without amendment.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 80. Resolution to continue the investigation relative to the production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber; without amendment (Rept. No. 31); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 32);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Kegel; without amendment (Rept. No. 33);

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke; without amendment (Rept. No. 34); 34;

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 35);

S. 355. A bill for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 36);

S. 403. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried

out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 37);

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Richard Barker; without amendment (Rept. No. 38);

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuseller Sigler; without amendment (Rept. No. 39);

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; without amendment (Rept. No. 40);

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 41);

S. 493. A bill for the relief of Emilliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 42);

S. 517. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 43); and

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom; with amendments (Rept. No. 44).

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 60, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on January 14, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940, and Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that I have any objection. I thought inquiries of the nature of that covered by the resolution were under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Commerce. Does this resolution relate to a subcommittee or the full committee or a special committee?

Mr. LUCAS. The investigation is being made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of investigation was first referred to the Committee on Commerce, and was reported back by that committee.

Mr. McNARY. That explains the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution does not provide for any additional appropriation.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 60) was considered and agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO FUEL IN CERTAIN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 61, submitted by the

Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on January 14, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942 (providing for an investigation with respect to fuel in certain areas west of the Mississippi River), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

DENIAL TO CERTAIN MUSICIANS OF RIGHTS IN CONNECTION WITH MECHANICAL REPRODUCTION OF MUSIC

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 81, submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] on January 21, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 286, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 24, 1942 (authorizing an investigation of the action of the American Federation of Musicians in denying its members the right to play or contract for recordings or other forms of mechanical reproduction of music), is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE AND FUEL SHORTAGES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 28, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] on January 7, 1943, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 156, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 28, 1941, Senate Resolution 189, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 9, 1941, and Senate Resolution 264, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, providing for an investigation with respect to shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products and solid fuels, is hereby continued until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation 3 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS—NOMINATION OF CLAUDE S. GILLETTE TO BE A REAR ADMIRAL

As in executive session,

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably several nominations for the Executive Calendar.

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

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Howard F. Kingman, May 10, 1942.

Claude S. Gillette, May 13, 1942.

Sherman S. Kennedy, May 13, 1942.

Frank A. Braisted, August 7, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received as in executive session, and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, through the thoughtful consideration and courtesy of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], I have an opportunity to indicate my very personal interest in one of the nominations which has just been reported. I realize that the nominations would lie over under the rule, but it will be impossible for me to be present in the Senate at the next session, and as one of the names presented is that of my only brother, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to call the nomination up for consideration at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request made by the able Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Claude S. Gillette to be rear admiral in the Navy.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senate will understand the pleasure I have in moving that the Senate advise and consent to the advancement of Claude S. Gillette to the grade of rear admiral, United States Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer and/or promotion in the Regular Army; and

Sundry second lieutenants of the Army of the United States, who graduated from the United States Military Academy on January 19, 1943, for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 625. A bill for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 626. A bill for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 627. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; and

S. 628. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy, as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 629. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 630. A bill to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 631. A bill for the relief of William R. Tipton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 632. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 633. A bill granting a pension to Grace L. Pierson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 634. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 635. A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 636. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 637. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 638 (by request). A bill to amend section 321 of the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to the character of military or naval property of the United States which may be transported at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 639. A bill to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 640. A bill to establish official checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States for clerks of United States courts and United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 641. A bill to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers;

S. 642. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

S. 643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 644. A bill providing for the removal of local superintendents; and providing for the

manner of calling elections; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 645. A bill to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 646. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 647. A bill to provide for separation from the armed forces of men whose services would be more valuable to the war effort in certain essential civilian activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 648. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 649. A bill to promote flood control in the basin of the Republican River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 650. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "To further extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak."; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 651. A bill to amend the act of April 27, 1916, establishing the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter; and

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 654. A bill to establish a Chiropody (Podiatry) Corps in the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 655. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a medical academy for training persons for service as commissioned officers in the medical branches of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 656. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach, and others, for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 657. A bill for the relief of James L. Hill; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 658, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 659. A bill prohibiting loss of retired pay to certain persons who accept essential employment during the present war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 660. A bill to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 661. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 662. A bill to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes;

S. 663. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes";

S. 664. A bill to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War

veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; and

S. 665. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of July 30, 1942, Public Law 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, to provide increases of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as Good Neighbor Day for the purpose of setting an example of neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow—leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELVA BIRCH DAVIS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I submit a resolution in behalf of the daughter of one of the employees of the Senate who passed away recently.

The resolution (S. Res. 89) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Elva Birch Davis, daughter of Robert R. Birch, late an employee of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

E. E. MOECKEL

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to E. E. Moeckel, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$69.75 as compensation for stenographically reporting hearings held before Members of the Senate on October 9, 1942, relating to the use of rayon instead of cotton in the manufacture of automobile tires, and furnishing a transcript of such hearings.

UNITED NATIONS POST-WAR PEACE CHARTER

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 91), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate approves the program of purposes and principles embodied in Joint Declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, and known as the Atlantic Charter.

That the Senate advises and urges the President of the United States to take early action to initiate, formulate, and make a joint treaty agreement with each and all of the United Nations subscribing to a joint declaration dated January 1, 1942, to wit:

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia, and such other nations as have since

that date or which may hereafter become associated with the United Nations in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism and similar governmental philosophies.

The Senate urges and advises that such formal treaty enunciate and stress that—

The joint signatories neither seek nor desire aggrandizements, territorial or otherwise,

That they respect and will approve the right of all people under proper opportunity to choose the form of government under which they will live and will countenance the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of this choice,

That they will collaborate in the formulating of a just peace, embodying formulas for post-war collaboration to maintain peace and security throughout the world,

That they recognize the necessity for just and equitable collaboration by all signatories to secure for all nations an economic advancement, improved labor standards, social security, and access on fair and equal terms by all peoples to the raw materials and the international commercial channels of the world,

That the Senate suggests that such proposed treaty might be entitled "The United Nations Post-War Peace Charter."

ABILITY OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE TO EXERCISE APPROPRIATE SUPERVISION OVER GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation in order to determine whether the General Accounting Office, under its present organization, can properly carry out the functions, as an agency of the Congress, of maintaining constant supervision over expenditures in the executive agencies of the Government and of reporting, at least once each month and more often if required, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to (a) whether funds appropriated to the various governmental departments and agencies are being properly and economically expended; (b) whether there are duplications of services and efforts by such departments and agencies and, if so, means for eliminating such duplication; (c) whether services of such departments and agencies can be reorganized so as to increase efficiency; (d) whether agencies interested with the recapture of large sums of money have properly functioned, and whether such sums due the Government have been recaptured; and (e) whether contracts entered into by the various agencies of the Government have been in compliance with existing law. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems ad-

visible. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$—, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

COST OF TAX COLLECTION AND DEFAULT IN INCOME TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there has been some unfortunate discussion across the country recently about the alleged high cost of tax collection through the United States Treasury. The subject was discussed in the Senate Finance Committee last week, and I asked Assistant Secretary Sullivan to furnish me with the facts for the RECORD. I am very happy now to present his letter which, far contrary to the reports which have been circulated, indicates that the cost of collection has been only 56 cents per hundred dollars, which is a thoroughly acceptable and commendable result.

Mr. Sullivan also presents, as bearing upon another phase of popular discussion at the present time, a table showing that

the average default in the collection of Federal income taxes for the past 22 years has been only one and three-tenths percent.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. Sullivan and the accompanying table be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 30, 1943.
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the hearing before the Senate Finance Committee yesterday you asked me to secure for you the figures which would show the cost of collecting Federal taxes. For the fiscal year 1941 the cost of collection of all Federal taxes was 81 cents for each \$100 collected. For the fiscal year 1942 this cost was 56 cents per \$100 collected.

For your information I am enclosing a table showing the individual income-tax collections and defaults over a 22-year period from 1921 through 1942. I think the remarkably low percentage of defaults in the past is reassuring for the future.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

TABLE 1.—Number of taxpayers, income tax collected from individuals, number of uncollectible individual income-tax items, and amount for the fiscal years 1921 through 1942

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Number of taxable individual income tax returns	Income tax collected from individuals	Individual income tax assessments abated as uncollectible			
			Number of items	Percent of total collections	Amount	Percent of total collections
1921	5,873,622	\$1,284,798,526	10,220	0.2	\$3,168,303	0.2
1922	3,701,970	1,056,398,000	13,395	.4	4,152,336	.4
1923	3,729,574	885,116,000	42,504	1.1	9,649,810	1.1
1924	4,305,422	762,120,000	32,709	.8	6,045,492	.8
1925	4,513,906	845,426,352	33,986	.8	9,143,727	1.1
1926	2,557,681	879,124,407	60,389	2.4	24,220,562	2.8
1927	2,485,586	911,939,911	31,953	1.3	9,663,872	1.1
1928	2,455,411	882,727,114	22,885	.9	23,658,666	2.7
1929	2,489,075	1,095,541,172	12,552	.5	23,506,491	2.1
1930	2,515,623	1,146,844,764	7,137	.3	20,476,846	1.8
1931	2,077,862	833,647,798	6,267	.3	11,195,394	1.3
1932	1,575,271	427,190,582	7,769	.5	20,204,213	4.7
1933	1,946,248	352,373,020	8,090	.4	14,942,282	4.0
1934	1,781,809	419,509,488	11,696	.7	13,942,533	3.3
1935	1,856,165	527,112,506	11,093	.6	14,642,710	2.8
1936	2,160,330	674,416,074	7,371	.3	6,996,447	1.0
1937	2,932,520	1,061,746,746	17,843	.4	12,496,802	1.1
1938	3,397,552	1,284,311,882	7,841	.2	9,491,776	.7
1939	3,063,235	1,028,833,796	13,554	.4	12,831,904	1.2
1940	3,985,482	682,017,376	20,194	.5	11,552,021	1.2
1941	7,576,642	1,417,655,127	10,075	.1	7,097,515	.5
1942	14,608,267	3,262,800,390	12,050	.1	9,837,622	.3
Totals for 22-year period..	81,590,253	22,053,845,361	395,573	.5	278,024,325	1.3

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research

November 27, 1942.

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue, Statistical Section, Income Tax Unit.

AWARDING OF E FLAG TO WAR PLANT AT SUNCOOK, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on December 16, 1942, I was present and took a small part in the ceremony at Suncook, N. H., on the occasion of the awarding of the E flag of the United States Army and Navy to a typical war plant in this small New England town. This plant is one that has pioneered in producing airplane material for many years.

I should like to read into the RECORD the invocation given there by the Most Reverend John B. Peterson, D. D., Bishop of Manchester, which applies so well to the industrial workers all over our country whose one aim is to work unceasingly until victory is achieved.

The invocation is as follows:

May the Lord Christ, a workman and the Son of a workman, lend His smile of approval to what we do here today.

Our Nation honors the working men and women of these mills, and of this town called Suncook—honors them for their complete cooperation in its purpose to keep men free. Freedom O God, is Thy precious gift to men—a gift that can be and is used for Thy glory by those who in justice and charity live their love for their fellowmen; and for Thee.

The spindles and looms of these mills sing of that love as they spin and weave the pinions that bear freedom's defenders on their mission of love, loyalty, and liberty. That love and that loyalty spring from the hearts of the liberty lovers who toil in these mills. We honor them for their toil. We honor their mills and their town, the active scene of their labors. We honor their State

and their Nation which are strengthened by their industry and their homes. We honor each one of them for what he or she has done and have given that freedom may still be ours and our children's. In honoring and thanking them, we of this Nation thank Thee, our loving God, author of liberty, whom by their toil and generous loyalty they honor. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT BY
OCONTO COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Eldred Klausner, of Stiles, Wis., in which he points out that Oconto County has passed a resolution, which it has sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, advising him that it desires to invest its surplus in bonds of the United States Government in order to assist in the prosecution of the war.

The remarkable showing of this county in getting out of debt and the patriotic action of its county board, I think, are worthy of attention, and I therefore ask that Mr. Klausner's letter, copy of the resolution sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, and a copy of the letter addressed to him, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILES FARMS,
Stiles, Wis., January 29, 1943.

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the direction of the Oconto County Board of Supervisors I am enclosing copies of a resolution and letter addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury for your information and with a request for cooperation. Oconto County, after many lean years both because of the depression and because it is one of the "cut-over counties" of northern Wisconsin, is now on its feet financially, and is planning to set up reserves for post-war work programs to employ its own people on their return from the wars. Our county government, while appreciative, has been restless under the necessity of accepting aids from other branches of government in addition to those that are shared by all. The same meeting unanimously adopted a memorial thanking the State emergency board for the special aids it had given in the past, and saying we do not need them any more. While this is probably an entirely unorthodox attitude, we feel that you will sympathize and approve of it.

Yours very truly,
ELDRED KLAUSNER,
Oconto County Planning Committee
and County Auditor.

Whereas Oconto County, Wis., has received aid from the Federal Government in various programs for meeting its emergencies during the depression, and has used these where possible toward its permanent economic rehabilitation; and

Whereas Oconto County wishes, insofar as possible, to establish a reserve for public-works programs, anticipating the necessity of providing immediate emergency employment for its men on their return from the wars, and wishes to have the cash then available to pay for this, and not to help the war effort of the Federal Government which has, in past county emergencies so generously aided it; and

Whereas Oconto County has, through the cooperation of its taxpayers, been enabled to establish cash reserves and provisions in the current tax levy to retire all of its county tax debt, whether due or not, and to provide for

the anticipated costs of county government on a reasonable basis for the present year, including a provision for a first installment for building up such reserves for post-war work programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oconto County Board of Supervisors this 21st day of January 1943, That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to permit Oconto County to purchase United States Government securities for the purpose of its post-war emergency reserves, and that he be requested to designate the type of securities best suited from the standpoint of the United States Treasury to accomplish this purpose for the county and to aid the war effort; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this petition be mailed to our Senators and Congressman with the request for their cooperation in securing its purpose, and in so helping Oconto County prepare for providing insofar as is possible for the employment at its own expense of its own people on their return from the wars, and to have the cash then available for the purpose without the necessity of additional county tax levies when its own taxpayers will be passing through a period of post-war depression and adjustment.

OCONTO, WIS., January 26, 1943.
HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a certified copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Oconto County, Wis., which I am directed to transmit to you. Having been very generously helped by the Federal Government in a time of great distress during the early years of the depression, and partly as a result of using this aid wherever possible to build a new stability and earning power for its people, it is now in a position not only to carry on its normal functions of county government without aids other than those granted to all counties in established Federal programs but to retire all of its county tax debt, and to build up reserves against the time of adjustment which will come after the war, when it wishes, as far as possible, to care for the immediate employment of its own people on their return, at its own expense.

In building up its reserves and in providing for the future retirement of such debt, not yet due, and on which the creditors decline to accept prior payment, it would like to purchase United States Government bonds or other obligations which should help the war effort at this time but which it will wish to cash when the time is ripe to meet the emergencies for which the reserves are being established. We wish to know what securities to purchase out of the various types offered by the United States Government.

There are the following reserves for which we wish to make purchases between now and tax-settlement time in the month of March:

1. Highway equipment replacement reserve: The proceeds of all equipment transferred to the United States Government with which we wish to purchase war bonds of some type plus the amount of depreciation charges on highway machinery and equipment now in use. Between \$18,000 and \$20,000 on the basis of present sales to the Government, plus additional amounts later.

2. County highway construction reserve: An annual tax levy provision for future construction, the first \$60,000 of which will be ready for investment on settlement of the current tax levy in March.

3. County tax debt retirement reserve: \$38,100 now ready for investment, to retire bonds at \$5,000 per year for each of 6 years, plus interest of about \$5,000 payable in 1944 and smaller amounts each year thereafter.

If you are interested in a brief review of how Oconto County has, through planning and the cooperation of its taxpayers, changed from its status a few years ago as one of the essentially bankrupt "cut-over" counties of northern Wisconsin to its present status of being able to stand on its own feet, and without the allotment to it of any new defense industries or camps to bring it a temporary prosperity, a brief statement is enclosed herewith.

Yours very truly,
OCONTO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
By ELDRED KLAUSNER,
County Planning Committee
and County Auditor.

CELEBRATION OF TWO HUNDREDTH AN-
NIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS
JEFFERSON

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate at any length. First I desire to thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me so that I may present a matter which I deem most important. We are fighting a war all over the world. The policy has been announced both by the head of this Nation and also by our Allies. In my opinion, none of the pronouncements with reference to freedom that have been made of late is anything new. Many years ago a distinguished and great American announced those policies, and I believe that due tribute should be paid to his memory. I beg the indulgence of the Senate and of the Senator from West Virginia while I read a few thoughts which I have penned.

Thomas Jefferson has been immortalized in the mind and heart of all freedom-loving peoples. He is to us Americans our first and truest emancipator. The battles of today's global war are being fought for the four freedoms given to the world by Thomas Jefferson when he penned the American Declaration of Independence. His high performance as a public official exemplified those freedoms possibly more than has that of any other servant of the people. Certainly this record alone is enough to recommend the giving of appropriate homage to the memory of this giant among men on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth, April 13.

In 1932, the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth was fittingly commemorated. It is only just and proper that Thomas Jefferson, Washington's fellow Virginian, and like him one of America's greatest gifts to the world, should receive due recognition as a man whose personal character and political stature have seldom, if ever, been equalled.

On April 13, the beautiful marble monument on the shores of the Tidal Basin is to be dedicated to the memory of Jefferson. But America and the world owe more to Jefferson than can be repaid in the form of a stone structure, imposing as it may be.

The Congress of the United States should, at the earliest opportunity, appropriate the necessary funds to effect the organization of committees, publicity units, and other agencies to honor Jefferson the man, and the Jeffersonian principles which we today so highly revere. In the process of paying homage to this outstanding American, we will relish the

pleasure of refreshing our memories of Jefferson's exemplary life, and the youth of today and of tomorrow may be inspired to tread the paths of glory so effectively measured by his stride.

My plea is that Congress not delay the laying of all necessary plans to honor the memory of Thomas Jefferson, the author of our Declaration of Independence, the founder of the University of Virginia, the author of Virginia's statute for religious freedom—of an American whose activities and labors for the welfare of men call for the small payment of our eternal reverence.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A representative of the Government, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, has decided to dedicate the great memorial to Thomas Jefferson on the anniversary of his birthday this year. I thought that statement should be made at this time as a matter of information, because, of course, as a member of that Commission, I heartily endorse all that the Senator from New Mexico has said. There will be a great dedication on the 13th of April.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.
THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—
EDITORIAL FROM BOWMAN COUNTY
(N. DAK.) PIONEER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Bowman County (N. Dak.) Pioneer of January 28, 1943. The editorial, which is in behalf of the Farm Security Administration, was written by a farmer, Mr. Otto Schade, who is a member of the Bowman County Railroad Committee, and is entitled "What Are We Fighting For?"

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

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

(By Otto Schade, member of the Bowman County Railroad Committee)

The old slogan was, and still is, "We fight to maintain the principles of American democracy." Yes; that is worth fighting for, and our boys at the fronts are doing a great job of it right now. Even while thousands of our men are fighting and dying on the battlefields to uphold what we all like to think of as the American way of life, certain individuals representing certain interests in our country are today attempting to wreck the Farm Security Administration, which came into being as the answer to a drastic need for assistance to thousands of our farm families, who through the depression and drought found themselves literally stranded without the means or credit to reestablish themselves.

In 1936 we had nearly 1,700,000 farm families trying to live on an average income of less than \$500 a year. To put it another way, more than 8,000,000 farm people tried to exist on about \$2 per week. That is a long way from "the American way of life." That was the actual situation when the Farm Security Administration was organized.

Over a million farm families have now been given a fresh start with the help of the Farm Security Administration. The writer has been a member of the County

Farm Security Administration Advisory Committee since the old Rural Rehabilitation Administration was first set up. I wish to ask those who are now trying to cripple the Farm Security Administration, a few definite questions:

1. Is it undemocratic for our Government to help low-income farm families to help themselves by extending loans at 5-percent interest, secured by a mortgage?

2. Is it undemocratic for our Government to back up these families with good sensible advice in order to increase food production?

3. Is it undemocratic for our Government to assist groups of farmers to purchase equipment on a cooperative basis, and to encourage and assist them in acquiring their own organization for selling, buying, and processing their own products?

4. Is it undemocratic for our Government to loan funds at 3-percent interest, secured by a real-estate mortgage, in order for tenants to purchase a farm of their own?

5. Is it undemocratic for our Government to assist nonvoting sharecroppers to become self-supporting American citizens?

The writer is quite certain that if our men who are right now doing the fighting for the rest of us had the opportunity to vote on these five questions, it would result in a practically unanimous "no" vote. Those who are willing to ruin the Farm Security Administration had better give some serious consideration to what plain Americanism stands for. It stands for a square deal for everyone. Yes; that includes even the unfortunate non-voting sharecroppers.

I wish that the leaders of the wrecking crew could come out here and learn for themselves what the Farm Security Administration is really doing in assisting many families to gain complete rehabilitation. I am sure that such evidence would convince anyone of the true value of our work, which should not and cannot be judged on dollars alone, although even from that standpoint we can show a fine record. It should rather be judged from the standpoint of the dignity of people and their welfare. When seen in that light the Farm Security Administration represents what our boys are now fighting for, namely, the right of every man to work and earn a decent living and a square deal for everyone. That is the American way of life.

FIRST NEW HOME PAID FOR FROM AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Athens, Ala., on December 18, 1942, on the occasion of the delivery to Curtis C. Haraway of the note and mortgage executed by him to secure the purchase price for a farm under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RUMPL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Ruml plan, delivered by him on February 3, 1943, on the Washington Evening Star Forum, and broadcast from Station WMAL, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROADCASTS TO JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the messages addressed to the Japanese people broadcast by him in November and December 1942, and January 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

ECONOMICAL DISTRIBUTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of economical distribution, delivered

by Senator Murray in New York on January 11, 1943, before the National Retail Drygoods Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Niles, Ohio, on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of William McKinley, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY EUGENE B. CASEY BEFORE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Eugene B. Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, to the First Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the legislative program of the National Grange for 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—LETTER FROM AMERICAN FEDERATION OF SOROPTIMIST CLUBS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the department of public relations of the American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs relative to the so-called equal-rights amendment proposed to the Constitution, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RUMPL PLAN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Congress to Assert Itself," published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS—LETTER FROM JAMES C. SELF

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by James C. Self, president of the Mathews Cotton Mill, of Greenwood, S. C., regarding the renegotiation of contracts, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCOTLAND GETS ITS OWN T. V. A.

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Scotland Gets Its Own T. V. A.," published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, December 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF STEEL PRODUCTION—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 3 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program I have the honor to submit a report known as the steel report. Our committee has been studying the steel situation for some time. We have gone into the subject exhaustively. We have heard witnesses here in Washington and in steel centers, and the report, which is rather lengthy and which will be submitted for the RECORD, is one which I believe every Senator should read.

I shall preface submission of the report by making a few observations of my

own which will be very brief, and which will touch on only a few of the high points contained in the report itself.

Mr. President, steel, always the backbone of America's economy, is the key-stone of our war production. But it has come very close to being the stumbling block. Almost all our strategic material shortages today could be relieved sooner if we had steel. The aviation gasoline program, the synthetic rubber program, the shipping program, the aircraft program, all have suffered for lack of steel. Our fuel oil and gasoline shortages, our farm machinery shortage, our railroad problems, our housing difficulties, could be relieved if sufficient steel were available.

On the other hand, we are producing steel in unprecedented amounts—86,000,000 tons in 1942 and over 90,000,000 tons expected in 1943. Our 1942 production came within 3,000,000 tons of equaling the total steel production of all the rest of the world—United Nations and Axis. The United Nations produced more than twice as much steel as their enemies produced.

The question which comes to mind is why there should be a famine amid such plenty. How does the Axis get along on so little? We now know that the Axis prepared for this war, built its plants, and stock-piled its armaments long before hostilities commenced. We, on the other hand, are hastening both to fashion the weapons and to build the plants at the same time. We must fill our present needs and those of our allies, and still attempt to build our stock piles of steel. That our needs are great is clear. The basic problems are whether we are making the best use of what we have, and whether we should create additional facilities to produce even more.

From its inception the committee has studied the steel picture continuously. Right at the start, early in 1941, we took the position that steel shortages would stall production lines. It was clear that immediate steps must be taken to increase steel facilities. The committee so advised the Office of Production Management, but steel expansion was delayed.

Three major factors are responsible for the steel shortage.

First, the armed forces seriously underestimated their needs. They are now using as much steel in 3 months as they previously stated they would need in a year. The sights were set too low. Throughout 1941 the Army and Navy Munitions Board freely granted necessary priorities for new armament plants, but refused clearance for steel mills to feed these plants.

The second contributing factor was the sluggishness of the Office of Production Management and the War Production Board in converting industry to a war-time basis. Far into 1942 untold tons of steel were poured into nonessential commodities. Not until the situation had become critical and the country's indignation had overflowed did the War Production Board eliminate those items, many of which may have been peace-

time necessities, but all of which are unconscionable luxuries during an all-out war.

The third cause of the delay was the cupidity of the big steel companies. They were determined to keep control of the steel industry after the war. They feared the bugaboo of excess capacities when peace arrives. They dreaded the competition they might have to face should the smaller companies obtain some nourishment during the war program. The representatives and employees of Big Steel dominated the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board. That was unfortunate. At first they failed to direct or even to allow expansion. Finally they concentrated a belated program in the eight largest companies. These Big Steel men and dollar-a-year men did just what they were accustomed to doing at home in normal times under normal conditions. To the eight largest steel companies they gave the lion's share of steel expansion. These eight companies produced approximately 80 percent of the steel ingots before the war. After the war they will still have the same control of the industry, but the small companies will not have kept even their meager dole of steel production. Before the war the small companies had approximately 20 percent of the ingot production. Unless the program is altered the larger companies will continue in the same strong position, while the weaker companies will have lost some of their pre-war standing.

Mr. President, the expansion program includes substantial tonnages for powerful newcomers in the industry, such as Kaiser and Koppers. The new companies' facilities will not affect the 80-percent control of Big Steel. Instead, it is the small companies which must move over to make room for the newcomers. Three companies alone—United States Steel, Bethlehem, and Republic—received a total of \$696,128,000, or about 55 percent of the \$1,283,667,000 which the Government is spending to expand the facilities of the entire steel industry. Apparently the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board believed that only the big companies could make steel.

The Nation suffered for these shortcomings and for this selfishness. At the committee's hearings during August of 1942 we found an alarming shortage of steel ingot; that is, of unmilled steel produced by open-hearth and electric furnaces. This has not yet been relieved. As late as October 1942—the most recent month for which figures are available—the shipments of all types of steel amounted to less than one-half of the unfilled orders requested for shipment that month. If only those orders which were earmarked for the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission had been filled, there would have been no steel left for any of the country's other needs, such as synthetic rubber, high-octane gas, oil pipe lines, lend-lease, or railroads. This situation still prevails.

We cannot expect to reap the benefits of the expansion program for another

6 to 12 months. Had this program been started earlier it would have been well on its way before other competing programs created a steel shortage. The committee knows of one instance where a steel company was unable to use its own steel to build a sorely needed blast furnace for itself, because it had more urgent orders on its books. It has been necessary to postpone all of the steel expansion program which cannot be finished before July 1943; otherwise we would not have enough steel for actual armaments. We do not have steel to support both programs. One or the other must give way. The battle will not wait.

The outlook for 1943, therefore, is not bright, it is gloomy. We will produce sufficient steel to satisfy our major war necessities, but there is no assurance that we will also be able to fill all the needs of essential civilian industries. These will have a 2-year backlog of needed repairs, replacements, and additions. We may well experience another serious shortage if the war continues for so long a time and its scope so expands as to require us to replace or increase plant facilities. Throughout 1943 continued shortages of the most important specialized types of steel must be expected. Electric furnace alloy steels, particularly those requiring special heat-treatment facilities, which are most important for the aircraft program, will continue to be scarce throughout 1943. Insufficient facilities for castings also will probably trouble us through all of this year.

There are not enough raw materials and manpower in this country to increase steel-making capacity until it is sufficient to provide for all possible needs. We must, instead, determine the amounts of the various forms of steel we shall need to win the war, and proceed to obtain that steel. We must expect to have less than we could profitably use; but we can make certain that the steel which we have is allocated and used efficiently and skillfully.

I am happy to report that much progress is now being made under the direction of Mr. H. G. Batcheller, who became Chief of the Iron and Steel Branch last September. The Branch was overhauled and advanced to the status of a division, called the Steel Division. Mr. Batcheller has proven capable and able, and has undertaken to meet the problems of the steel industry. He has made remarkable progress.

However, much still remains to be done. What has yet to be done, together with the limited facilities for doing it, represents, in my judgment, one of the most serious worries or problems of the war. A study of that problem, and of the advance which is being made by American genius, will be one of the greatest stories to come out of the war.

Specifications must be reexamined. Those which are too exacting should be eliminated. Sizes and grades should be standardized. New melting techniques should be adopted extensively, particularly in electric furnace operations where we face the prospect of serious shortages.

The steel companies must overcome their reluctance to disturb their settled customer relations. That factor is out for the duration. They must outgrow the technical conservatism which developed during the period when management did not have to extend itself to survive competition.

The present haphazard price structure must be given attention. Further attention must be given to the allocation of the products among consumers.

The committee has not seen any evidence that the scrap situation has been competently or completely taken in hand. Steel production may well suffer seriously unless increased supplies of high-grade scrap are made available. We believe that ultimate control over the collection of steel scrap should be placed in the Steel Division, and that it must be methodically and continuously worked out. The Steel Division should also be in a position to insist that the Office of Price Administration fix scrap prices high enough to induce the scrap dealer to go out and get the scrap. That is a very important recommendation. If we are to obtain scrap, the price must be reasonable. This does not mean an inflationary price increase. It means payment for increased labor and harder work.

In July 1942 the committee suggested that representatives of both labor and small mills should be given a place on the Steel Division's important committees. We believe that should be done without delay. The Little Steel men of the country should be brought into the picture. This has been done only recently and in a most limited way. The committee believes that considerably more can be done along these lines. When it has been done it will be possible for the Steel Division to break the stranglehold which big companies have on the entire industry. Then, and then only, the Steel Division will be able to beat down the industry's reluctance to meet wartime conditions. We shall then see the development of the steel industry along new lines and in new areas. In this way we shall get the steel we need to win this all-out war.

Mr. President, before I conclude I desire to ask my colleagues to read the report. I also ask them to study the progress which is being made in the shifting and expansion of the steel-production program.

I make the prediction that before this all-out war increases its compelling need upon our economy to the degree of greater hardships, American genius will respond to the challenge and make our supply of steel meet every wartime requirement, and almost all of the very vital civilian requirements.

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

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 607, which was introduced by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and which is on the table, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, for hearings and consideration.

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from New York to yield for a question, and he yielded to me. Therefore I have the floor.

I was watching for the conclusion of the Senator's remarks, as my beloved colleague the Senator from Florida was doing. He had the edge on me because he was standing to the rear of the distinguished Senator from New York, and he could more quickly tell when the remarks of the Senator from New York had been concluded than I could, and I had to beat him to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Carolina for the purpose he has suggested?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has concluded his speech. I asked the Senator if he would yield and he said he would be glad to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if my distinguished colleague would only let me make reply to the Chair myself I should be obliged to him, and yet I might not be unfriendly to him.

It is true, Mr. President, that I had completed my speech; and it is also true that I thought I yielded for a question to come from my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Carolina, who now claims he has the floor. I thought I yielded to him to make some observations concerning my speech, or to have something inserted in the RECORD. However, if in yielding I should lose the floor, and there would be no opportunity for what I may modestly term "complimentary comment on the steel report," I might selfishly side against my distinguished colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am standing on the record. The RECORD will show that I asked the Senator from New York to yield for a question. He answered me by saying that he would yield for one question.

Mr. MEAD. Apparently I yielded for that one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Will the Senator yield to the junior Senator from North Carolina?

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

Mr. MEAD. It appears to me that I must first yield to Senators who will have something to say concerning the steel report. After that I shall be glad to yield the floor so that my distinguished colleague from North Carolina may obtain recognition.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am in favor of steel, more steel, and better steel.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina

is apparently trying to steal the floor right now. [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not concluded. I have just begun my comments on the subject of steel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. He has declined to yield for the purpose explained by the Senator from North Carolina, and he now yields to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to propound a few questions to the able Senator from New York, who has just submitted an outstanding report on behalf of the Truman committee, which has done so much to improve war production.

The first question is, Have the Senator and the committee which he ably represents found in their investigation of steel production and the provision of steel facilities that steel production for war purposes has been impaired or diminished in volume because of any division of responsibility among Government agencies in seeing that facilities are provided for the maximum production of steel?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me say in reply to my distinguished colleague that an early concentration of authority would have expedited the steel program, but, unfortunately, living in a democracy and planning only for peace, and without any experience in planning for an all-out war demanding over 100 percent of many of our important materials, there was a necessary evolution of authority and the creation of several different agencies involving delay which resulted in the slowing up of the steel program—a situation which could be corrected by a concentration of authority or by a concerted exercise of authority over this particular industry.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Do the able Senator and his committee find that the claimant agencies which have to do with steel production and the development of steel facilities are likely to be pulling in different directions, and likely to follow courses which tend to diverge, unless there is above all the claimant agencies some authority which can coordinate the Nation's effort to provide the maximum of steel-production facilities and the maximum steel output for the Nation?

Mr. MEAD. I think that is logical. In reply I should say that, as in the past, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission always will seek to exert authority and precedent and priority over what might be termed "indirect war needs or vital civilian needs," and there always will be that vying for supremacy. Perhaps that will interfere with the farm program, the program for the production of high-octane gas, and the program for the production of synthetic rubber, for emphasis will be placed by the War Department upon purely war needs. Emphasis may be placed by the War Production Board upon needs for the production of sup-

plies for the granary of the world, the agency having to do with the production of synthetic rubber might insist upon the necessity of developing the synthetic rubber program; and so there is need for an over-all directional head.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question, if the able Senator will further yield. Has it not been the discovery, therefore, of his distinguished committee that the matter of production for war purposes is essentially a single program, and that the facilities of the Nation must be mobilized as if the facilities in a single factory, if confusion, divided responsibility, and inefficiency are not to impair the whole war-production program?

Mr. MEAD. That is more true under present conditions in the all-out war than ever before was true in the history of the country.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I asked the Senator to yield in order, first, that I might compliment the committee for which he is speaking, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is the chairman, for the study which went into the preparation of its most excellent report.

It seems to me that one or two words might be added to what has been said in the report and in the comment of the Senator from New York. The Senator has very correctly pointed to the tremendous concentration which has been going on in the war industries. That matter is not covered in the report, for reasons which probably are obvious. I think I violate no injunction of secrecy, however, when I point out that, as of the 30th of June 1942, the United States Government had awarded war contracts in the value of \$55,400,000,000. Of that tremendous sum, which is actually beyond the capacity of the human mind to imagine, more than 70 percent was awarded to 100 companies. Worse than that, in excess of 50 percent of that \$55,400,000,000 worth of contracts was awarded to 24 companies. In other words, 24 large corporations in the United States, headed by the General Motors Corporation, which alone received \$4,500,000,000 worth of those contracts, have been awarded in excess of \$27,000,000,000 worth of contracts. Not only is that true, but the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, operating through the Defense Plant Corporation, one of its subsidiaries, has expended in excess of \$8,000,000,000 for construction of war facilities of various kinds; and many of the 24 companies which have received more than half of all the war contracts have also been beneficiaries under the facilities expansion program.

Mr. President, the statement of that rather startling fact is not meant to be a criticism of the War Production Board or of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It should not be so interpreted. It is merely a statement of a condition which is going to be the source of the most significant and important problem which the people of the United States

will have to settle after this war. As the Senator has very well pointed out in the report, the production of steel in the United States has been increased from approximately 38,000,000 ingot tons in 1937 to 89,000,000 tons in 1942. However, even that great expansion is not sufficient to permit us to provide the steel needed for the war effort alone.

Let us take the case of shipping: The Maritime Commission last year produced 8,000,000 tons of shipping. Its goal this year is 16,000,000 tons, at least. It has the capacity of producing 20,000,000 tons of shipping. We need the 20,000,000 tons, because the German war effort this year is being directed in a submarine campaign for the destruction of every possible ship which the United Nations have and which the submarine campaign can reach. The submarine campaign for the destruction of American shipping is the last recourse of Hitler in his war effort. He has been hemmed around everywhere else, and his object now is to prevent the United States from getting the men and the supplies to the war front in Europe. Obviously, therefore, it is of tremendous importance that we should have increased capacity and increased production of steel if we are to manufacture the needed ships.

That is not enough. The Navy Department seeks to expand the construction of escort vessels in order to protect the convoys used in sending both men and supplies abroad. The construction of additional escort vessels requires more steel than it is possible for the War Production Board to allocate among the various agencies.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interject?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MEAD. In view of the fact that I have a luncheon engagement, and also an embarrassing predicament facing me here, I wonder if I may steal away, and leave the floor with the distinguished Senator?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I did not mean to take the distinguished Senator from Wyoming off his feet. He was making a very able statement, and I trust that he will be permitted to continue. As I said, I have an engagement, and I should like to keep it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield the floor?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask the Senator whether his committee has in mind certain legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield in order that the Senator from Minnesota may direct a question to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether the committee which has submitted the report has in mind legislation to cure the situation?

Mr. MEAD. No. We have contained in our report, which will be printed in

the RECORD, recommendations to alleviate existing conditions—recommendations which we trust will be acceptable to the War Production Board, particularly to the Steel Division and to the other services which require a portion of the steel which we have available and which we will have available. We do not recommend legislation, but we recommend a method of procedure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to conclude. I desire to call attention to the fact that not only does the Maritime Commission need steel, not only does the Navy Department need steel, but the Office of Petroleum Coordinator needs steel for the plants necessary for the manufacture of the high-octane aviation gasoline which is essential in order to carry on the war in the air. The director of the synthetic-rubber production program needs steel in order to manufacture synthetic rubber. The railroads need steel in order to build tank cars, more freight cars, and more locomotives to transport men and materials.

In other words, Mr. President, wherever we look in the war effort we find a crying necessity for more and more steel, and the worst factor of all lies in the fact that in the United States there is not sufficient scrap to enable us to continue to produce the amount of steel which we are now turning out. It is of the greatest possible importance that there should be increased collections of scrap and increased production of substitutes for scrap.

A small effort has been made in that direction. The Committee on Appropriations during the last year and a half, realizing this problem, has made appropriations for the purpose of meeting it; but always there has been some vague and indefinite opposition to the development of any program that would produce steel by anything but the blast furnace method.

In the State of Nevada at Boulder City, through the appropriation made by Congress, a plant now being operated by the Bureau of Mines is turning out from 8 to 10 tons of iron daily. A plant is being constructed at the University of Wyoming by the Bureau of Mines to test certain processes there. These efforts, however, are only scratching the surface. What is needed is an all-out program to produce iron by any and every method if we are to provide the materials needed for the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know the great difficulty the able Senator from Wyoming has had, and I know the long struggle in which he has participated and which he has led toward providing additional steel facilities and raw materials for the country. I wish to ask the able Senator whether he has found that the division of authority and responsibility for doing what he last said, that is making the fullest use of the Nation's resources with respect to steel production, has, in his opinion, impaired or in any way impeded his efforts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Committee on Public Lands, which submitted a report and several reports during the past year and a half upon this general subject, recently, 2 or 3 months ago, submitted its report on petroleum, and there it pointed out, as this committee has also pointed out, the division of authority among five or six agencies. The same division of authority exists with respect to the production of other mineral resources. For example, the War Production Board has its agents working throughout the country; it has special representatives dealing with the production of minerals; the R. F. C. has a special corps of employees working on the production of minerals; the Bureau of Mines has officials working on the same subject as has the United States Geological Survey. I will state to the Senator that the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am chairman, has contemplated using the same technique with respect to minerals that it has used with respect to oil, namely, to invite the heads or the representatives of each of the separate agencies to a round-table discussion, so that, across the board, they may, in public, discuss this conflict of authority which ought to be eliminated.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As a matter of fact, was it not necessary for the able Senator, acting legislatively as chairman of the committee, with his committee, to get the various representatives of the departments having jurisdiction over this subject before the committee so as to obtain any coordination of their activities and efforts whatever?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, the Congress, aside from the person of the President, was the only agency in Washington which could get a coordination of the activities of the Government dealing with a single subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it ought to be added there that the Congress, throughout the entire period of preparation for the war and during the war itself, has been constantly urging a greater degree of coordination among the executive branches of the Government; and the Congress, contrary to the representations which have been so persistently made, has never failed to urge greater and greater progress and efficiency in the organization of the war.

Now, Mr. President, let me add one word further, and I shall yield the floor. I desire to refer to the tremendous importance of the concentration which has gone on. It may have been altogether necessary, that this concentration should be made effective, if we were to get the results which have already been achieved; and in any criticism that is voiced of conditions which exist here, there ought to be an acknowledgment of the fact that a perfectly tremendous program of accomplishment is to the credit of all these agencies, even though they have been divided and even though there has been concentration represented

by the fact that more than 70 percent of the total amount of contracts was awarded to 100 companies. What we must look forward to is this: When the war is ended and when the Government contracts are no longer flowing to these corporations and to others, when the workers who are now engaged in the war industries are being demobilized, there will arise the greatest economic and political question which has ever been presented to America, namely, how are we to provide opportunities for employment to those who have been gathered into these great enterprises for the production of war goods?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject of the great concentration which has taken place I believe we ought right here to go back in our thinking and in our history and remember that it was the problem of concentration which, in a small way, made so difficult the setting up of stock piles looking toward such a time as we have today. It is the habit of thinking on the part of people and certain governmental and industrial and labor notions about things that stand in the way at all times.

If, for example, there should be greater concentration on a larger scale, without a change of outlook, without a change of habit, the problems are going to be more difficult than they ever were.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator. I am happy he has raised this phase of the problem, because it gives me the opportunity to make the record clear, that it was the Senator from Utah who, as long ago as 1938, I believe—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. 1935.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator corrects me and says 1935—as long ago as 1935 he introduced legislation in this body for the purpose of enabling the accumulation of the necessary stock piles. The Senator from Utah was aware of what was going on in Europe, and he initiated the legislation and brought the legislation upon the floor calling for the accumulation of stock piles and the granting of all necessary authority for that purpose; but, nevertheless, it was not done or, at least, it was not done in sufficient degree to avert the shortage crisis in which we have found ourselves for the past year or more.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I wish to make a simple point that everyone can understand. The principal problem in setting up stock piles was the problem of price. Everyone could see that if great demand came there would be need for stock piles, but the large industrialists like to buy in a cheap market. The setting up of stock piles acts as the building up of reserves, making the commodity a little scarcer. So there was a fear on the part of many in business that if the Government, looking to the future, set up stock piles it might do one of two things: It might release the stock piles at an untimely moment and thereby deflate prices or put them down or it might, on the

other hand, build up such immense stock piles that the price would rise to such an extent that ordinary industry could not buy that which it needed.

Mr. President, when we realize the habits of thought of our people we come to the conclusion that the trouble with our country was that the people of the United States had a fear of their Government. The irony of ironies has taken place. In a country such as ours, controlled by the people, where the Government is responsible to the people, where, in theory and practice, the Government must react to the people, the people themselves become frightened of the Government when it tries to do something to help them.

That is the basic irony of attempting to change anything, it does not matter what. If we move into the health field, it is the doctors who are frightened. If we move into the hospital field, it is the hospitals which are frightened. If we move into the insurance field, it is the insurance companies which are frightened. When the people of our country learn that the Government of the United States is on their side, taking steps which are designed to build up, then will come the right kind of prosperity and the right kind of cooperation between the Government and the people.

There is a natural tendency for a person who has a business to desire to make a monopoly of his business, to want to expand his business and to have no one come into the competitive field. Yet, in the history of competition, it has been competition itself which has caused the great expansion of the original producers of things. It has changed the habits of people, created greater demand and greater activity.

Now, we have before us such bills, for example, as the bill for the rehabilitation of returned soldiers, and persons who have been injured. Some have argued that bill and will argue the bill on the basis of State's rights, for example, whether the Government should execute the law or the States should do it.

Mr. President, why can we not think about the individual? If we can return to society a presently worthless individual, and make him an economic asset, does not that individual help industry? Does he not help his State? Does he not help his Government?

Why should there ever be these theoretical conflicts between Government and industry, between the States and the Nation, when we are trying to do something for the good of men, women, and children in the United States? Can we not see that if we separate the men, women, and children from the United States, we do not have the United States, and can we not see that wherever we create wealth, we bring about a stimulus for the creation of more wealth?

For these reasons I cannot help saying, since this remarkable discussion has started, that what we have to do is to understand the psychological aspects of these questions, the habit-forming aspects of the questions, and, above all, have the thing we call faith, and realize that, after all, 130,000,000 people are destined to a certain kind of leadership

in the world, as the result of the last 150 years of their history, and to understand that we cannot ever see our Government and our people take the place in the world which they must take without realizing the destiny that is forcing them on, and without realizing the position they have among the peoples of the earth.

The report submitted by Mr. MEAD from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program was ordered to be printed (pt. 3 of Rept. No. 10) and entire is as follows:

DRAFT OF STEEL REPORT—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Steel, always the backbone of America's economy, is the keystone of our war production. But it has come very close to being the stumbling block. Almost all of our strategic-material shortages today could be relieved sooner if we had steel. The aviation-gasoline program, the synthetic-rubber program, the shipping program, the aircraft program, all have suffered for lack of steel. We have been short of both gross tonnage and the specialized types of steel. Our fuel oil and gasoline shortages, our farm-machinery shortage, our railroad problems, our housing difficulties could be relieved if sufficient steel were available.

On the other hand, we are producing steel in unprecedented amounts—86,000,000 tons in 1942 and over 90,000,000 tons expected in 1943. Our 1942 production came within 3,000,000 tons of equalling the total steel production of all the rest of the world—United Nations and Axis. The United Nations produced more than twice as much steel as their enemies.

The question which comes to mind is why there should be a famine amid such plenty. How does the Axis get along on so little? We now know that the Axis prepared for this war, built its plants, and stock piled its armaments long before hostilities commenced. We, on the other hand, are hastening both to make the armaments and to build the plants at the same time. We must fill our present needs and those of our allies, and still attempt to build our stock piles. That our needs are great is clear. The basic problems are whether we are making the best use of what we have and whether we should create additional facilities to produce even more.

The committee has studied the steel picture continuously since the committee's inception. During the spring of 1941, shortly after beginning its study of steel production, the committee took the position that shortage of steel, as well as almost all of our basic raw materials, would stall production lines. It was clear that immediate steps must be taken to increase production. In each case the committee so advised the Office of Production Management.

Three major factors delayed steel expansion and are responsible for our current steel shortage.

First, the armed forces seriously underestimated the amount of steel they would need under war conditions. As late as November 1941 the armed forces estimated their steel requirements at a total figure much smaller than their present demands. They are now using as much steel in 3 months as they previously informed the Office of Production Management they would need in a year. The much discussed Gano Dunn report concluded in February 1941 that the then existing capacity would be sufficient for both military and civilian needs on the basis of these low estimates of military needs. The sights were indeed set too low, and this should have been evident to reasonable men. Throughout 1941 the Army and Navy Munitions Board freely granted necessary priorities for new end product plants but refused clearance for raw materials facilities to feed these plants.

The second cause of the delay was the desire of the big steel companies to prevent any expansion that might react unfavorably against their control of the steel industry after the war. They feared both the possibility of having excess capacities of steel-making facilities after the war, and the competition of smaller companies which might gain strength during the war program. The representatives and employees of big steel companies dominated the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board. They first failed to direct or even to allow expansion. Finally they concentrated practically all of the belated expansion in the hands of the eight largest companies. The Office of Production Management, which was the predecessor of the War Production Board, failed to make proper estimates of steel requirements even after its delinquencies were called to its attention by the committee.

The third contributing factor to the present condition was the delay of the War Production Board in converting industry to a war basis. Untold tons of steel were permitted to be consumed until far into 1942. The priorities system was designed to assure at least that war industries would be supplied before any others. It failed to accomplish its purpose and did not stem the huge flow of steel into nonessential commodities.

The committee held hearings during August 1942. It continued thereafter to follow developments intensively and to discuss the steel program privately with the War Production Board. At the committee's hearings it found an alarming shortage of ingot, that is, of unmilled steel produced by open hearth and electric furnaces. This has not yet been relieved. In October 1942 (the most recent month for which figures are available) the shipments of all types of steel were less than half of unfilled orders covered by preference ratings requested for shipment in that month. The total orders on the books of the steel producers which carried certification that the material was for the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission amounted to more steel than the entire country could produce in that month. Certainly it was more than could be consumed with existing fabrication facilities. If these orders had been filled there would have been no steel for defense projects (other than on direct Army and Navy orders), for lend-lease, railroads, or for any of the other civilian needs essential to our war production.

The full benefits of the present expansion program cannot be felt for another 6 to 12 months. Had this program been started on a larger scale at the outset of the defense emergency, it would have been well under way before other competing programs rendered it impossible to fill all urgent needs. The committee is informed of one instance where a steel company, making large quantities of the types of steel needed for an additional blast furnace it was constructing, was unable to obtain permission to use its own steel for the purpose because it had more urgent orders on its books. During the spring of 1942, it was found necessary to postpone those parts of the plant expansion program which could not be finished before July 1943. Otherwise we would not have enough steel for actual armaments. We do not have steel to support both programs. The battle will not wait.

Today it appears that we will barely produce sufficient steel in 1943 and thereafter to satisfy the major war necessities. The expansion program will be slightly delayed by the recent decision to advance the synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, and aluminum plants. After July 1943 the most urgent demands for steel to be used in constructing new plants will have been filled as a result of the policy of finishing major plant construction by that date. Thereafter primary needs for steel will be for actual armaments, for fighting equipment, for the shipbuilding

program, and for essential civilian equipment such as railroads and farm machinery. There is every reason to believe that there will be substantial amounts of steel for military purposes. But there is no assurance that we will be able to fill all the needs of essential civilian industries which will have a 2-year backlog of needed repairs, replacements, and additions. We may well experience another shortage if the war so continues, and its scope so expands as to require us to increase or replace plant facilities. The present prospects for over-all ingot tonnage may therefore be viewed without undue alarm, although not with complacency.

The outlook for specialized types of steel, on the other hand, is not as promising. A sufficient gross tonnage of ingot does not in any way assure that specific alloy steels and hardened steels, needed for the various programs and for the aircraft program in particular, will be available. Until the latter part of 1943 there will continue to be a shortage of castings and of electric furnace alloy steels, particularly those requiring special heat-treating facilities and other special facilities.

The shortages of raw materials and manpower in this country are such that we cannot expect to end the steel problem by simply increasing steel-making capacity until it is sufficient to provide for all possible uses. We must, instead, determine the amount of the various kinds of steel which we will need to win the war and then proceed to increase steel-making capacity to that amount. Consequently throughout the war we must expect to have less steel than we could profitably use and we must make sure that the steel which we have is allocated and used efficiently and skillfully.

Allocation of steel to consumers has been one of the vitally important jobs of this war. It is complicated by the need to plan facilities far in advance for the types of products which will be needed. Unless the various products balance, excesses in any line are simply wasted; not only is capacity lost but also the large quantities of steel and labor used in building the plants. In this way the task of allocation is very closely related to the task of planning production capacity. As a result of misdirected planning and shifts in emphasis by the armed forces, we are now facing overcapacities of facilities to produce armor plate, and deficits of alloy steels and of heat-treating and casting facilities. Throughout the second half of 1942 plate capacity far exceeded demand. Construction of some plate mills was canceled. But under the shipbuilding program for 1943 we again face a deficit.

Poor allocation of the product on hand was one of the most serious failures of the iron and steel branch during most of 1942. This committee ascertained during its hearings that the branch did not know the ultimate use to which a substantial part of steel deliveries was put. In the summer of 1942 it became apparent that the priority system was entirely inadequate for the task at hand. Beginning in August 1942 an effort was made to install a system of allocations to replace the priority arrangements. The outgrowth of this is the controlled-materials plan, which corrects many of the weaknesses of the priority system. If the armed forces make their needs known sufficiently early and the administrative details are carefully handled, it should solve the problem. The system of controlling production by issuing production directives on rolled steel products to the various steel mills has also helped eliminate previously existing inefficiencies, although the priorities system is still impeding efforts to control the production of steel.

On September 21, 1942, Mr. H. G. Batchler became head of the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board. He has proven capable and able and has undertaken to meet the problems of the steel industry.

Under Mr. Batcheller's direction, the management of the steel situation has progressed considerably and should progress further in the future. The former Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board was advanced to the status of a division, called the Steel Division, centralizing jurisdiction over its activities in fewer hands. An effort was made to revamp the expansion program to the fullest extent possible at this late date.

At the time of the committee's hearings, the then Iron and Steel Branch depended almost wholly on trade associations for industry statistics. However, the present Steel Division's approach to the problem is to get as close to the industry as possible, and one of its new functions in this direction is the collection and analysis of its own statistics.

While much has been accomplished in the last few months, there still remains much to be done. It is too late to talk of readjusting the basic steel program. However, it is not too late to attempt to utilize what we have in order to get the most out of it and to provide much-needed special facilities.

Specifications must be reexamined with a view to elimination of too exacting requirements. Sizes and grades should also be standardized. The new national emergency alloys should be used much more extensively. These have the strength, and by utilizing most modern technique, save critical alloying metals. Centrifugal and pressure castings should be substituted for many types of forgings, with resultant savings of steel, time, labor, and facilities. Modern melting practices already developed to a high degree should be adopted extensively, particularly in electric-furnace operations. Much more open hearth alloy steel should be made. Mills should be required to limit their output to those items for which they are best suited, each mill specializing in some items. They should also discontinue making a range of items requiring loss of tonnage due to changeovers. The alloy steel field and the ferro-alloy field must be carefully studied, with a view to increasing emphasis on products now underproduced. The Steel Division is now working on most of these matters.

Many of the above problems arose because of the reluctance of the steel companies to disturb their settled customer relationships. Some result from the technical conservatism which has grown in big companies which have not had to perform miracles of production to survive in competition. Many result from a haphazard price structure. It is natural for steel consumers to purchase the cheapest articles that will meet their requirements. In too many instances the lowest prices prevail on the steels that are least desirable to the over-all steel program. The national emergency steels, for instance, have been developed to serve as adequate substitutes for steels rich in alloying elements. But the new steels are now more expensive. As a result steel consumers purchase and use, and have been allowed to purchase and use, the standard steels instead of the satisfactory new alloy saving steels.

The scrap-steel picture must be given careful attention, and the utilization of alloy steel turnings in particular is the most pressing problem. Production with present facilities can be expected to fall short of capacity, unless supplies of high-grade scrap are made available. The committee has not seen any evidence that the scrap situation has been competently taken in hand; certainly it has not been solved. Ultimate control over the collection of scrap steel should be placed in the Steel Division, with the power in that Division to issue directive to the Salvage Division, which is the organization within the War Production Board charged generally with the task of collecting scrap. The Steel Division should also be in a position to insist that the Office of Price Administration fix scrap prices high enough to induce the scrap dealer to go out and get

it. This does not mean an inflationary price increase. It means paying for the increased labor of looking farther afield and working harder to collect the scrap.

Personnel changes in the Steel Division have improved the working force. However, the committee's suggestion made in July 1942 that representatives of both labor and small mills should be given a place on the Division's important committees has been followed only very recently and in a most limited way. The committee believes that considerably more can be done along these lines.

The big companies retain their stranglehold on the entire industry, and are still reluctant to adopt new melting practices or to adapt themselves to varying conditions of scrap and ore supply. This retards efforts to develop the industry along new lines and in new areas. The expansion program was arranged by War Production Board committees composed mainly of men associated with the big companies and loaned to the Iron and Steel Branch on a dollar-a-year basis. The program which was sponsored by these representatives of the Big Steel interest gave the lion's share of the expansion to the big steel companies at the expense of the small steel companies. The eight largest steel companies each have an ingot production of approximately 3,000,000 tons or more each. These are United States Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Co., Republic Steel Corporation, Inland Steel Co., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, American Rolling Mill Co., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., and National Steel Corporation. Prior to the war these companies produced approximately 80 percent of the steel ingots. They were unable to prevent new companies such as Kaiser and Koppers from obtaining a substantial portion of the increase in steel-making capacity, but they were able to see to it that those increases were made at the expense of the smaller producers of steel while Big Steel retained its 80-percent proportions of the industry. Three companies alone, United States Steel, Republic, and Bethlehem received a total of \$662,888,000, or 53 percent of the \$1,250,872,000 which the Government spent to expand the facilities of the entire steel industry.

Full discussion of the above is divided into three categories:

1. The steel expansion program.
2. Inefficiencies in utilizing existing capacity, including use of scrap, use of manpower, and scheduling of production.
3. Distribution of steel products.

THE STEEL EXPANSION PROGRAM

In 1938 total steel ingot production was approximately 38,000,000 net tons, and total capacity was 73,047,892 net tons. In 1942 production was 86,092,209 net tons, and capacity on November 1 was 89,454,000 net tons. At the end of 1943 capacity will be 97,115,000 net tons. Practically all of the new production facilities are scheduled for completion by the middle of 1943.

Before there can be full understanding of the task confronting this country in the expansion of steel-producing facilities at the outset of the defense program, it is necessary to consider the status of the steel industry at that time. We did not start with a normally healthy industry. It was instead engaged in a struggle for survival. In June 1938 pig-iron production was at its lowest point with a production of approximately 1,200,000 tons for the month. Similarly ingot production reached its lowest point in December 1937 with a production of approximately 1,700,000 tons for the month. When the objective of 5,900,000 tons of pig iron per month and 8,250,000 tons of ingot per month in December 1943 is considered, the full extent of our rapidly expanding program can be realized.

Because our steel production during the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 was much less

than our capacity to produce steel we failed to produce 50,000,000 tons of steel which we could have made. This should be contrasted with the policy in the Axis Nations of producing steel at full capacity in preparation for war.

It was a difficult task even to bring production close to capacity. Plants had been abandoned, dismantled, and scrapped. Some of the weaker, nonintegrated companies had given up the struggle, their departure hastened by stronger companies. The big companies seized the opportunity to acquire their foundering competitors and accelerate the program of dismantling and scrapping as a method of eliminating competition.

Judged by these standards production has been tremendously expanded. But much more might have been done. The late start and the insistence on conventional methods have limited us mainly to conservative increases primarily raising the capacities of the larger companies. There is ample evidence that the west coast and the South could provide the raw materials for considerable expansion to supply demands in those areas. Some expansion there has been authorized. Considerably more could have been permitted had the program been started early enough when the steel necessary for construction was available. The expansion program hewed to the lines laid out by the big companies. As a result, it relied on the huge tonnages the few companies could produce and paid only slight attention to the possibility that in wartime the aggregate contribution of many small producers could be substantial. Practically no weight was given to the possible contributions of newcomers or of new processes.

Before the expansion program went into effect 8 companies producing more than 3,000,000 tons of ingots each, had a total of 79.8 percent of the pig iron capacity, 79.3 percent of the steel ingot capacity, and 68 percent of the finishing capacity of the country.

After the program the eight big companies will have substantially maintained their position in the industry as a result of obtaining a share of the expansion in capacity roughly proportionate to their domination of the original industry.

But although the big companies were able to extend their domination even in the Government program the small companies did not fare as well. Powerful newcomers in the business (Kaiser, Lone Star, Koppers) were awarded 11.5 percent of the total pig iron expansion and 8.1 percent of the ingot. The smaller companies therefore will emerge with a smaller proportion of the total production than they had before the war.

Moreover, the big companies prepared their expansion projects in such a way as to balance their facilities, that is, to use in their fabricating mills all of the steel ingot they produced. As a result the small companies which do not have steel-making equipment are having great difficulty in obtaining sufficient ingot to continue their operation. The Steel Division is now attempting to remedy this situation by allocation of ingot. Not a single instance can be found where a small company with only finishing facilities received steel-making facilities under the program despite the fact that applications for such facilities were made.

It appears that the dollar-a-year men from the big steel companies who directed this expansion had a conviction that only the big companies could make steel. Unfortunately, the War Production Board committees selected to pass on the expansion program were dominated by officials of the five largest steel companies and did not even have a representative of the small companies or of labor to voice any opposition. The public could hardly be expected to rely on the wisdom or impartiality of the committees so constituted. Nor could it be favorably impressed by the

delays in the expansion program and the favoring of Big Steel.

The expansion program calls for a total ingot capacity of 97,115,000 net tons at the end of 1943. Since over 7,000,000 tons will be in construction during 1943, total production in 1943 will be only 94,666,000 if production comes up to capacity. However, past experience indicates that ingot production is not likely to equal capacity. In 1941, despite a potential capacity of 84,152,292 net tons existing on January 1, 1941, the actual production of steel for the entire year was 82,836,946, or approximately 97 percent of capacity. Similarly, in 1942, production of 86,092,209 tons was attained with a potential capacity on January 1, 1942, of 87,862,000 net tons and a capacity on November 1, 1942, of \$89,454,000 net tons.

Moreover, looking further into the figures behind the proposed capacity, other factors appear which cast further doubts on the likelihood that production will measure up to the forecasts.

The expansion program contemplates that to support a production of 97,115,000 net tons of steel ingots, the following materials will be necessary: Pig iron, 61,759,000 tons; home scrap, 27,192,000; purchased scrap, 14,386,000; ore to be fed directly into open hearths, 8,911,000; fluxes, 8,137,000 tons. It is not clear that all of these materials will be available.

On January 1, 1942, the existing blast-furnace capacity for the production of pig iron was 60,010,000. This, however, was not all available for the manufacture of steel, as 9,500,000 tons were used in the manufacture of ferroalloys, gray-iron castings, and other iron products, leaving 50,510,000 tons available for steel-ingot production. The expansion program is designed to increase blast-furnace capacity by 10,840,000 tons, resulting in a final capacity at the completion of the program of 70,850,000 tons. However, 9,500,000 tons will still be required for iron production and miscellaneous uses, leaving only 61,350,000 for steel making, as against the pig-iron requirements of 61,759,000 tons needed to support the contemplated ingot program.

Home scrap is the term used to describe scrap produced within the finishing departments of a steel plant and returned to its steel-making units. The program expected to produce 94,666,000 tons of ingots is based on a production of home scrap equal to 28 percent of ingots produced. The committee has been advised that, based on past operations, home scrap approximated 20 to 25 percent of the total ingot production. This would mean that 3 to 8 percent less of ingots produced would be utilized in final steel products so that the gain in ingot production would be offset by the loss in final products. On the 20- to 25-percent basis, the reoccurring scrap would approximate somewhere between 19,000,000 and 24,000,000 tons, if we assume a 94,666,000-ton production. The 28-percent figure which would yield the desired 27,192,000 tons is based on the expectancy that quality steels will be used in greater quantities in the future. These steels yield a larger amount of scrap than the common grades of steel. On the other hand, in peacetime operation the major portion of a steel plant's ingot production followed through the plant to the finishing departments. Today, much less ingot is finished in American plants due to the abnormal demand for ingots and for semifinished products to supply lend-lease requirements. As a result the supply of scrap can be expected to decrease.

The estimated 14,386,000 net tons of purchased scrap which is required for the program may or may not be realized. The persons charged with scrap collections are not in a position to advise the Steel Division whether it will be forthcoming. This situation is discussed more fully below.

It is doubtful whether the 8,911,000 tons of lump ores called for in the program will be available. High-density ores are required for feeding directly into open-hearth furnaces, a practice becoming more and more important because of the scrap shortage. There is a deficiency of lump ores of sufficient density for this operation so that it is necessary to treat the available ores to increase their density. This is called sintering. But it is questionable whether there is an adequate supply of the proper kind of sinter to make up for the deficiency of satisfactory ore. The melters who actually make the steel have stated that there is not enough sinter, but the Industry Advisory Committee and the Steel Division have not made a thorough study of the problem. One proposed step has been approved by the Steel Division, to assure an emergency supply of high-grade ore which could be fed directly to open hearths. This is a plan to drain Steep Rock Lake, now covering easily accessible high-grade ore deposits in Canada. But this ore will not be available in 1943.

Despite these failings in the program, it is only fair to mention the tremendous scope of the undertaking. Not only have facilities for finished and semifinished products been created, and for steel-ingot capacity and pig-iron capacity behind them; there was also provided a huge additional tonnage of coke, ores, and additional transportation to bring the ores to the blast furnaces—all essential to completed task. Only a well-organized and vigorous industry could do this job.

The most vexing aspect of the expansion program is the futile effort and wasted material which have gone into the creation of unnecessary facilities while we are begging for other urgently needed plants.

For the lack of balance of certain types of facilities in the expansion program the armed forces are largely responsible. The armed forces do not have any satisfactory mechanism to determine in advance of a program just how much of each raw material is needed and to recommend this proper amount to the War Production Board. There is an excess of capacity for rolled armor plate. The Army sponsored a 19,000-ton plant to be operated by Carnegie-Illinois at Gary, and then had to shift to other products so far as possible. Much of the plant was so near completion that it was not practical to change it. There is an excess of capacity for forged armor plate. Despite this excess the Carnegie-Illinois Co. is operating not only its own plant at Homestead, Pa., but the Government's Naval Ordnance Plant at South Charleston, W. Va. The committee found that some work that could and should have been done at South Charleston has been diverted to Homestead by keeping particularly skilled workers at Homestead. Both of these plants, as well as two other private companies doing similar work are running below capacity because the demand for their product has gone down. History has shown that the continued operation of the Government-owned plant is necessary and desirable as a means of keeping prices within reason by its very existence.

These overcapacities may be justified on the ground of caution. Facilities of this type cannot be created quickly. Their existence may be considered as insurance, albeit very expensive in terms of materials.

It is much harder to explain the instances where capacity falls short of requirements. As a result of the undercapacities for special alloy steels airplane construction will suffer. Heat-treated steels, forgings, and castings also will not be available in the required quantities. In spite of data which indicated that there was not sufficient heat-treating capacity, various expansions were held up or materially curtailed. Now the shortage is again acute, and will continue to be so as the demand for aircraft steels increases. These shortages could have been avoided if the demand had been foreseen in time. To a great extent they are the result of the armed forces'

reluctance to prepare itemized bills of materials to cover their production programs. In one instance coming to the attention of the committee a special alloy steel was tested after deliveries had started and fatigue tests showed a slight variance. The order was canceled necessitating removal of large tonnages of steel from production lines and adapting the steel to the manufacture of another product.

Expansion of mining operations has followed the same pattern as expansion of steel-making facilities. For steel making in the Pittsburgh area by the big companies no ores can compete today with the high grade, cheaply obtainable Mesaba ores of Minnesota. But in parts of the country distant from Mesaba steelmakers need ore supplies closer at hand. There are many such deposits in proximity to other necessary raw materials, although none are as cheap and plentiful as the Mesaba deposits. Their development, therefore, is dependent on the erection of steel-making facilities in their vicinity. A program has been undertaken to expand the production of iron ore in the eastern States to the extent of 3,750,000 tons, and other projects were initiated to develop production of iron ore in Texas, Southern California, and Utah. However, the vast tonnages in Texas, the South, and the Northwest are hardly being touched. And little use is being made of many fine ore deposits throughout the country because there are not sufficient steel-making facilities at hand.

Some thought is being given to the fact that the easily accessible high grade ores in the Mesaba Range will be depleted in 7 to 14 years at present rates. Further steps should be taken to develop new ore deposits in the country. If the war extends for many years, we shall have to be prepared to find means to continue a high rate of steel production with ores less accessible and of lower quality than the best Mesaba ores. For example, we must learn how to use commercially the huge quantities of taconite ore in the Lake Superior ranges if we are to continue the present steel industry located at Gary, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other points on the shores of the Great Lakes. A proposal to allocate money for testing methods of treating low grade ores has to date received a cold reception at the War Production Board. But the comparatively small sums of money required to test such projects are well justified as insurance for the future. The Axis nations have, by necessity, been forced to improve techniques so as to enable them to use lower grade ores. Each type of ore presents special problems. Farsightedness should dictate a policy of preparedness to meet any similar emergency arising in this country by initiating now our program of research. Moreover, it may be wise, after the war to preserve our best ore deposits for some future emergency period when steel will be needed in quantities obtainable only by stripping a range like Mesaba of its best ores. In this event we should be ready to substitute lower grades and less accessible ores for the peacetime operations of the steel industry.

Another problem in the facilities program was created by the serious shortage of scrap steel. Many proposals were presented for methods of creating high quality melting stock as a substitute for scrap. In essence the majority of these utilized sponge iron processes. The making of sponge iron has been a controversial subject in the steel industry for many years and it is not entirely clear that any of the processes will prove successful for large-scale operations. None the less, some of these offered promise and could have been tried out on a sufficiently large scale with comparatively small expenditures of steel and money.

The matter was delayed, however, until late in 1942 by indulgence in theoretical discussions and attempts to obtain the opinions of scientific authorities, whose statements only

emphasized our lack of knowledge and provoked further controversies. The committee had many private discussions on this subject with the War Production Board. Finally, the reorganized Steel Division adopted a logical solution that the expenditure involved in a reasonable working test of the projects with the most promise was justified because of the great need to develop a substitute for high-grade scrap. One proposal has been approved and the others are being considered. The committee agrees that, in view of the scrap situation, the small quantities of steel and money which must be risked are well worth spending on any proposal which appears to have a fair chance of providing large quantities of high-quality scrap. The one project which has been approved to date involves a process which requires high-grade magnetic ores and which would not, even if successful, prove the general utility of sponge-iron processes for other ores. Since high-grade magnetic ores are found in only a few parts of the country and are in great demand, it would be wise to approve at least one project which could use nonmagnetic ores of lower quality.

The War Production Board's experience with sponge iron is indicative of its unwillingness to originate and sponsor experimental projects. The desirability of providing synthetic scrap was clear long before any project was approved. The Steel Division made no effort to sponsor a synthetic scrap project and limited its action to formulating objections to those proposed to it.

INEFFICIENCIES IN UTILIZING EXISTING CAPACITIES

Many inefficiencies in operation, including the methods of collecting and using scrap, failure to utilize most productive melting practices, failure to revise standards, unscientific scheduling of production, and wasteful use of manpower must still be eliminated from the program.

Scrap collection presents the most serious of the unsolved problems. To maintain steel production in 1943, 14,386,000 net tons of purchased scrap will be needed in addition to the home scrap produced by the steel companies. Foundries will require a further 7,806,000 net tons of purchased scrap. This scrap must be found in the collective junk heaps and storerooms of America. While steel can be made with less scrap than the estimated requirements, operations would be seriously hampered and production would decrease substantially. The steel industry today is geared to using large quantities of scrap in its open-hearth furnaces to dilute the carbon content of pig iron in the manufacture of steel. Large quantities of purchased scrap are also needed in making electric-furnace steel. High-grade scrap is required for many operations, so that the most important steels will suffer most seriously if scrap is not found in sufficient quantity and quality.

Sponge-iron experiments cannot be expected to produce any substantial quantities of substitute scrap in 1943, even if wholly successful. The most that could be expected from sponge-iron development for the purpose of producing synthetic scrap would be volume production in 1944 or 1945. If we knew that we could count on such production we could use our existing supplies of scrap freely and rely on sponge iron for the future, but we have no such knowledge. Scrap collection and utilization, therefore, continue to be of vital importance.

The seemingly outmoded Bessemer converter has a new usefulness in connection with the scrap shortage, being used to produce a synthetic scrap which can be fed hot into open-hearth furnaces as readily as high-grade scrap. This practice has been adopted where facilities permit.

Even more useful, however, is the duplexing of bessemer converters with electric furnaces. This is valuable because of the serious shortage of high-grade scrap suitable for

electric furnace production and the shortage of electric furnace facilities. Low-grade scrap is fed to a cupola to desulfurize it. The hot metal is then processed in a bessemer converter to remove carbon and silicon. Then it is fed hot into an electric furnace. The electric furnace's capacity is thereby increased 30 percent and its consumption of electricity decreased 50 percent. Where bessemer converters are close enough to electric furnaces to permit this practice they should be so used, as the alloy steels produced by the electric furnaces are critical in our war effort. A large proportion of the great quantity of alloy turnings can be melted in cupolas without appreciable loss of the contained nickel and molybdenum. One serious defect in this procedure is the loss of the contained chrome, and for this reason the subject is still being studied.

The civilian population responded patriotically to the various local scrap campaigns. People have been willing to do their share. But after the initial flourish civilians found that there was no organization established to guide them in their enthusiasm by telling them exactly what to do. Nor are citizens impressed by the sight of huge scrap piles lying unutilized over long periods.

It must be realized that many of the contributions of the individual householder make poor scrap because they are too light and too small. When this scrap is thrown into a furnace, much of it blazes away and is lost to the operation. It also is more difficult to handle and slows down the entire steel-making operation. It must also be realized that former reliable sources of heavy scrap are disappearing. With the conversion of the civilian durable goods industries to war production, people are less prone to junk what they have. Moreover, once the present supply has been junked, no more automobiles and other heavy articles will be available to replace them and in turn be junked. Railroad lines are being rehabilitated where formerly they were torn up and put on the scrap heap. When the heavy steel articles being made today are scrapped, we expect that they will not be available for use by the steel industry because of previous use on the battlefields abroad. In brief, the sources of scrap are drying up, and we must seek new supplies diligently and with an eye to the future.

The scrap collection program has proceeded haphazardly. The Salvage Division, which has succeeded the Bureau of Industrial Conservation, is in charge of finding scrap, of stimulating its flow, and of collecting it. This Division is responsible not for the steel-scrap program but for all salvage operations. It is organized along lines designed to conduct a salvaging job. It has not been able to seek out and find scrap steel to be used as an essential raw material for steel production. The Steel Division has no jurisdiction over the collection of scrap, but merely allocates it after it has been found by the Bureau of Industrial Conservation.

The Bureau has not been able to ascertain the amounts of available scrap or to survey the places where scrap will be found. As a result the collection has been a hand-to-mouth proposition. Scrap dealers are hampered by the labor shortage, complicated regulations as to the use of their equipment, stringent specifications, too much red tape, and lack of centralization of the program. The scrap dealer must cope with the Bureau of Industrial Conservation, with the Office of Defense Transportation, with the War Labor Board, with the priority authorities, and with the Office of Price Administration. Discussions with the War Production Board on the disposition of scrap must usually be suspended until the price has been adjusted by the Office of Price Administration. Scrap prices are too low to enable the dealer to take new measures and to find and haul new

and remote sources of supply. Most of the scrap dealers are trying to do their job. The Government should utilize its employees to seek out new sources of scrap steel, rather than to check and recheck the scrap dealers.

One huge store of steel which should be readily subject to requisitioning and collection lay untouched during most of 1942 and to date has not even been inventoried. This is the huge stock pile of steel which pre-war industry, particularly the automobile industry, had on hand when operations were curtailed after Pearl Harbor. Estimates of the aggregate amount of this steel vary, but all agree that there are millions of tons. The quality is good. The War Production Board knows just where to find it, yet to date most of it is still unused and deteriorating, rusting usually in the open air. An organized effort to move these stocks began in the late fall of 1942, and is now under way. Some of it is of quality and type that could be immediately fabricated into such items as farm machinery.

But the farmers of America are being denied steel necessary to make the farm machinery which they and the Department of Agriculture assert is essential to the food program. The Petroleum Administrator cannot get steel for sorely needed pipe lines and barges. The railroads cannot get steel for cars, and the Maritime Commission cannot get steel for ships.

Other serious problems to be solved are the present waste of scrap due to failure of steel fabricators to segregate the various classes of scrap and due to the failure of the industry to absorb alloy steel turnings. There is in effect an order requiring segregation, but only the large producers have complied. The average scrap producer mixes all types of steel with the result that much of his scrap is wasted. The segregation order must be enforced. Alloy steel turnings now run about 100,000 tons a month. The steel companies advise that they cannot utilize over 40,000 tons a month with present facilities for preparing the scrap for melting. The Iron and Steel Branch and the Industry Advisory Committee were advised a year ago that there would be 100,000 tons a month of alloy turnings, but practically nothing has been done to handle this quantity. The alloying elements in the wasted scrap are of prime importance and vigorous efforts must now be taken to find a way of recovering the alloying metals in these turnings.

This is no time for halfway measures. The entire steel scrap collection program should be revamped. Ultimate responsibility for finding scrap for steel, as contrasted to salvage operations, should be in the hands of the Steel Division with power in that Division to issue necessary directives to the Salvage Division. The steel scrap collection program is no mere matter of salvage and conservation. It goes to the very heart of production.

Reports have come to the committee that the steel companies could operate more efficiently if production schedules were better adjusted to their particular facilities. The Steel Division cannot wait for the companies voluntarily to take action which would disturb their customer relations. Mills should not be permitted to roll various sizes of a given product where each particular size could be assigned to the particular mill best equipped for the job. Substantial production time and manpower is lost during time spent on turn-overs from one type of job to another. Some items, which should be used extensively, are not in demand because of the price structure. Low-alloy steels sell at prices higher than high-alloy steels, with a resultant waste of the alloying elements in cases where carbon or low-alloy steel would be satisfactory; the various ferro-alloy prices result in a tendency to produce the most profitable products rather than those which help the most in conservation. The solution of

this problem is in the hands of the Office of Price Administration. Prices should be adjusted to equalize profits or to make the more important products the most profitable.

The priority system also has affected production adversely in many instances. Under heretofore existing conditions steel companies have had to produce the items with highest priority numbers first, whereas they would be able to operate more efficiently if they could schedule a total maximum output of all products for a particular period and produce them in such a way as to achieve maximum efficiency. This condition will probably be cured when the Steel Division puts into effect a more inclusive production-directives system and integrates this with the controlled-materials plan. Under this system the mills will be specifically instructed with respect to the particular items they must produce in each month, with due consideration given to the plant's backlog of orders and its particular problems.

Abandonment of the priority system in favor of specific allocations will also eliminate other less important factors which unbalanced production. In the past the customer with the low priority number could shop around for a mill with a small backlog to fill his order, while another customer with a high priority number would go unsatisfied if he ordered his steel from a producer with a large backlog. Most large corporations maintained a retinue of scouts in the field to cope with this situation. The new system should eliminate these mechanical difficulties and also enable the War Production Board to know exactly how steel is being utilized. With such information it should be able to insure that the most important needs are satisfied first and that war production is maintained at the highest possible rate.

The system alone will not solve the problem. One situation which requires careful consideration is due to orders for certain types of products being placed seasonally in some cases, such as tin plate; this creates a serious problem. A large crew is required to turn out the job in a hurry when the pyramided orders arrive. In order to keep experienced crews of workers available against the time when the orders come in, the mills have shown a tendency to hoard these men. Although tin-plate production has been considerably curtailed for some time, manufacturers have believed that the packing of the incoming large food crop will result in a sudden rush for all available tinplate capacity. When it does come, they will need a full and experienced crew. Accordingly, workers are being held on although not needed. It would be preferable to place orders for this type of material well in advance, and to space production to avoid peaks and depressions, thus enabling the mills to utilize their plant and personnel uniformly over a long period of time and to release those workers whom it otherwise tries to save to handle a rush of work.

Specifications also should be reexamined with a view to making sure that they are not too exacting with a resultant loss in production. Wherever it is possible to relax specifications without sacrificing military effectiveness, this should be done. We cannot afford to sacrifice materials needed now to gain additional durability for articles which will certainly do their job and outlast the war. The new national emergency alloy steels do the job of old alloy steels and save substantial quantities of scarce metals. The Steel Division should take positive action to require the use of these steels, and the Office of Price Administration should look into the price situation with respect to them. At present high prices for these steels set by the steel companies are proving a deterrent to their use.

Centrifugal castings and pressure castings should be used more freely as a substitute for forgings and rolled bars. Consumers have been reluctant to make the change, although

the castings have proved their merit and save great quantities of steel. Many forgings utilize as little as 15 percent of the steel which goes into their making, whereas in equivalent castings the yield often is as high as 80 percent. The finished casting requires much less machining than a forging. The change-over would not result in junking equipment. There is more than enough demand for all the forging facilities that would be available even if centrifugal and pressure castings were widely used. New equipment for this purpose can be built quickly and with much less critical material than rolling and forging facilities.

Testimony developed at the committee's hearings showed that orders for sheet steel were assigned to large mills, with equipment to produce a variety of items, whereas small mills equipped only to roll light sheet were operating far below capacity.

The committee recommended that, insofar as practicable, the small mills be given orders which would enable them to continue in business and at the same time release for other work facilities and employees of the large mills with varied operations to the extent of the work that can be given to the smaller mills. The manpower situation, in particular, would warrant this, since the small mills have their manpower at hand. If they are forced out of business, the manpower will drift away, probably to other industries, and certainly away from the housing facilities they now occupy, whereas the large mills could readily use the manpower which they themselves would release if they gave up some of these operations. To date, however, this situation has not been much improved, and the committee is of the opinion that more could be done to aid the small mill and at the same time help the war effort.

The Bessemer steel capacity of the country is not being fully utilized to date. In connection with the discussion of scrap in this report, the committee concluded that Bessemer converters would be most useful where duplexed in operation with open-hearth and electric furnaces. This is possible only where the two are close enough to permit the feeding of hot steel from the Bessemer to the open-hearth or electric furnace. But there are many Bessemer converters in places where such duplexing would not be feasible, and these are not producing Bessemer steel up to capacity. This steel is not suitable for most military purposes, due to its lower ductility. Nevertheless, it can be used to fill many essential needs which otherwise would go unfilled. Pre-war specifications, however, shunned Bessemer steel, and the armed forces and industry in general have not yet been willing to use it for purposes where they were accustomed to use open-hearth steel. Bessemer should be specified wherever possible.

DISTRIBUTION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

The controlled materials plan is rapidly being put into effect. Under it the armed forces and other consumers will state in advance exactly what they need and allocations will be specifically made to the extent that the materials are available. The principles underlying the plan appear to be sound, but its success will depend almost entirely upon how it is administered. Actual operation and practice have not yet proceeded far enough to enable an accurate appraisal of its efficiency to be made.

The priorities system of distribution depended on assigning an arbitrary priority designation to a particular steel purchase. The priority number was based on the best approximation of the urgency status of the particular purchase and the relative importance of the item to be produced as related to the entire defense program. No steps were taken to prevent a steel plant from favoring production of more profitable items over other items having a higher priority status. Nor was any program evolved

to equalize the distribution of urgent priority orders uniformly between the various steel manufacturers. As a result, astute purchasers with low priority ratings were able to place their orders with manufacturers having less of the higher priority commitments and thereby improved their ratings.

The priority system was further predicated on the theory that the priorities would absorb all the ingot produced in order of their ratings flowing progressively from the highest to the lower ratings until all the production found its way into the program. But in actual practice many urgent programs with high priority ratings went begging for steel, while large tonnages of low priority ratings were being filled.

The black markets disclosed in the steel industry were patronized by producers of vital items who were unable to get quick deliveries of steel in any other way. These black markets were able to exist because of the absence of control of less than carload lots. A few jobbers took advantage of this to sell at exorbitant prices, with a resultant disarrangement of the price and priority system. Black markets must be constantly sought out and eliminated when found. On the other hand, the jobbers can perform a most valuable function by stocking odd items of which individual purchasers order small quantities.

Under the priorities system, a shipyard could pile up inventories of plate even though failure of other deliveries made the plate useless. Low priority numbers on some items could and did hold up construction jobs which had high ratings on other items.

The Steel Division should check very carefully accumulations of large inventories at this time when so many urgent needs have not been satisfied. The armed forces, and some Navy shipyards in particular have supplies on hand for many months, in some instances for 8 to 10 months. Each case should be examined to determine whether, without prejudice to the war effort, the steel could be put to immediate use, and replaced by later production.

With programs as important as the synthetic rubber, oil pipe line, shipbuilding construction, and farm machinery, begging for steel, we cannot afford to wonder where steel ingot is going.

It is essential that every ton of steel produced by every mill be specifically allocated to the most important work at hand. It is essential that so far as possible this allocation be carried back as far as the ingot so that the quantities of each type produced can be adjusted to the facilities for finishing the most urgently needed products. This requires considerable planning and effort. It will require primarily that the armed forces determine their needs and state them correctly, conservatively, and in sufficient time to permit proper planning. It will emphasize, though not increase, the dangers of asking for the wrong finished products and then changing specifications in the midst of production. It should greatly lessen the all too prevalent practice of asking for too much on the theory that that is the best way to assure getting at least enough.

If this program is to be successful, the Army and the Navy will have to cooperate in it. There is too little leeway in the over-all requirements estimates for 1943 to justify any extravagance or waste. In the steel program, the requirements of the armed forces compete, not just with essential civilian requirements, but with programs essential to the actual fighting of the war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States

Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

INFLATION—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have been told for many months of the great danger of inflation. The President of the United States himself has sent us several messages dwelling on the damage which it would cause, and last September he regarded it as such a tremendous danger that he threatened to fix prices and wages himself without legal authority if Congress did not act promptly on the anti-inflation measure. I agree that a serious inflation would create hardship and injustice among our citizens and, if carried to extremes, might destroy our whole financial and economic structure.

I was the more surprised, therefore, to learn of the action of the Federal Reserve Board taken in December, resulting in the issue of \$660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes, which are the exact equivalent of greenbacks. I do not know any policy more likely to bring about inflation than the issue of paper currency without reserves and resting for its value entirely on the unsecured promise of the Government of the United States. In the name of preventing inflation, one department of the Government is subjecting the people to every form of Fascist control in the regulation of prices, wages, and rationing, while another department is engaged in inflating the currency.

On January 21 I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and another letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have received replies describing the procedure taken in connection with the issuance of \$660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes. I assume the facts to be as stated in those letters, but they do not change in any way my condemnation of the procedure.

I ask that the letters be printed at the close of my remarks, together with the enclosures, so that the whole story may be in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. TAFT. These Federal Reserve bank notes are being issued under section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, as it was amended in 1933, at the time of the bank crisis. Amended section 18 was passed while the banks were closed, in order to provide a liberal supply of currency, in case there should be any runs on the banks when they were opened. That was its only purpose, and it provides that no note shall be issued under it after the President has declared by proclamation that the emergency recognized by him by proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated.

In other words, an act was passed for an emergency which existed in 1933. It was expressly provided that if the Presi-

dent should declare that emergency to be ended, the statute should be void. It happens that the President never has declared that emergency to be ended. I do not think he has ever declared to be ended any of the hundreds of emergencies which have occurred since 1933. The result is that legally this statute is still in effect. That emergency apparently never has been formally terminated, and so the Treasury now takes action under this act.

The act authorized any Federal Reserve bank to deposit Government bonds or commercial paper with the Treasury, and against the security of such obligations to issue its own notes, known as Federal Reserve bank notes. Any bank could bring its assets to the Federal Reserve bank, therefore, and the Federal Reserve bank could issue this currency to it in return. It was recognized at the time that this was not a permanently sound procedure, because it resulted in effect in the monetization of the national debt, that is, when bonds were actually deposited. Under the present action no bonds are deposited, but it is not a sound procedure even when bonds are deposited. It was not extensively used, only \$265,000,000 being issued in 1933, and all but \$18,000,000 of these have since been retired. Those eighteen million are apparently in safety deposit boxes, or lost, or have in some way disappeared.

Apparently someone in the Treasury found in some back drawer \$660,000,000 of these notes which had been printed and never used in 1933, and he got the bright idea that they might as well be issued now. So a method was devised which is even more unsound than the original issue of the notes under emergency conditions.

Another provision of section 18 provides the method by which these Federal Reserve bank notes can be retired, that method being the same as the one pursued in the retirement of national-bank notes, that is, the notes issued by the ordinary national banks prior to the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act.

If any national bank or any Federal Reserve bank desires to retire any of these notes, it may deposit cash with the Treasury and take back its collateral. Thereupon it is provided that the liability for the note is transferred to the United States, and the national bank or the Federal Reserve bank is released from further liability. It is intended, of course, that this shall result promptly in the retirement of the notes. So apparently what happened in this case is that the Federal Reserve Board ordered the Federal Reserve banks, who knew nothing about the matter and had no need for such currency, to issue a proportion of these notes. Each Federal Reserve bank took its Government bonds and deposited them as collateral with the Federal Reserve agent. At least, that is what is claimed. They are not there now.

Immediately, and apparently as part of the same transaction, it notified the Treasury of its intention to retire the notes, withdraw its collateral, and meet the requirement for the deposit of cash by setting up a credit to the Treasury

on its own books. Thereupon it relieved itself of any liability on the new Federal Reserve bank notes, and this liability was transferred to the United States. These Federal Reserve bank notes have apparently never appeared in any statement as a liability of any Federal Reserve bank. The net result of this transaction is that there are now outstanding \$660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes, against which there is no collateral, which are not liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, but are liabilities of the Government of the United States. No effort was made to retire these notes, although probably they were still in the hands of the Federal Reserve banks, but they are being issued to the public from time to time. The net legal effect is the same as if the United States had issued greenbacks in the same sum. It is stated on the face of the notes that they are liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, and that bonds have been deposited to secure their payment, but these are not facts. At least, they are no longer liabilities of the Federal Reserve bank, and no bonds are now deposited for their payment.

It may be that the procedure followed is legal, and that these notes are legal obligations of the United States. That is the opinion of Mr. Dreibelbis, general attorney of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, whose opinion is attached. Certainly Congress never intended such an issue to take place, and there is a complete violation of the spirit of the law. In the first place, Congress made clear its intention that no such notes should be issued after the 1933 emergency came to an end. The statement issued by the Federal Reserve Board frankly says that—

Authority for Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve bank notes will expire when the President proclaims that the emergency recognized in his proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated.

Apparently no such proclamation terminating the bank emergency of 1933 is expected. It is quite true that the President has declared many emergencies since that time; but I have never heard of anyone claiming that that particular emergency is still in effect.

Secondly, the act was certainly passed for the benefit of the Federal Reserve banks to supply them with currency when they needed it. In the present case these banks knew nothing about the matter until they were ordered to take out the notes. It will be noted that the Secretary of the Treasury says that these notes are being issued by the Federal Reserve banks at the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. There is nothing in the law which gives the Board of Governors power to issue any such order. However, the Federal Reserve banks ordinarily comply with what they are requested to do.

Thirdly, the statute permitting the retirement of the notes and the transfer of liability to the United States is not being complied with in good faith. The United States was only supposed to assume a liability between the time when the need for the notes had come to an end, as in-

dictated by the banks' desire to retire them, and the time when they could be retired. It was merely a step in the process of retirement. Instead of that, the notes are permitted to be issued after the notice of retirement has been given, and apparently it is the intention to keep the notes in circulation more or less indefinitely. The statement of the Federal Reserve Board says that—

The Federal Reserve bank notes will be canceled and retired as they become unfit for circulation.

In other words, when they are torn to pieces or worn out they will be retired, after a period of perhaps 3 or 4 years.

It may well be a number of years before this condition exists. I even question whether Government bonds were ever really handed to the Federal Reserve agent, although I assume that he perhaps saw them for a minute or two. Perhaps they were put in his hands for that purpose.

Fourthly, the procedure was so simultaneous that I rather doubt whether there was any moment at which the Federal Reserve banks were liable to anyone on these notes. Apparently they still held the notes when they withdrew their collateral. If so, the notes never were outstanding, and never were in fact Federal Reserve bank notes.

It is argued by the Board in effect that since they are issuing so many bonds anyway, it does not make much difference whether the unsecured notes are issued or not. Of course, that begs the question. Furthermore, these notes are a little worse form of currency than any other to which we have resorted. The Civil War greenbacks, of which there are still \$346,000,000 outstanding, are secured by a 45-percent reserve of gold. The Federal Reserve notes are secured by reserves in gold of not less than 40 percent. Silver certificates are secured by silver, usually to the full value of the certificates. Bank deposits, both in commercial banks and in Federal Reserve banks, must have adequate reserves. But here is a series of notes resting solely on the promise of the Government of the United States, without collateral of any kind.

I realize that it is impossible at the present time entirely to avoid an inflationary procedure with reference to the currency, but there are certainly far more sound and conservative methods of dealing with the currency than this one. Fundamentally, inflation is caused by the creation of purchasing power through Government borrowing. Ultimately, the only way to avoid inflation is to reduce expenses, raise more taxes, and sell bonds to individuals and institutions which have really saved the money and have it available for investment. In time of war it is almost impossible to secure any great reduction in expenses. We are undertaking to tax up to the very limit that the people can bear without suffering more harm than the avoidance of inflation will do good. Even though we go the limit on taxation, the Government will have to borrow from fifty to sixty billion dollars next year. The most important policy for the Treasury to pursue

is to put on a complete and all-inclusive bond-selling campaign to get the money, not by issuing notes, but by selling bonds to the people in return for their savings. It must provide the kind of bonds that people in different situations are interested in buying. It must sell those bonds by a house-to-house canvass on the same basis on which we conduct our Community Chest campaign.

For the first time, in December the Treasury turned toward such a policy, but even then \$5,000,000,000 of the \$12,000,000,000 of bonds sold were sold to commercial banks. The sale of bonds to commercial banks is simply the creation of purchasing power out of thin air, for the deposits created are passed on by the Government to individuals who have the money to spend. The holdings of commercial banks have increased approximately \$10,000,000,000 in 1 year, and will increase more than twice that amount in the next year if we do not do a better job of selling bonds. The holdings of the Federal Reserve banks have increased approximately \$3,700,000,000 dollars in 1 year. For various reasons the amount of currency outstanding has increased more than \$3,000,000,000 in 1 year. If this inflationary process continues, I do not care how strong we make the dike of price control and wage control, it will be swept away by the flood of paper.

I have to admit that the sale of bonds to commercial banks has ultimately about the same result as the issue of unsecured paper money such as I have been discussing, but there is a substantial difference in the nature of the process. In the first place, the commercial banks do not have to buy bonds unless they wish to do so, and they cannot do so unless their resulting situation provides sufficient reserves. In other words, there is a limit to the process of selling bonds to commercial banks. The least dangerous form of inflation, therefore, is this method, which has been pursued too liberally by the Treasury up to this time.

The second method of financing the Government through inflation, somewhat more dangerous than that of selling bonds to the commercial banks, is the purchase of bonds in the open market by the Federal Reserve banks. This process has been authorized for years, and as a balance wheel to meet an increased or decreased volume of business, it is generally recognized as sound. When it is used, however, as it is now being used and has been used during the past year, to help finance the Government's war program, it is distinctly inflationary. I have pointed out that the Federal Reserve banks have increased their holdings of bonds by \$3,700,000,000, and evidently they intend to go on increasing their holdings. The effect of this is to increase the bank reserves and to make it easier for the Treasury to sell bonds to the banks.

A still more inflationary procedure consists in the direct sale of Government bonds to the Federal Reserve banks. This was authorized by statute last year over my protest, and I understand that it has been used by the Treasury, al-

though when the bill was passed they denied any intention of making use of it except temporarily to assist financing over tax day.

Finally, the most inflationary method of all, psychologically and practically, is the direct issue of paper money. Unfortunately, the statutes already permit this to be done in several ways. They permit it to be done in the case of silver certificates. Without further action by Congress, the Government today could issue \$1,700,000,000 worth of additional silver certificates, representing the difference between the actual cost of the Government's silver and \$1.29 an ounce, the monetary value. I hope the Government will not do so. So far, the Treasury has apparently no intention of doing so.

As a practical matter, however, the issue of this money while it would be pure inflation, would at least provide a substantial reserve behind the notes; because of course there would be that silver; and while it would not be for 100 percent, it still would be for from 50 percent to 60 percent of the face amount of the notes.

There is also some authority under certain circumstances to issue \$3,000,000,000 worth of greenbacks under the Thomas amendment of 1933.

Now, Mr. President, the Treasury has dug up another method of printing paper money, and I should say that it falls in the most dangerous class of inflationary action. I might point out that if the Treasury can do this at all, if the Treasury can issue the \$660,000,000 worth of notes—notes which were printed 10 years ago—it can also go on printing the notes in unlimited quantities. It can increase the issue from \$660,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000. If there is statutory authority for the issuance of \$660,000,000 worth of notes there is statutory authority for issuing \$10,000,000,000 worth of the notes. So the situation presents a wide-open field for pure inflationary issuance of paper money.

It is difficult for me to see how any responsible official of the United States Government can deliberately favor the issuance of unsecured paper money and at the same time inveigh against the dangers of inflation. The Federal Reserve bank notes should be immediately retired, and Congress should repeal the act which authorizes their issuance.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce a bill for that purpose.

The bill (S. 658) to repeal the sixth paragraph of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXHIBIT A

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, January 26, 1943.

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TAFT: This is in reply to your letter of January 21 in which you inquire whether in the issuance of \$660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes the provisions of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act have been complied with and requesting

also an explanation of the exact procedure followed in the issuance of these notes.

With regard to the legality of the issue, I enclose a memorandum opinion by the general attorney of the Board which shows conclusively that the notes were issued in strict compliance with the law and the regulations thereunder. With respect to the procedure, I attach a memorandum prepared by the staff which gives the details of the procedure followed. You will note that it is in conformity with procedure followed in the past, both with respect to Federal Reserve bank notes and national bank notes.

In addition, I enclose a memorandum which Dr. Goldenweiser, Director of our Division of Research and Statistics, informally prepared after reading the open letter sent to Congress by the secretary of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. Dr. Goldenweiser fully explained the matter over the telephone to the writer of this open letter and felt indignant that nevertheless the open letter had been sent in the light of the facts and the disturbance of public confidence which could result from a deliberate distortion of the truth.

I trust that this material will acquaint you fully with the facts, but if you desire more information, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES, Chairman.

Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics at New York University, and secretary of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, addressed an open letter to Congress on January 20, 1943. In this letter he says that the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes by the Treasury up to \$660,000,000, or any other amount, is not authorized by law; that these notes must be issued by the Federal Reserve banks; that they are not being issued by these banks and are not liabilities of these banks, and that the statement on the face of these notes, that they are secured by United States Government obligations is a falsehood.

First, as to the law: The law and regulations thereunder authorize the Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve bank notes against Government securities pledged for the purpose and to extinguish their liability on these notes by depositing lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States. When the Reserve banks' liability has been extinguished in this manner, they are at liberty to withdraw the Government securities that were pledged against the notes. What was done is precisely that. The notes were issued by the Reserve banks and Government securities were pledged against them. Lawful money was deposited with the Treasurer of the United States by giving the Treasury a deposit account at the Federal Reserve banks, which is withdrawable at any time in gold certificates, silver certificates, or any other lawful money. In this way the liability on the notes was extinguished, and the securities back of the notes were then withdrawn.

The accusation that the words "secured by United States bonds" on the notes is a falsehood is specious. It is true that they are no longer secured by bonds because of the series of transactions which has been described. But they are secured "by like deposit of other securities" to wit, lawful money. The transaction is identical with the course followed in the case of Federal Reserve bank notes in 1921-24 and 1934-35. It is identical with the course pursued at the time that national bank notes were taken over from the national banks and made liabilities of the Treasury. These notes, the same as Federal Reserve bank notes, are no longer secured by United

States obligations but by lawful money and require no other collateral.

The particular point that Mr. Spahr makes about the notes being labeled "national currency" would be puzzling if one did not know how it happened, as he should know. The reason the words "national currency" appear on these notes is that at the time of the banking holiday in 1933, when it became necessary to be prepared to meet currency withdrawals in case they should continue after the banks reopened, it was essential to print the notes in a hurry. For this purpose existing plates of national bank notes were used, with some overprinting. This was in accordance with law which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury has authority to determine the form of any United States currency that is issued.

The next question is as to the good faith of the Board when it stated that the purpose of issuing these notes was to save the paper and manpower necessary for printing other notes. The fact is that that was the sole purpose of the issue. These notes were in existence, they were lying idle, and it would have taken 225,000 man-hours, 45 tons of paper and some other scarce materials to produce a supply of other notes.

It is true that the Treasury, as a result of this transaction, got the use of \$660,000,000 without interest for the period until these notes will have been retired. That this was not one of the objects of the issue is apparent, however, from the circumstances surrounding the issue. It costs the Treasury about three-eighths of 1 percent a year to borrow the money which it would have had to have if the notes had not been issued in the manner indicated. But in that case the Federal Reserve banks would have had to pay the Treasury one-half of 1 percent tax on the notes, so that, as a matter of fact, the Treasury sustained a nominal loss as a result of using the method of issuing the notes that was adopted.

All this, however, is within the realm of reasonable discussion and debate. But, beyond this point, Professor Spahr proceeds into a long discussion based on the supposition that the Federal Reserve bank notes will add \$660,000,000 to the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks; that this amount will support, in round numbers, \$1,900,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank deposits, and that this, in turn, will support about \$9,500,000,000 of member bank deposits, or, if reserve requirements are reduced to 10 percent, as the law permits, it will support nineteen billions of member bank deposits.

It is in the figure of nineteen billions of deposits added to the paying medium of the country that Professor Spahr sees danger to the economy and inconsistency with the policy of the Government in trying to prevent inflation. The facts of the matter are that the \$660,000,000 are not being added to the Federal Reserve banks' reserves, since they are being paid out into circulation as fast as there is a demand for them. A delay of some weeks in some instances may occur where the notes are in denominations of \$50 and \$100, which do not circulate rapidly. All of the notes, however, will be paid out in a relatively short time.

The other and much more important fact is that even if those notes were added to the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks this would be an act of supererogation. The Reserve banks now have eleven billions of excess reserves. On the basis of these reserves, following Mr. Spahr's calculations, they could build up a member bank-deposit structure of \$300,000,000,000, in comparison with which the professor's nineteen billions would fade into insignificance. To build up a vast monster of inflationary danger by assuming such

an addition to the reserves of the Reserve banks (even if it should occur, as it will not) and then to accuse the Government of an improper act on that score is to exceed the boundaries of responsible discussion.

ISSUANCE AND RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK NOTES

JANUARY 23, 1943.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS:

(Mr. Dreifelbis, General Attorney.)

On December 12, 1943, the Board authorized the Federal Reserve banks to utilize the existing stock of currency known as Federal Reserve bank notes amounting to approximately \$660,000,000. This currency is the remainder of a supply printed in 1933 and is identical with the Federal Reserve bank notes now in circulation.

I am informed that the procedure followed in issuing, redeeming and retiring Federal Reserve bank notes has been and is as follows. Government securities are pledged with the Federal Reserve agent as agent for the Comptroller of the Currency and upon their deposit the Federal Reserve agent delivers Federal Reserve bank notes to the Federal Reserve bank. However, it has been the practice of the Federal Reserve banks to reduce or extinguish their liability on such notes by establishing credits in the Treasurer's general account. When the credit has been established, the collateral is returned to the banks and subsequent retirement or redemption of the notes is effected by charges to the account.

My opinion has been requested as to the legal authority for this procedure.

The issuance and retirement of such notes are governed by the provisions of paragraph 6 of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act and regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury issued pursuant thereto.

The pertinent provisions of paragraph 6 of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act read as follows:

"Upon deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, (a) of any direct obligations of the United States * * * any Federal Reserve bank making such deposit in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be entitled to receive from the Comptroller of the Currency circulating notes in blank, duly registered and countersigned. * * * The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and empowered to prescribe regulations governing the issuance, redemption, replacement, retirement, and destruction of such circulating notes and the release and substitution of security therefor. * * * No such circulating notes shall be issued under this paragraph after the President has declared by proclamation that the emergency recognized by the President by proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated, unless such circulating notes are secured by deposits of bonds of the United States bearing the circulation privilege. When required to do so by the Secretary of the Treasury, each Federal Reserve agent shall act as agent of the Treasurer of the United States or of the Comptroller of the Currency, or both, for the performance of any of the functions which the Treasurer or the Comptroller may be called upon to perform in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph."

On March 11, 1933, Secretary of the Treasury Woodin issued a regulation which provides for the issuance of such notes and the deposit and maintenance of collateral as security therefor. The pertinent provisions of this regulation will be found in paragraphs 1 and 4 which read as follows:

"1. The Federal Reserve agent accredited to each Federal Reserve bank is hereby authorized and required to act as the agent of the Treasurer of the United States or of the

Comptroller of the Currency, or both, for the performance of any of the functions which the Treasurer or the Comptroller may be called upon to perform in carrying out the provisions of such sixth paragraph of section 18, as amended. The term 'Federal Reserve agent' as used in this regulation shall be construed to mean the Federal Reserve agent as agent of the Treasurer of the United States or of the Comptroller of the Currency, or both, as the case may be."

"4. Upon deposit with the Federal Reserve agent of the security required by such sixth paragraph of section 18, as amended, the Federal Reserve agent may deliver Federal Reserve bank notes to the Federal Reserve bank to which he is accredited."

On March 31, 1933, Acting Secretary of the Treasury A. A. Ballantine issued a regulation which provides for the retirement of such notes. The pertinent provisions of this regulation will be found in paragraphs 5 and 7 which read as follows:

"5. Deposits by Federal Reserve banks for credit in the redemption fund provided for under paragraph 10 of the regulations approved March 11, 1933, [or deposits to retire Federal Reserve bank notes as hereinafter provided may be made by credits in the Treasurer's general account or by payment through the gold settlement fund]". (Language in brackets indicates our emphasis.)

"7. Any Federal Reserve bank may at any time retire its Federal Reserve bank notes by the deposit of such notes with its Federal Reserve agent, or may reduce its liability for outstanding Federal Reserve bank notes by the deposit of lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States, and upon delivery to the agent by the bank of any of its Federal Reserve bank notes, or upon advice from the Treasurer [or the Federal Reserve bank] that a deposit of lawful money has been made by the bank for retirement of its Federal Reserve bank notes, the agent shall have general authority to surrender an equivalent amount of collateral to the bank. Any Federal Reserve bank notes surrendered to the Federal Reserve agent by the bank may be reissued to the bank only on the basis of an original issue. The Federal Reserve agent shall daily report to the Treasurer of the United States, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board the amount of Federal Reserve bank notes surrendered by the bank."

You are advised that, in my opinion, the procedure outlined above meets the legal requirements of section 18 of the Federal Reserve Act and the applicable regulations issued thereunder.

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ISSUANCE OF
FEDERAL RESERVE BANK NOTES

In December 1942 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with the approval of the Treasury Department, authorized the Federal Reserve banks to pay out the existing stock, approximately \$660,000,000, of Federal bank notes which were printed in 1933. This was done to help meet the extraordinary demands for currency and at the same time conserve thousands of man-hours and valuable materials for other purposes. It was estimated that there would be a saving of 225,000 man-hours in printing alone and 45 tons of paper, in addition to substantial quantities of nylon and ink.

The issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes was authorized in the Federal Reserve Act as originally drawn in 1913. Such notes were

¹Language in brackets inserted by amendment dated December 14, 1942, to permit alternative advice by the Federal Reserve bank.

issued during the period 1916-20, and again in 1933, when a shortage of currency appeared imminent at the time of the bank holiday. About \$912,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes were printed in 1933 (none have been printed since that date), of which about \$265,000,000 were issued to member banks for circulation purposes. Between February 28, 1934, when \$194,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes were in circulation, and March 1, 1935, the various Federal Reserve banks extinguished their liability for Federal Reserve bank notes then outstanding by depositing an equal amount of lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for their redemption, as provided in the Treasury Department's regulations of March 31, 1933, covering the issue and redemption of Federal Reserve bank notes. From then on the Federal Reserve banks had no liability for Federal Reserve bank notes in circulation. About \$18,000,000 of these Federal Reserve bank notes are still in circulation.

In 1935 a similar procedure was followed in extinguishing the liability of national banks for approximately \$654,000,000 of national bank notes which were in circulation at the end of July 1935, when the Secretary of the Treasury called for redemption all United States securities available as collateral for currency issued by national banks. The national banks deposited lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States for the redemption of their bank notes then outstanding, and thereupon the liability for such notes was assumed by the United States. There are still about \$135,000,000 of national bank notes in circulation.

The Federal Reserve bank notes now being put into circulation are issued by the Federal Reserve banks in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury. For all notes issued to the Federal Reserve banks, Government securities were deposited by the Reserve banks with the Federal Reserve agents, acting as agents of the Comptroller of the Currency, pursuant to Treasury Department regulations. Instead, however, of leaving the bonds pledged with Federal Reserve agents as collateral for Federal Reserve bank notes issued by them to the Federal Reserve banks, and showing such notes as a liability, the Federal Reserve banks secured the release of the bonds by depositing lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States in an amount sufficient to redeem all Federal Reserve bank notes issued to them. The Federal Reserve bank notes will be canceled and retired as they become unfit for circulation.

If the Federal Reserve banks had left Government bonds pledged as security for Federal Reserve bank notes they would under the law have paid a tax of one-fourth percent semiannually upon the average amount of such notes in circulation. The method followed has the effect of relieving the Federal Reserve banks of the payment of the tax, and member bank reserves will be temporarily increased as the funds deposited in the United States Treasurer's general account are checked out. This effect on member-bank reserves will be reversed as the Federal Reserve bank notes are redeemed and retired from circulation.

Authority for Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve bank notes will expire when the President proclaims that the emergency recognized in his proclamation of March 6, 1933, has terminated.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 1, 1943.

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of January 21, 1943, in which you make

several inquiries with respect to the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes.

These notes, as you know, are being issued by the Federal Reserve banks at the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The Board of Governors consulted the Treasury prior to directing their issuance and the Treasury approved this action.

All steps taken in connection with the issuance of these notes have been in compliance with the applicable statutes and regulations, and were approved by counsel for the Board of Governors and for the Treasury. I understand that you have already been furnished with a memorandum opinion by Mr. J. P. Dreifelbis, general attorney of the Board of Governors, fully explaining the legal basis of the action. Our own counsel concurs in the conclusions reached in this opinion.

The issuance of the existing stock of Federal Reserve bank notes will result in a substantial saving of money. As Professor Spahr says in his so-called open letter to Congress, this saving will accrue immediately to the benefit of the Federal Reserve banks which are required by law to reimburse the Treasury for all expenses connected with the preparation of Federal Reserve bank notes. The saving will ultimately fall into the Treasury, however, as it will add that much to the surplus of the Federal Reserve banks which is the property of the United States subject to the disposition of Congress. More importantly, the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes will result in substantial savings of scarce labor and strategic materials which cannot be adequately evaluated in terms of money.

Federal Reserve bank notes from the existing stock of \$660,000,000 are being issued only as needed for actual circulation and will not be added to the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks. Even if they were so added, the issue would be negligible as the Federal Reserve banks have a very large amount of excess reserves. The issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes is no more inflationary than the issuance of a corresponding amount of Federal Reserve notes.

I am taking the liberty in this connection of sending you a copy of a memorandum on the economic effects of the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes by Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, director of research and statistics of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I understand that a copy of this memorandum has already been transmitted to you by Chairman Eccles. I agree completely with Dr. Goldenweiser's comments and share his indignation, referred to in Chairman Eccles' letter to you, that Dr. Spahr should have chosen to issue his "open letter" in the face of the actual facts of the situation.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,

Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION—
REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a motion in regard to Senate bill 607, to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes, introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and other distinguished colleagues.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there will be some discussion of the motion and the bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Just a moment. Did the Senator from North Carolina complete his motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was about to give my reasons as to why I thought the bill should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator completed his motion. He did not actually make the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Then, I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is constrained to inform the Senator that he will first have to make a motion to have the bill taken up for consideration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 607) to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now move that Senate bill 607 be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield to me to make the point of no quorum? I think Senators should be present when the motion is voted on.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bridges	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lucas	Tobey
Butler	McClellan	Truman
Byrd	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	McNary	Vandenberg
Chandler	Maloney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh
Danaher	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis

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

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the

Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, our distinguished leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was good enough a moment ago to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that I might have the opportunity of explaining to Members who were not then present my individual reason for believing that Senate bill 607, copies of which Senators will find on their desks, should be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

Mr. President, one has but to read the bill to know why it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. In my opinion the wording of the bill itself implies that the only committee to which it can properly be referred is the Military Affairs Committee. I make that statement for the simple reason that the bill deals with the mobilization of the people of America for an all-out war effort. Let me read a few paragraphs of the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to (1) inventory and mobilize all the economic resources of the United States, including manpower, facilities, materials, technical and scientific knowledge, and natural resources—

For what purpose? For one purpose only—

For maximum use in the provision of military and essential civilian needs—

Mr. President, that is the first purpose of the bill. That is its main objective. The second purpose of the bill is what?— and (2) adjust and stabilize the economy in accordance with the needs of full mobilization and other conditions created—

By what?—

created by war.

Created by war, and by war alone. Let us turn now to page 3, Mr. President, for the purpose of ascertaining the program as outlined by the bill, and what do we find? We find the following language in section 3:

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Administrators of the four constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization.

What shall the committee which the bill seeks to create do?

This committee shall develop, subject to the approval of the President, a comprehensive national program for maximum use of resources for military and essential civilian needs.

All those needs were created by one thing only, and that is by war itself.

This program shall be based on schedules—

Of what?—

Schedules of military requirements—

Furnished by whom?—

Furnished by the War and Navy Departments and determinations as to minimum essential civilian needs and available resources by the Office of War Mobilization.

Mr. President, the bill, as I see it, deals fundamentally, first, with the mobilization of the manpower of the Nation, and I contend that without first having the mobilization of the manpower of the Nation we cannot mobilize anything else; and insofar as manpower is concerned, the Committee on Military Affairs has for many months past and is even now today considering the question of mobilization. The committee has had before it innumerable witnesses. I should say we have had before us a minimum of 50 witnesses from the time we began hearings upon the question of manpower early last fall. Those witnesses have included representatives of virtually every branch of the Government.

Only last week there were before us high representatives of the War Department and also of the Navy Department, and of the Maritime Commission, and today we listened to a statement made by Mr. Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board. Tomorrow there will be with us for the second time the Honorable Paul V. McNutt. He will be followed on Monday by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard. We have already considered many phases which are involved, I might say, in the objectives of Senate bill 607.

Mr. President, I therefore argue that in my humble opinion the bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs, inasmuch as it deals with more war mobilization, a subject in which the Committee on Military Affairs is vitally interested.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to make a statement which will require approximately 3 minutes.

Mr. KILGORE. I think that what I have to say will not require much more time than that, and I should like to finish my statement before yielding again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move, to begin with, to amend the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs by striking out the words "the Military Affairs Commit-

tee," and inserting the words "the Committee on Education and Labor." I should like to discuss that motion for a moment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. I have no interest in the controversy between the eminent Senators, one of whom wants the bill referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the other to the Committee on Education and Labor; but I am always interested in the observance of the Senate's rules and the parliamentary practice which should be followed.

It is my opinion that a motion of the kind just made by the Senator from West Virginia is not in order. It is not in order to move to substitute one committee for another, but a vote must come directly on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina—namely, reference of the measure to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I suggest my view to the Chair. If my view is the correct one, the procedure which I have suggested would entirely destroy and render unnecessary the motion made by the very eminent senior Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that the Senator from Oregon is correct, and sustains the point of order raised.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well, Mr. President. Then I desire to discuss some of the matters raised by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs with reference to his motion.

In the first place, I question whether he realizes the historical background in connection with some of his remarks. There was a time in the history of our Nation when his statement would have been more applicable than it now is. There was a time in the history of our Nation when the War Department handled all matters relating to our armed forces. Gradually we have built up other organizations; and gradually, in order to meet that condition, the Senate has built up other committees, so that now the Senate Committee on Military Affairs deals largely with the Army of the United States and its needs and problems. We have a Naval Affairs Committee, which certainly has some jurisdiction under the bill.

We have a Banking and Currency Committee which, due to its jurisdiction over economic stabilization, certainly has some jurisdiction with reference to a hearing on this bill.

We have a Commerce Committee which, due to its connection with the Maritime Commission, certainly has some jurisdiction with reference to this bill.

We have a Naval Affairs Committee which certainly should have something to say with reference to it.

We also have a Foreign Relations Committee which has jurisdiction over the

lease-lend program, which is one of the most important parts of our present program of military expansion. That committee certainly should have some consideration because this bill also deals with lease-lend matters.

The Committee on Education and Labor has to do with measures affecting labor and, inasmuch as manpower has to do with labor, it should have some jurisdiction.

The Agricultural Committee has to do with manpower on the farm and, due to the fact that this bill bears directly on that question in connection with manpower mobilization, certainly that committee should have some jurisdiction.

So we have a bill the jurisdiction of which is divided. There is no over-all wholly appropriate committee in the Senate to consider the measure. For that reason, a motion to refer the bill to the Military Affairs Committee as one of the committees having jurisdiction is perfectly proper.

My position in the matter has been taken in the interest of the economy of time. I feel that the bill should be speedily considered by the appropriate committee to consider it, which is the committee of the whole Senate. My stand has been taken in the interest of getting this bill to the floor at the earliest possible date so that its merits and weaknesses may be discussed, and that the question of the war program may be threshed out with reference to the mobilization of our industry behind the war movement and the mobilization of our agriculture behind it and the economic stabilization behind it.

My effort on last Monday to have this bill referred to the Committee on Education and Labor was due to the fact that it had originally gone to that committee and that the Committee on Education and Labor on that original reference had conducted 10 days' hearings and had heard testimony of 32 witnesses—witnesses such as—

Frederick W. Conant, vice president, Douglas Aircraft;

W. H. Johnstone, assistant to the vice president, Bethlehem Steel;

Harry L. Cannon, president, National Cannery Association;

J. T. Hartson, executive vice president, Glenn L. Martin;

D. W. Siemon, personnel director, Glenn L. Martin;

D. B. Cole, priorities coordinator, Curtiss-Wright Corporation;

Raycroft Walsh, senior vice president, United Aircraft;

H. M. Horner, vice president, Pratt Whitney Aircraft Division;

S. A. Stewart, general manager, Hamilton Standard Propellers;

C. J. McCarthy, general manager, Vought-Sikorsky Aircraft Division;

M. F. Burke, personnel director, United Aircraft;

Ferdinand Eberstadt, Vice Chairman, W. P. B.—250 pages of transcript on Controls of Materials Plan;

Senator Truman;
Senator Kilgore;
Representative Tolan;
Representative Sparkman;
Representative Voorhis;

The top six men of the Tools Division, W. P. B.;

Capt. E. R. Henning;
Lt. Col. V. A. Armstrong, Tools Branch, Army-Navy Munitions Board;

E. D. Spicer, manufacturing vice president, General Electric;

Austin Elmore, production engineer, W. P. B.;

Charles E. Wilson, president, General Motors Corporation;

Charles E. Kettering, General Motors Corporation; and

Mr. Hunt, executive vice president, General Motors Corporation.

Fourteen hundred pages of testimony have already been taken and the subcommittee hearing that testimony is, or should be, ready to report, in fact at the previous session it tendered a report, of which there is a printed copy, I believe, on the desk of each Member of the Senate. I am trying to get the bill in a position in a committee which certainly has some jurisdiction, along with numerous other committees, so that the bill may be brought before the Senate as a whole at an early date. My interest in the matter was purely to get the bill on the floor for discussion.

Certainly there must be some need for discussion of this program. If it were not so, I question whether the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] would have delivered the address he delivered a short time ago with reference to manpower on the farm. Agricultural manpower has become a problem in this country. Shall that question be submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be deprived of any jurisdiction or the opportunity to have any hearing on it? That is a logical "follow through" from the pending motion.

I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and I wish it distinctly understood that I am not casting any reflections whatsoever on that committee. It is now carrying on a manpower investigation; but manpower is only a part of this bill. This is an over-all bill designed to coordinate the war effort, not to reorganize, not to disorganize, but to coordinate it. The bill provides a method whereby the manpower problem may be threshed out with representatives of the departments involved and interested in having something to say in an executive way, and not threshed out in the newspapers by controversies in the press between the heads of various departments of the Government, not threshed out on the floors of Congress, and not occasioning four concurrent investigations to be carried on by legislative committees of the Senate in addition to an investigation which has previously been conducted by a special committee of the

Senate on just one problem, that problem being manpower alone.

Certainly the questions involved should be brought up and discussed; certainly we should have some opportunity to get the bill on the floor speedily, and either make it workable and pass it or say we are wholly satisfied with the present condition; we want no reorganization; we want no change, no coordination.

For instance, there is certainly need for some coordination or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would not have had to carry on the extensive investigation as to the use of alcohol for rubber and why certain patents were not being used. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] some time ago was right about the farm-labor shortage and the farm structure. All that must be geared into the number of men taken for war. There is no need of putting a uniform on a man and taking him out of labor and putting him in a camp and having him stay there indefinitely. If he is put in uniform, he must be of use to the armed forces.

I should like to have the Members present again read the sections read by the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee without special emphasis on certain phases. Just read them as they stand in the bill before deciding whether the Military Affairs Committee should have jurisdiction, due to the fact that the Secretary of War is the first man mentioned. That fact, of course, was highly accented, but is no reason why the Committee on Military Affairs should be the only committee to consider the bill. Before deciding that all these problems are problems for the Military Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee alone, the Senate should consider that the Secretary of the Navy is also mentioned in the bill, and thus, through him, the Committee on Naval Affairs is involved; that agriculture is likewise involved, as is economic stabilization, which is under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. If the Senate should send the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, I think we should change the name and call it a committee on the "total over-all conduct of the Nation in time of war."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I shall not yield; I desire to finish my statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question or would he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. KILGORE. I should prefer not to be interrupted until I can get through with this phase of my statement.

We are now engaged, for instance, in north Africa in an offensive effort, and there everything must balance. A soldier over there without supplies is a dead soldier, and the tonnage in carrying him over has been wasted. Is it right that one department and one department alone and one committee and one committee alone should consider this bill,

and delay the opportunity to bring it speedily to the floor of the Senate?

So I contend that the argument which was recently made is without the firm foundation on which it is alleged to have been placed. There is no single committee of the Senate that has this over-all jurisdiction. Many of them have partial jurisdiction, but none of them has over-all jurisdiction. The Senate, as a whole, would be the only body at present that could really have a reference of this bill.

It is my purpose—and I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor—to get this bill before the Senate as speedily as possible, and not to have it brought out months and months later, when it could do no good.

As evidenced by the newspapers, I believe the people of this country—businessmen, farmers, and all others—are urging a simple decentralized administration of the war effort and an opportunity to be heard without the delay incident to investigation and without controversies in the press, which we must admit cause disunity.

Mr. President, that alone impelled me to make this statement. It is intended as no reflection on the Committee on Military Affairs, as I trust the distinguished chairman of that committee will understand. Why should the Committee on Military Affairs occupy 2 or 3 or 4 months of its time, taking the same 1,400 pages of testimony and possibly some additional testimony, when, within a very few days, the committee to which the bill was originally referred when it was introduced in the last session, and which would have reported the bill to the floor of the Senate had the session lasted a few days longer, can take the bill, pass upon the evidence with the same membership, bring out a report on the bill and decide whether or not the bill should be submitted to the Senate, or whether it should be reported with a recommendation that it pass or what amendment should be made, and then let the Senate, as a whole, have the opportunity to pass on the question.

CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate approved the bill providing for a merger between the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the Postal Telegraph Co. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and I sought, rather unsuccessfully, to secure some information regarding the financial structure of the Postal Telegraph Co., and as that information did not appear to be available, I voted against the bill. Since the passage of the bill, I have secured from official Government agencies the information which I sought. This information is such that, had I possessed it at the time the vote was taken, I would still have opposed the passage of the bill.

It appears to me that such legislation would establish an unwise and wholly unusual precedent, in that a certain few Wall Street brokers and their clients would be the principal beneficiaries and would be assisted in securing some rather unusual profits on their investments.

Since the agitation for the merger of the two telegraph corporations started, there has been a constant and a rather active trading in stock in what is generally considered to be an insolvent corporation. To bear out this assertion, I ask leave to have inserted at this point in my remarks a list of the principal stockholders of the Postal Telegraph Co., as taken from the 1940 report furnished by the Securities and Exchange Commission; a list of the principal stockholders as of December 31, 1941, and a list of the principal stockholders as of May 9, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Postal Telegraph, Inc., list of principal stockholders, 1940 report

	Com- mon	Pre- ferred
Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.	6,640	24,586
Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers' Trust Co.	11,600	23,227
Lehman Bros.	22,316	17,081
E. Lowitz & Co.		5,960
Wertheim & Co.	2,600	4,755
Nutt & Co.		4,225
Hayden, Stone & Co.		2,350
Henry J. Gaisman, care of City Farmers' Trust Co.		2,000
Hallgarten & Co.		1,915
Sigler & Co., care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.	7,488	1,872
H. Hentz & Co.	7,300	1,785
Laird & Co.		1,724
University of Rochester	6,500	1,625
A. M. Kidder & Co.		1,620
Goldman, Sachs & Co.	24,632	1,569
Orvis Bros. & Co.		1,522
Jos. A. Toledano & J. M. Pinto		1,500
Smith, Barney & Co.	5,800	1,457
Hurley & Co.	5,144	1,286
Chas. Frederics & Co., care of Irving Trust Co.		1,238
Archer Milton Huntington		1,225
Lazard, Freres & Co.		1,225
Dominick & Dominick	8,700	1,075
Goodbody & Co.	4,320	1,025
Lake & Co., care of Manufacturers' Trust Co.		1,000
Higson & Co.		1,000
G. M. Dahl		1,000
Kordula & Co., care of City Bank Farmers' Trust Co.		1,000
Faroll Bros.		995
Content, Zuckerman & Co.		920
Granberry & Co.	5,220	
Ernst & Co.	5,210	
Frederick W. Fielding, care of Jessey & Co.	5,000	
Minnie L. Taylor, care of Jessey & Co.	4,530	
Arabella Huntington, care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.	4,500	
Mardick L. Ballozian	4,600	
Bear Stearns & Co.	3,920	
Baar, Cohen & Co.	3,800	
Fuller, Rodney & Co.	3,600	
Fahnstock & Co.	3,550	
Ray L. Wise	3,000	
Globe Telegraph Co.	2,910	
Newman, Worms & Co.	2,700	
Lawrence Turnure & Co.	2,700	
Krauss & Co.	2,600	
Shields & Co.	2,320	
Confederation Life Association	2,460	
University of Nevada	2,400	

Postal Telegraph, Inc., stockholders, Dec. 31, 1941

Name of security-holder	Address of security	Stocks	
		Com- mon	Pre- ferred
Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.	61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.		23,670
Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers' Trust Co.	55 Broad St., New York.	10,750	22,427
Lehman Bros.	1 William St., New York.	20,828	17,016

Postal Telegraph, Inc., stockholders, Dec. 31, 1941—Continued

Name of security-holder	Address of security	Stocks	
		Com-mon	Pre-ferred
E. Lowitz & Co.	29 Broadway, New York.	5,960	
Nutt & Co.	46 Wall St., New York.	5,325	
Wertheim & Co.	120 Broadway, New York.	4,875	
Hayden, Stone & Co.	25 Broad St., New York.	2,375	
Laird & Co.	61 Broadway, New York.	2,100	
Keyes & Co., care of Bankers Trust Co.	529 5th Ave., New York.	2,100	
Henry J. Gaisman, care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co.	22 William St., New York.	2,000	
Hallgarten & Co.	44 Pine St., New York.	1,905	
Sigler & Co.	70 Broadway, New York.	7,488	1,872
H. Hentz & Co.	60 Beaver St., New York.	7,300	1,785
Fartoll Bros.	50 Broadway, New York.	1,700	
Charles Frederic & Co., care of Irving Trust Co.	1 Wall St., New York.	1,638	
University of Rochester.	Rochester, N. Y.	6,500	1,625
A. M. Kidder & Co.	1 Wall St., New York.	1,610	
Hurley & Co.	55 Wall St., New York.	5,144	1,286
Lazard Freres & Co.	120 Broadway.	1,225	
Tucker, Anthony & Co.	do.	4,624	1,156
Goodbody & Co.	115 Broadway, New York.	4,300	1,155
Goldman Sachs & Co.	30 Pine St., New York.	15,900	1,138
Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., trustee for Arabella Huntington.	70 Broadway, New York.	4,500	1,125
Dominick & Dominick.	115 Broadway, New York.	8,760	1,085
Higson & Co.	30 Broad St., New York.	1,000	
Lake & Co.	55 Broad St., New York.	1,000	
T. L. Watson & Co.	40 Wall St., New York.	1,000	
G. M. Dahl.	20 Pine St., New York.	1,000	
McDonnell & Co.	120 Broadway, New York.	987	
H. Cassell & Co.	61 Broadway, New York.	919	
Robert Willcombe, care of Bonner & Bonner.	120 Broadway, New York.	16,145	
Minna G. Werdman, care of Bonner & Bonner.	do.	12,000	
Dorethea Campbell, care of Charles Hughes & Co.	32 Broadway, New York.	5,000	
Frederick W. Fielding, care of Jessey & Co.	2 Rector St., New York.	5,000	
Minnie L. Taylor, care of Jessey & Co.	do.	4,030	
W. L. Ballozan.	10 West 33d St., New York.	4,000	
Barar, Cohen & Co.	39 Broadway, New York.	3,900	
Bear, Stearns & Co.	1 Wall St., New York.	3,900	
Fahnestock & Co.	do.	3,550	
Granberry & Co.	50 Broadway, New York.	3,540	
Fuller, Rodney & Co.	44 Wall St., New York.	3,200	
Bridget Flynn, care of Bonner & Bonner.	120 Broadway, New York.	3,200	
John B. Cline, care of Charles Hughes & Co.	32 Broadway, New York.	3,000	
Arthur L. McBain, care of Bonner & Bonner.	120 Broadway, New York.	3,000	
Olga Schnepf, care of Bonner & Bonner.	do.	3,000	
Smith, Barney & Co.	14 Wall St., New York.	3,000	
Bertha G. Wendehack, care of Bonner & Bonner.	120 Broadway, New York.	3,000	
Raymond L. Wise.	80 Broad St., New York.	3,000	
Globe Telegraph & Trust Co.	Electra House, London, England.	2,910	

Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942

Name and address †	Number of shares	
	Com-mon	Pre-ferred
Abraham & Co., 120 Broadway.	329	2,160
Allen & Co., 30 Broad St.	60	5,100
Asiel & Co., 11 Wall St.	3,188	78
15 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.	1,330	
Baar Cohen & Co., 39 Broadway.	3,600	50
J. S. Bacbe & Co., 36 Wall St.	1,262	1,420
Mordick L. Ballozan, 10 West 33d St.	4,000	200
Mordick L. Ballozan, 120 Broadway, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc.	2,800	
Harrington J. Barrus & Lois Marsh Barrus, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway.	3,500	100
Manuel Berdu, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Board of Regents of the University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.	2,400	600
Boody, McLellan & Co., 111 Broadway.	2,000	
Gertrude S. Brazier, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway.	5,500	100
Bucher & Co., care of Guarantee Trust Co. of New York, 524 5th Ave.	500	
Leigh Caffey, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	4,600	
Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., trustee, V. A. dated Apr. 10, 1901, with Arabella D. Huntington, deceased, for Archer Milton Huntington, 70 Broadway.	4,500	1,125
John B. Cline, care of Charles Hughes & Co., 32 Broadway.	3,000	
Clooney & Co., care of Fiduciary Trust Co. of New York, 1 Wall St.	500	
Confederation Life Association, 12 Richmond St. East, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.	2,460	615
Content Hano & Co., 39 Broadway.	600	
Jacob S. Carre, care of Bonner & Bonner, Inc., 120 Broadway.	2,700	
Cudd & Co., care of the Chase National Bank, 11 Broad St.	40	510
G. M. Dahl, 20 Pine St.	1,000	
Delafeld & Delafeld, 14 Wall St.	400	1,010
Dominick & Dominick, 115 Broadway.	2,480	1,508
Joseph M. Dragoni, 46 East 52d St.	2,500	
Joseph M. Dragoni, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,500	
Mury F. Drake, Cooperstown, N. Y.	2,100	
Alexander Drucker, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,100	50
Francis I. Dupont & Co. and Chisholm & Chapman, 1 Wall St.	1,915	
Francis I. Dupont & Co. and Chisholm & Chapman, a single copartnership, 1 Wall St.	820	
Charles Engelhard, 30 Church St.	2,000	
C. A. Englan & Co., care of Chemical Bank & Trust Co., 165 Broadway.	2,225	
Fahnestock & Co., 1 Wall St.	700	5,225
Faroll Bros., 50 Broadway.	2,675	
Flor, Bullard & Smyth, 39 Broadway.	1,075	
Bridget Flynn, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	3,200	
Fox, O'Hara & Co., 60 Broad St.	1,040	530
Charles Frederic & Co., care of Irving Trust Co., 1 Wall St.	2,879	1,312
French & Co., care of The Penna Co., Packard Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.	1,600	
Fuller, Rodney & Co., 44 Wall St.	3,000	
William N. Gillette, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Globe Telegraph & Tr. Co., Ltd., Electra House, Victoria Embankment, London, England.	2,910	
Goldman, Sachs & Co., 30 Pine St.	13,448	587
Marcus S. Goldamer, Edinar Bldg., Washington, D. C.	2,000	
Goodbody & Co., 115 Broadway.	4,664	1,550
Anna H. Greenwald, care of Jessey & Co., 2 Rector St.	2,100	
Joseph J. Haesler, 98 Overlook Rd., Upper Montclair, N. J.	2,500	
Hallgarten & Co., 44 Pine St.	706	1,905
Harris, Upham & Co., 11 Wall St.	4,388	1,313
Hayden, Stone & Co., 25 Broad St.	200	1,000
H. Helntz & Co., 60 Beaver St.	4,540	1,810
Frank Herbst, 44 Wall St.	2,027	701
Herzfeld & Stein, 30 Broad St.	2,000	600
Miss Emma Hey, 39-01 Main St., Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., care of M. L. Gottlieb.	2,000	
Mathilda Hickey, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	3,000	
Higson & Co., care of Continental Bank & Trust Co., 30 Broad St.	1,000	2,310
Hirsh, Lillenthal & Co., 165 Broadway.	4,380	
Hirsh, Lillenthal & Co., 25 Broad St.	4,380	

† Unless otherwise noted, addresses are in New York, N. Y.

Postal Telegraph, Inc.—List of common stockholders of 2,000 shares or more and preferred stockholders of 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942—Continued

Name and address	Number of shares	
	Com-mon	Pre-ferred
William A. Hunt, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	3,300	
Hurley & Co., 55 Wall St.	5,044	1,261
A. M. Kidder & Co., 1 Wall St.	4,222	7,218
Kidder, Peabody & Co., 17 Wall St.	3,076	441
Spencer B. Koch & Co., 29 Broadway.	120	630
Kordula & Co., care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co., 22 William St.	2,200	730
Krauss & Co., care of Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co., 284 Main St., Buffalo, N. Y.	2,600	650
Augusta Kubieck, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	7,700	250
Laird, Bissell & Meeds, 120 Broadway.	700	
Lehman Bros., 1 William St.	19,028	10,217
Henry Lieferant, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,100	
Alfonse M. Linderfelser, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Alexander List, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Frederick Lohl, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	5,000	
Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 61 Broadway.	1,100	16,294
E. Lowitz & Co., 29 Broadway.	40	5,010
McDonnell & Co., 120 Broadway.	2,660	4,082
Robert B. McFalls, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	100
Arthur L. MacBain, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	3,000	
Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 1295 State St., Springfield, Mass.	2,000	500
Merrill, Lynch Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine St.	1,433	2,470
Richard Meyer, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Newan Bros. & Worms, 25 Broad St.	5,150	8,245
Nutt & Co., 46 Wall St.	100	625
Orvis Bros. & Co., 14 Wall St.	1,840	757
Donald F. Othmer, 99 Livingston St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	2,000	
Parrish & Co., 40 Wall St.	200	1,450
Pearl Assurance Co., Ltd., High Holborn, London, England.	2,182	540
William Rosenblatt, 1125 Park Ave.	2,000	500
Rudolph & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co., 45 Beaver St.		1,300
Salkeld & Co., care of Bankers Trust Co., P. O. Box 704, Church St. Annex.	2,020	505
Henry G. Solomon, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Ewald Schmitz, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,000	
Olga Schnepf, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	3,000	
Warren S. Schoenthaler, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,800	
J. & W. Seligman & Co., 65 Broadway.	300	700
Shields & Co., 44 Wall St.	2,300	775
Sigler & Co., care of Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 70 Broadway.	8,048	1,887
William Simon, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	4,000	
I. M. Simon, 315 North 4th St., St. Louis, Mo.	2,000	100
Smith, Barney & Co., 14 Wall St.	3,454	835
Stephen J. Stroock & Co., 1 Wall St.	600	
Sidney Susswein, 220 Broadway.	2,000	
Sutro Bros. & Co., 120 Broadway.	1,760	700
Hazel Thurnher, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	3,600	
Albert Tramer, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	7,000	200
Tucker, Anthony & Co., 120 Broadway.	4,300	1,543
University of Rochester, Lincoln Alliance Bank & Trust Co.	6,500	1,625
Ward, Griever & Co., 40 Exchange Place.		4,020
Minna G. Werdermann, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	27,580	
Wertheim & Co., 120 Broadway.	1,000	3,175
White Weld & Co., 40 Wall St.	20	700
Wiley & Co., care of Manufacturers Trust Co., 55 Broad St.	500	7,625
Robert Willcombe, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	24,676	62
C. King Woodbridge, care of Bonner & Bonner, 120 Broadway.	2,200	125
Total.	326,384	135,706

Mr. AIKEN. It will be observed that the principal stockholders are virtually all New York City brokers and their clients.

Although it was stated on the floor at the time the Senate passed the bill that the effect of its enactment would be to bail out the stockholders, yet, so far as I can see, the legislation would not necessarily result in all the original stockholders recovering what they lost, but rather would have the effect of rewarding speculators who have more recently acquired the stock at comparatively low cost.

It is significant that one Wall Street brokerage house and its clients are listed as holding 40,325 shares of Postal Telegraph stock on December 31, 1941, while as of May 9, 1942, 5 months later, according to the latest figures available, the Federal Communications Commission reports the same brokerage house and its clients as holding 121,656 shares of stock. It appears to me that this comes within the category of speculation rather than of investment.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator give for the RECORD the name of that New York brokerage house?

Mr. AIKEN. It will appear in the list of the principal stockholders. The Senator can see for himself how holdings of this particular brokerage concern increased from one period to the other. That is why I have asked leave to have the lists printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. It appears to me also that this speculation was prompted by the assumption that Congress would enact legislation permitting this merger. It is worthy of note that the value of the preferred stock, which is reported to have been as low as $9\frac{1}{2}$ during 1942, has constantly risen, being quoted on January 23 of this year at $18\frac{3}{8}$, and yesterday, 10 days after the passage of the bill, it closed at $19\frac{1}{2}$.

I ask further leave to have inserted at this point a list of officers and directors of the Postal Telegraph Co., Inc., for the year 1940, as furnished by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF POSTAL TELEGRAPH, INC., 1940

Harris Berlack, 1 Wall Street, New York City; Curtis E. Calder, 2 Rector Street, New York City; Edwin F. Chinlund, 253 Broadway, New York City; William H. Coverdale, 120 Wall Street, New York City; Gerhard N. Dahl, 20 Pine Street, New York City; William J. Deegan, 253 Broadway, New York City; Frederick J. Fisher, Fisher Building, Detroit, Mich.; George S. Gibbs, 253 Broadway, New York City; Thomas Hitchcock, Jr., 1 William Street, New York City; Raymond C. Kramer, 1275 Broadway, New York City; James M. Landis, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.; Harold F. Linder, 61 Broadway, New York City; Sidney Maestre, Mississippi Valley Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Hamilton Pell, 40 Wall Street, New York City; William Rosenblatt, 80 Broad Street, New York City; Cecil P. Stewart, 67 Wall Street, New York City; Ellery W. Stone, 253 Broadway, New York City; Harold E. Talbott, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York City; Paul E. Mannheim, 1 William Street, New York City.

OFFICERS NOT DIRECTORS (ALL ADDRESSES ARE 253 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY)

John J. Lynch, Clinton B. Allsopp, John T. Logue, Walter P. Marshall, James C. Phelps.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it will be noted that all the officers and directors of this corporation, with the exception of three, namely, Frederick J. Fisher, of Detroit; Sidney Maestre, of St. Louis; and the Honorable James M. Landis, of Harvard Law School, now Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, are located in or near Wall Street.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is good policy to enact special legislation to bail out the stockholders of this company, some of whom at least must be classed as speculators in this matter. If it is good business to enact legislation especially designed to cover the losses of profits to these people, why should we not do the same for home owners who have lost their homes through inability to keep up payments, or farmers who have lost their farms because of crop failure or animal diseases? I believe that some Members of the Senate might have voted differently on this measure had they had a full knowledge of the facts at the time the bill was approved. It is also possible that some Members of the Senate may have been influenced to favor the proposed legislation because it was sugar coated with a provision requiring the authorized monopoly to find jobs for all the employees of the insolvent company, or to guarantee their present rate of compensation for a period of 5 years.

I have a great deal of information on this matter which has been furnished me by Government agencies, particularly the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. I shall gladly make any of this information available to any Member of the Congress. In fact, I should like to insert at this point the history of the case as given by the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

MEMORANDUM RE POSTAL TELEGRAPH, INC. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, February 1, 1943.

Postal Telegraph, Inc., was incorporated September 20, 1939, under the laws of the State of Delaware, for the purpose of acquiring certain securities owned by the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation (debtor) and its subsidiary, The Associated Cos. (debtor).

These securities were acquired as of January 31, 1940, pursuant to an order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in a proceeding under section 77-B of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, under which Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation filed, on June 14, 1935, a voluntary petition for reorganization, and under which, on June 21, 1938, The Associated Cos., a subsidiary of the Postal Corporation, filed similar voluntary petitions.

Prior to reorganization, the 35 operating companies constituting the Postal Land Line System, were controlled 100 percent by The Associated Cos., and The Associated Cos. in turn was controlled 91.4 percent by Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation. The latter corporation was controlled 100 percent by the

International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

In the reorganization of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation, approved on January 31, 1940, the Postal land line companies were divorced from the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, but as a part of the reorganization the land line companies executed contracts for exchange of traffic, etc., with the operating companies in the International Telephone & Telegraph group. Under the plan 4 new corporations were formed. This discussion relates to Postal Telegraph, Inc., which was formed to acquire the capital stock of The Associated Cos., the Postal Telegraph Sales Corporation, and the 35 separate telegraph companies that at that time comprised the Postal Land Line System.

Postal Telegraph, Inc., issued 256,769.9 shares of 4 percent noncumulative preferred stock without par value (entitled in liquidation to \$60 per share), with a stated value of \$10 per share, and 1,027,079.6 shares of common stock with a par value of \$1 per share, all of which is now outstanding. A list of the common stockholders that held 2,000 shares or more, and of the preferred stockholders that held 500 shares or more, as at May 9, 1942, is attached. The company has negotiated loans with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and with the Bankers Trust Co., all of which are now outstanding. The outstanding securities of the Postal Telegraph, Inc., as of October 31, 1942 (except for the notes payable to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which are shown as of this most recent date, January 28, 1943), were as follows:

CAPITAL STOCK

Noncumulative 4-percent preferred stock, authorized 256,770 shares without par value (entitled in liquidation to \$60 per share), issued and outstanding 256,769.9 shares, stated value \$10 per share, \$2,567,699.

Common stock, authorized 1,250,000 shares with a par value of \$1 per share, issued and outstanding 1,027,079.6 shares, par value, \$1,027,079.60.

NOTES PAYABLE

To Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for loans made from April 24, 1940, to January 28, 1943, \$9,000,000.

To Bankers Trust Co., for loan made on February 5, 1940 (secured by certificates of deposit in various depositories and not subject to withdrawal), \$1,200,000.

The current liabilities as of October 31, 1942, for unpaid money orders, unpaid wages, traffic balances, taxes, interest, etc., aggregated \$4,120,648, as compared with current assets consisting of cash, materials, and supplies, accounts receivable, etc., totaling \$7,121,354.

The company has established on its books a reserve for employees' benefits and pensions, but, as an offset to this liability, there has been no fund established or any other segregation of assets. The reserve requirement was determined by actuarial computations and is stated in the amount of \$7,298,424 as of October 31, 1942, of which the sum of approximately \$3,500,000 represents the present worth of future payments to be made to employees who have become eligible for retirement and are now on the pension rolls. For the first 10 months of 1942 the payments for employees' benefits and pensions amounted to \$465,673. The Postal Telegraph, Inc. is also liable as guarantor for subsidiary companies on surety bonds aggregating \$160,000.

The Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation (debtor) had outstanding at the date of reorganization, January 31, 1940, the following securities:

CAPITAL STOCK

Common stock without par value, 1,017,650 shares, stated value \$25,441,250.

Preferred stock, 305,295 shares, par value \$30,529,500.

LONG-TERM DEBT

Twenty-five year collateral trust 5-percent gold bonds, dated July 1, 1928, par value \$44,630,500.

Twenty-five year collateral trust 5-percent debenture stock, dated July 1, 1928, par value \$6,039,680.

Under the plan of reorganization the holders of the bonds and debenture stock of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation were entitled to receive, for each \$1,000 principal amount of bonds or \$206 principal amount of debenture stock, the following:

1. Thirty-five dollars in cash.
2. Five shares of noncumulative preferred stock and 20 shares of common stock of Postal Telegraph, Inc.
3. One hundred and sixty dollars principal amount of Commercial Mackay Corporation income debentures (or scrip therefor), with attached warrants to purchase common stock of American Cable & Radio Corporation at the rate of 115 shares for each \$1,000 of income debentures of Commercial Mackay Corporation;
4. Twenty dollars principal amount of All America Corporation income debentures, series B (or scrip therefor); and
5. Twenty shares of common stock of American Cable & Radio Corporation.

The holders of the 6,838 preferred shares of the associated companies outstanding in the hands of the public were entitled to receive, under the plan of reorganization, for each such share of the associated companies one-half share of the noncumulative preferred stock and 2 shares of the common stock of Postal Telegraph, Inc.

No provision was made in the plan of reorganization for the holders of the preferred or the common stock of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation or the common shares of the associated companies because the court found that Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation was insolvent and the holders of the common shares of the associated companies had no equity in the assets of the associated companies.

The plan of reorganization of Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation was sponsored by Messrs. Robert Lehman, Walter H. Bennett, Harris Berlack, Charles V. Howard, Charles G. Meyer, Edwin L. Weisl, and Frazar B. Wilde as the protective committee for the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent gold bonds due July 1, 1953, and 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent debenture stock due July 1, 1953, and by Messrs. Cecil P. Stewart, Milton W. Harrison, Hamilton Pell, and William Rosenblatt as the bondholders committee for the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent gold bonds due July 1, 1953, and 25-year, collateral-trust, 5-percent debenture stock due July 1, 1953. On December 24, 1935, the Honorable Alfred E. Smith and Mr. George S. Gibbs were appointed temporary trustees of Postal, which appointment was made permanent by court order dated January 27, 1936. By order of the court dated September 8, 1937, Mr. Raymond C. Kramer was appointed a cotrustee, the appointment being made permanent October 5, 1937. On January 10, 1938, the resignation of the Honorable Alfred E. Smith as trustee was accepted as of December 31, 1937.

Under the provisions of the order of the court directing the consummation of the plan of reorganization of the Postal Telegraph & Cable Corporation (debtor) and the associated companies (debtor) a special cash fund for reorganization expenses of \$650,000 was allowed, of which the sum of \$15,901.30 had been expended on January 31, 1940. This fund was placed with Postal Telegraph, Inc., and expenditures from the fund to January 30, 1943, amounted to \$621,352. There is at present the sum of \$28,648 remaining in this special fund for reorganization expenses.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I merely wish to make the observation that had the information the Senator is now giving the Senate been given prior to the final vote on the measure, I should have voted differently from the way I did vote.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his statement.

I do not wish to take more time this afternoon, when we have other matters before us, but I do wish to reiterate that in my opinion approval of the proposed legislation was unwise and established an unsound precedent. If we are to bail out Wall Street speculators, then there is no reason in the world why we should not bail out other unfortunate investors, particularly the poor people of our country who have sustained losses through no fault of their own. Such a general policy, however, would be unwise, and, in the long run, unworkable. Such legislation does not make for a sounder government.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION—
REFERENCE OF BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 607) to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bridges	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lucas	Tobey
Butler	McClellan	Truman
Byrd	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	McNary	Vandenbergh
Chandler	Maloney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh
Danaher	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hill in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in assuming that the question before the Senate is the motion that Senate bill 607 be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question before the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Is a substitute motion parliamentarily possible? For example, a motion that the bill be referred to a combination of two or more committees which have jurisdiction of the subjects thereof, since there are several subjects included in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would not be in order. Under the rules of the Senate a motion to refer a bill to a committee is not amendable by the substitution of another committee.

Mr. PEPPER. A third parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, in view of the present parliamentary situation, it is not possible for the Senate to determine anything except whether the bill shall be referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state his question again?

Mr. PEPPER. Then, if I understand correctly the advice of the Chair, the only thing the Senate can do, now that the motion has been made that the bill be referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, is either to agree or disagree to the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah for that purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state the inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, according to the ruling made by the Chair, I assume, then, that if the motion is not agreed to the bill will automatically go to the Committee on Education and Labor? Or will it be referred to some other committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair will state that if the motion does not prevail the bill will remain on the table until the Senate makes some reference of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And then the bill will be referred regularly by the Vice President to some committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Vice President has stated that he would submit this question to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Then there will have to be positive, affirmative action following failure of the motion to prevail, if it shall fail to prevail?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Yes, there will have to be positive, affirmative action as to reference of the bill. If the pending motion is defeated a motion to refer to another committee would then be in order.

Mr. **PEPPER**. Mr. President, I wanted the parliamentary situation to be clear before I began the discussion of the motion.

I wish to make it very clear to the Senate that if the bill were for the first time coming to the Senate and this motion were made I would certainly have no objection to the motion, even if I did not concur in it. But the bill is not coming to the Senate floor for the first time. A similar bill, with a few immaterial variations, was introduced in the last session of the Congress in the Senate by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **KILGORE**] and the junior Senator from Florida. Upon the motion of the able Senator from West Virginia, and with the concurrence of the Senate, the bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The able chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. **THOMAS**], appointed a subcommittee to consider that bill and to hold hearings thereon. That subcommittee consisted of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. **HILL**], former Senator Schwartz of Wyoming, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. **LA FOLLETTE**], the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. **MILLIKIN**], and the junior Senator from Florida, who had the honor to be named chairman of that subcommittee.

We decided that we would begin as much as we could to put into practice here in the Senate some of the counsel we had been giving to the administrative agencies—namely, better to coordinate their efforts and activities than had been done in the past. Accordingly the subcommittee entered into consultation with the Tolan committee in the House of Representatives, which for some 2½ years has been investigating the subject of defense migration and various evolutions of that subject, which finally, in the logical circumstances, brought that committee to the consideration of the most efficient plan of war production for our country. The Tolan committee allowed the Senate Committee on Education and Labor the use of some of the members of its staff, without any cost to the Senate. I may say that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor never had a dime of money with which to employ a staff; only the expenses of the stenographer were incurred by the committee.

Our committee consulted the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. **TRUMAN**] personally cooperated in every way he could in avoiding duplication of testimony in the hearings before the committee, and in bringing to the attention of the subcommittee, as far as he could, the knowledge which his committee had obtained on the general subject of civilian war production.

The Senator from Missouri participated in the first press conference which was held. Thereafter, and during the whole course of the deliberations of the

subcommittee, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **KILGORE**] was a participant in the investigation, acting in two capacities; first, as chairman of the Special Committee on Manpower and of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and second, as chairman of the subcommittee on technological mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee. A bill with respect to technological mobilization which had been introduced by the able Senator from West Virginia, was pending before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and he had been appointed by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee to be chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the subject of technological mobilization.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. **MURRAY**], chairman of the Small Business Committee, sent from his home authority to be included at the press conference when this bill was first discussed with the press after its introduction. The Senator himself, as well as the members of his staff, gave all the cooperation they could give to the subcommittee in the consideration of this question.

The coordination of these five committees was so effective that every time there was reference in the press to this investigation it was spoken of as the five-committee investigation on the subject of civilian war production. We have brought together, in a fine spirit of coordination and cooperation, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, whose jurisdiction related primarily to manpower and production, as well as to vocational training; the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program; the Murray Committee on Small Business; the Manpower Subcommittee of the Truman committee; the technological mobilization subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee; and one committee of the House of Representatives, the Tolan committee.

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

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. **PEPPER**. I yield.

Mr. **LUCAS**. How many committees are investigating the manpower situation?

Mr. **PEPPER**. As I was saying, only one committee was conducting the investigation, but the committees which had kindred subjects under consideration collaborated with this committee by having contacts with it, consulting with its members, and making available, so far as possible, to the committee conducting the investigation, such discoveries as they had made.

Mr. **LUCAS**. It was my understanding the other day, when the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **KILGORE**] made a report in which the Truman committee was eliminated from the consideration of the subject of manpower, that he said that at that time some three or four committees were studying the same question. I was occupying the chair at the time and I did not have an opportunity to interrogate the able Senator from West Virginia. I should now like to

know whether or not the statement is accurate.

Mr. **KILGORE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **PEPPER**. I yield and then I shall comment on the subject.

Mr. **KILGORE**. I believe that the question which was asked was misunderstood by the able Senator from Florida. He was discussing the committees which had collaborated on the subject. The announcement was made by me that in view of the fact that four legislative committees of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Education and Labor, were conducting hearings on the subject of manpower, the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program would suspend further hearings on the subject and make all the evidence which it had available to those four committees, or any other committee desiring to have it.

Mr. **LUCAS**. I thank the Senator.

In view of the statement which has now been made may I make one observation in the time of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. **PEPPER**. I yield.

Mr. **LUCAS**. As a result of the colloquy between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Florida and myself with respect to the various committees studying the manpower question, I desire to make this observation:

Obviously, somebody ought to study the manpower question, and it ought to be studied with complete thoroughness. Every phase of the subject should be gone into by some committee of the Senate. However, it certainly seems most ridiculous and absurd for four different committees of the Senate to be studying the same question.

Mr. President, I do not believe the question is large enough to warrant four committees studying it, and I doubt if the proper results will be obtained by having four or five Senate committees, and one or more committees in the House, carrying on simultaneous investigations on this important question. I do not believe it would contribute to the war effort to require men like Mr. Paul McNutt and other responsible agents in the Government to be constantly in attendance before committees, spending hour after hour and day after day of their valuable time in consultation with the committees. That is exactly what must happen if each of these committees expects to conduct a proper investigation and examination into the subject. The men at the head of the various governmental agencies must appear before each committee to give testimony with respect to this very important problem.

Frequently Senators, in discussing on the floor of the Senate what is going on in the various departments at the other end of the Avenue, criticize and condemn the duplication of effort and division of authority which exist in various agencies of the Government which are promoting the war effort. Such criticism is proper. Senators are not amiss in their castigation and condemnation of

various agencies when they try to find some central authority which has the power to initiate a program and carry it through with effectiveness and efficiency in order to carry on the war and bring it to a close as soon as possible.

Mr. President, in the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois, it does not behoove us to indulge in much condemnation and criticism if we have four or five committees in the Senate investigating this very question. I say, with all the seriousness that I possess, that four or five committees taking busy men away from their work would hamper the war effort instead of aiding it. I do not care which committee does the work, but one committee ought to do it. We ought not to have several committees continuing to harass these men, bringing them here from their various departments day after day and consuming valuable time when it is so necessary for them to get along with the work which they have to do.

I thank the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire to make something clear to the Senator from Illinois. In the discussion which took place last Tuesday the Senator from West Virginia mentioned the committees which collaborated, and merely suggested that the chairmen of the respective committees, instead of summoning the officials to whom reference has been made for hearing, could have available the testimony which had been amassed over a long period of time in the various committees. The testimony could be placed in the record to save the time we are all trying to save. I believe that that effort to save time and avoid duplication is most laudible.

I am heartily in sympathy with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I very heartily and distinctly concur in everything the Senator from Illinois has said. That was the point to which I was coming. I was endeavoring to point out that this committee has done just as he has suggested. The so-called war mobilization bill has a great many subjects in it. It affects the Military Affairs Committee and several other committees. In the last session the bill had been actually referred by the Senate—and I did not have anything to do with that reference—to the Committee on Education and Labor. A subcommittee had been appointed to consider the bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I tried to do what the Senator from Illinois pointed out, namely, to avoid duplication of anything that any other committee had done. We did not call Mr. McNutt or Mr. Donald Nelson. I do not think we duplicated the testimony of any witness. We called Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt. I do not recall that he was before any other Senate committee. He may have been before the Truman committee, but I doubt it. I doubt if a case of duplication of testi-

mony of any witness can be found in that hearing.

On the contrary, the Tolan committee came in and submitted its record. Mr. TOLAN, chairman of the Tolan committee of the House, frequently sat in at the hearings and tried to be of assistance. Mr. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, a member of the Tolan committee, personally testified, giving us a summary of what the Tolan committee had done.

The chief of staff of the Tolan committee, Dr. Lamb, one of the ablest staff chiefs on Capitol Hill, gave the subcommittee a summary of the record of what the Tolan committee had done in more than 2 years of its investigation throughout the length and breadth of the country.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] personally appeared before the committee and summarized the results of the Truman committee's investigation of the subjects covered by the bill. Staff members of the Truman committee appeared and presented summaries and suggestions from their experience, which were helpful to the subcommittee. The same thing is true of the Small Business Committee, headed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. We thought we had done a pretty fair job in coordinating the committees having an interest in the subject, and in endeavoring to avoid duplication of effort.

Mr. President, we proceeded with the investigation for 10 actual hearing days. We heard a total of 32 witnesses. We took 1,400 pages of testimony. These are the prominent witnesses who appeared at our hearings:

Frederick W. Conant, vice president of the Douglas Aircraft Co.; W. H. Johnstone, assistant to the vice president, Bethlehem Steel Corporation; Harry L. Cannon, president of the National Canners Association; J. T. Hartson, executive vice president of the Glenn L. Martin Co.; D. W. Siemon, personnel director of the Glenn L. Martin Co.; D. B. Cole, priorities coordinator of the Curtiss Wright Corporation; Raycroft Walsh, senior vice president of the United Aircraft Co.; H. M. Horner, vice president of Pratt & Whitney aircraft division; S. A. Stewart, general manager of Hamilton Standard Propellers; C. J. McCarthy, general manager of the Vought-Sikorsky aircraft division; M. F. Burke, personnel director of the United Aircraft Co.; and Ferdinand Eberstadt, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and in charge of the critical materials control plan. As I say, I do not know of any other committee which has called Mr. Eberstadt.

There also appeared at the hearing before the subcommittee the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], Representatives TOLAN, SPARKMAN, and VOORHIS of California; representatives of the Tools Division of the War Production Board; Capt. E. R. Henning; Lt. Col. V. A. Armstrong, of the Tools Branch, Army-Navy Munitions Board; E. D. Spicer, manufacturing vice president of the General Electric Co.; Austin Elmore, production engineer of the War Production Board; Charles E.

Wilson, president of General Motors Corporation; Charles E. Kettering, vice president of General Motors Corporation; and Mr. Hunt, executive vice president of General Motors Corporation.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that we did not go to the department heads and ask the men who were representing the Government what their policies were. We got men from the field. We called witnesses from out in the country to tell us how the Federal program was functioning, whether adequately or deficiently. We did not take the time of any official of the Government. Not once did Mr. Nelson or any of the other top men in the governmental agencies working on the program come before us.

During the same period of time when the subcommittee was considering the bill—Senate bill 2871, as it was then, the bill for the creation of a war mobilization board—we were investigating, at the instance of the committee itself, the question of manpower, particularly with reference to the shortage of doctors in the civilian population of the country. Obviously the subject of manpower runs into many ramifications, and consequently we touched the perimeter of certain other subjects. Witnesses who appeared and discussed the subject of manpower and commented upon the subject of the war mobilization board were numerous, including the heads of the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the railway brotherhoods. All of them appeared, and numerous other witnesses likewise appeared. Those witnesses commented upon the general subject of the efficient use of the nation's facilities and manpower resources.

Mr. President, the committee concluded the hearings which were possible to be had before the holidays, and made a report to the full Committee on Education and Labor. The report of the subcommittee is printed, and I ask that the pages distribute copies of the report to the desks of all Senators, so that they may ascertain whether or not an honest and possibly a capable effort was made by the subcommittee to discharge its obligation to the Senate, whose agent it was, in the consideration of this subject. The printed report embraces 14½ pages. Since I had only a small part in the preparation of the report, I am presumptuous enough to believe that it will not be ridiculed or belittled by anyone who will give the subcommittee the courtesy of reading it.

The subcommittee tried to make an analysis of our civilian production problems. It was not out to "get" anyone. It did not disparage or discourage anyone, either personally or as an agency. We did not have any ax to grind. However, Mr. President, we were vitally aware of what civilian production means not only to the eventual determination of the issue, but to the length of time required to reach the end of the war. If there is division in responsibility among the administrative agencies, if there is inefficiency in their program, if there is lack of necessary authority, if there is too much evading and equivocation on the

part of the agencies affected, if there is no head to the war effort save in the person of the President of the United States, the committee ventured to think that it is time for the Congress to go into the matter seriously.

Mr. President, the bill is called the war mobilization bill. Perhaps as good a way as any for me to indicate to the Senate the nature of the bill is to say that its first and primary object is to provide a head for the civilian war effort of the Nation during this war; and that head, according to the provisions of the bill, would be the Director of the War Mobilization Board for which the bill provides. The Director would preside over two bodies.

One would be the War Mobilization Board itself, which we might say would have, by the provisions of the bill, the primary responsibility and power to get the maximum war production out of the Nation's facilities for production. Who would constitute the War Mobilization Board? It would be composed—to read from the bill itself—of 16 persons; 4 representatives of industry, 4 representatives of labor, 4 representatives of agriculture, and 4 public members at large, all to be appointed by the Director, with the advice and approval of the President.

Let me say that the Director himself is to be appointed by the President, not subject to confirmation by the Senate, and under the terms of the bill would be given a fixed salary, and would be required to give his full time to his duties, and to separate himself meanwhile from any private interest. We took away the power of confirmation by the Senate, in order to give the President the greatest possible flexibility in the administration of the program and the selection of the responsible personnel.

Mr. President, the War Mobilization Board, as I have said, is to be presided over by a director called the Director of War Mobilization, to whom I have just referred.

Another important adjunct of the organization is a committee on requirements and program, under the chairmanship of the director of the War Mobilization Board, and to consist of the following: The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the administrators of the four constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization.

Imagine, if you will, therefore, the War Mobilization Board itself composed of 16 persons representing, respectively, industry, labor, agriculture, and the public, and then on the same plane with the War Mobilization Board itself a committee on Requirements and Program, consisting of the officers whom I have just named. That is what we might call the general staff of the War Mobilization Board.

Underneath the War Mobilization Board is to be set up the administrative, operating organization, which would consist of four pillars, Mr. President. One of those would be concerned with war production and supply or procurement, not merely for the Army, not merely for the Navy, not merely for the Maritime

Commission, not merely for the Office of Lend-Lease, not merely for agriculture, but for the United States of America, one nation indivisible, waging war indivisibly. So imagine as the first pillar under the Office of War Mobilization, the Office of Production and Supply.

The next pillar, and essentially a vital one, would be the Office of Manpower Supply, in charge of manpower—not merely for the War Department or the Navy Department or some other branch of the Government, but for the Government of the United States waging and making war.

The third pillar would be the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization. As I said, provision for it was incorporated into the bill primarily because it is essential to efficient and effective war production that there be coordination of all the research of the country in order that it will be available to all the agencies of the Government engaged in production, so that it will be the instrument of the Nation and not merely of a particular company or of a particular division of the War Production Board or of the armed services.

The fourth pillar would be the Office of Economic Stabilization—the one which would have the responsibility for economic stabilization in the Nation—not merely for a part, not merely for only one class, not with respect to only one group, but economic stabilization in the United States of America.

So at the top we should have the Director of the Office of War Mobilization; and under the Director, and presided over by him, would be the Board of War Mobilization. Let me say that we did not believe in committees; we are trying to get away from committees, so that someone can decide something sometime; and, Mr. President, let me say that with respect to the matter of committees I suspect that I share the sentiment entertained by most, if not all, Members of the Senate. I have seen so much frustration by committees that I wondered whether I should prefer to go to heaven if my going there had to depend upon the eventual decision of a committee, if it would be like some of the United States Government coordinating committees located in Washington. I thought that I might as well go on to the other place, because that is usually where a project eventually goes if it has to run the gamut of committees, without anyone being the head of any one of the committees and responsible for its doing a job.

Mr. President, I digress here to mention two things which come to my mind in that respect. One of them was what a wag said during the impeachment proceedings against Lord Hastings.

That case rocked on for 7 years, I believe. The very able attorney who later came to be Lord Eldon, and who then was attorney for Warren Hastings, had the following practice: Every time a critical point came up he would make objection to the introduction of the testimony; and the House of Lords would rise solemnly from their seats, would solemnly parade out the doors to their secret chamber, would solemnly deliberate and debate upon the point made by the de-

fense counsel, thereafter would solemnly arise, would solemnly walk back into the chamber, would solemnly sit down again, and would solemnly announce their eventual decision.

After, as I say, the case had gone on for 7 years, and had not concluded, it was said, "The court moves that the case stand still." Or I might refer, Mr. President, to what was said to have been the provision of a statute in one of the pioneer States of the early days which is supposed to have read, "When two trains shall meet neither shall proceed until the other has passed."

So I have said, at the top is the Director of the War Mobilization Board; under him is the War Mobilization Board itself, consisting of 16 different men, representing industry, labor, agriculture, and the public. Then, on the same level with the War Mobilization Board, is the Committee on Program and Requirements, consisting of the individuals I named a while ago. Then, under that, are the pillars of the structure, the Office of Production and Supply, the Office of Manpower Supply, the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization, and the Office of Economic Stabilization.

But again, Mr. President, we wanted unity somewhere, not just at the top but at the bottom, actually on the ground. Consequently, these four pillars, as it were, converge into a regional office in every region in the country, and we find that in each one of those regions there is not a division of responsibility and separation physically and intellectually in their policies, but we find the four principal operating agencies of the whole structure actually sitting together around the table presided over by a representative of the Chairman of the War Mobilization Board. That means that in a region, for example, there is somebody who can speak with authority, somebody who is chairman of the Board who can call them together, and have them sit around the table, and they know they have all the necessary authority. We would not have the spectacle of a little businessman going somewhere in an effort to get a contract and one agency saying, "We are sorry but it does not come within the scope of our authority," and another saying, "We are sorry but this does not come within the sphere of our duty," until the poor fellow is frustrated in his effort to find somebody who can speak before the Government of the United States acts.

So what we have done in the bill is to provide for a concentration of responsibility and authority, a decentralization of operating authority and power, and such a coordination of power that they can effectively function together, so that if a problem comes up there will be some one there whose duty it will be to deal with the problem.

Mr. President, at the present time it is a sad fact that the very lack of that kind of an organization or something similar to it is prolonging the war, even endangering the issue of the contest, and exacting a tragic toll of the lives of those who must bear the brunt of the prolonged fighting. In other words, discussing the merits of the bill, the American people

have become sorely tired of seeing agency after agency here in Washington fighting with one another, having conflicts over whether the octane gas or the escort vessel program or rubber production should get vital and critical materials, with no one able to tell how greatly either program would be affected by a separation of or a division of war materials. In other words, today there is not anywhere in Washington anyone who can tell any Senator if Mr. Jeffers' request for materials to carry on his synthetic rubber program is granted what it will do to the ship program of the Navy and what it will do to the octane gas program, because no one knows what facilities are really being employed in those programs, and the critical materials and the facilities in this country have not been so scheduled as to channel into the various operations. That is the essential deficiency at which this bill is striking.

Senators know what has been the evolution of the civilian war production and the war program. In the days before Congress passed the lease-lend bill the Government had no particular interest or any responsibility for efficiency in American production that went to the Allies. They came here; they negotiated; they bought, and delivery was made according to the law as it then existed. But in the spring of 1941 we passed the Lend-Lease Act, and then the Government of the United States committed itself to a war-production program.

Mr. President, as you know, we had a National Defense Advisory Committee in the first instance; then we had S. P. A. B.; then we had the Office of Production Management; finally, the Office of War Production; and, eventually, the Chairman of the War Production Board, acting pursuant to certain directives that were given by the President. We have never had a legislative organization of the war effort; it has been left solely to the administrative branch of the Government. The program has simply evolved. Many glorious achievements have been realized; but, Mr. President, I remind Senators that it is not what we have done that is important in respect to the Nation's production; it is whether we have done all that we could have done and are doing all we can do.

Every one of us shares immense pride in what we have accomplished; but, Mr. President, our obligation is to do our best and to remove any bottleneck, to supply any deficiency, to provide against any inadequacy that may keep us from doing the very best that this Nation is capable of doing. Yet, in spite of all the evolution that has been going on and all that has been accomplished, nearly every day the newspapers bring illustrations of the necessity for the centralization of war production in the hands of some persons and boards other than in the person of our great President himself.

Mr. President, war production in war is a gigantic, a colossal enterprise. The President cannot be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, exercise his civilian functions as President, and, at the same time, be the effective head to the extent that he would like to be of

the war-production program of the country. Of course, he is the final authority in the Army, but he does not administer the details of the Army. When he wants to consult with the Army or give it a directive, he does not call in the Quartermaster Corps; he does not call in the Signal Corps; he does not call in a division of the Army; he calls in the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff, and, under that great organization, are sprawled and stretched the mighty forces of our war organization.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been very much interested in what the Senator is saying, but as I understand his explanation, his plan really means that we would have two Presidents, would we not?

Mr. PEPPER. No; no more than we have two Presidents or two Chiefs of Naval Operations or two Chiefs of Staff. Mr. President, we should merely have one President to whom these various heads would be answerable; but there would be a sort of general staff for war production and somebody at the head of it answerable to the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. My question was prompted by a realization that if we had a single head and then, under that single head, had the various divisions which the Senator has outlined, and under them, had certain executives who would give the whole program motivation, so to speak, it seems to me that practically all the power, except tactical dispositions of the military and the Navy would be in the hands of a single individual who would be the director of war mobilization.

In other words, he would control economic stabilization, the manpower for agriculture and factory alike, and the material situation for both the war effort and the civilian population; so, outside of levying taxes and directing the tactical employment of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps, practically all the power—and I am not criticizing it, understand—I am merely listening to the explanation—one man would have virtually all the power which we have given to the President, with the exception perhaps of his right as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the congressional right to appropriate money. There does not seem to be much else in the picture. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, I should say the Senator is wrong, for the reason that the President, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and as the President, has just come back from a great conference in Africa, where he was in consultation with the civil heads of other governments, where the civil heads, the military and naval heads, the supply heads, and so on, were in consultation.

The fact that the President had a Chief of Staff, a very able one, whom we all respect; the fact that the President had a distinguished Chief of Naval Operations; the fact that the President had various very efficient heads of the supply services did not mean that the President himself was not a very busy man, and did not have any obligations to fulfill.

In other words, he did not sit in a place of isolation and say, "All I have to do is just to talk to my one man." Being Commander in Chief is a busy job, even when there is a magnificent organization under him, as the President has.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with that phase of the matter, but as I listened to the powers which would all stem back to the director, I was trying to ascertain what he would not have the right to do, as well as what he would have the right to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I could answer the Senator in several different ways. For example, as I stated awhile ago, the President would have the power to remove the man who was the Director of the War Mobilization Board. Of course, he would be in constant consultation with the Director, just as he is with the Chief of Staff, whom he has the power to remove, or the Chief of Naval Operations. In addition to that, he would have to approve all the different appointees. They, too, could be removed by him.

Mr. TYDINGS. By whom; by the President?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator has gotten the import of my question. I am not talking about the President; I am talking about the head man of the War Mobilization Board which the Senator would create. It seems to me he would have all the power—and perhaps it would be right to give it to him—possessed by the President under our Constitution, except the right to be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; and, indirectly, to some extent he would have a pretty big voice in that. He would not participate in the power of taxation, and perhaps the power of legislation, in a formal way; but his decision, in the first or second or third or fourth category of the general set-up, would be so all-embracing that he would practically be king, would he not?

Mr. PEPPER. No; he would not be king. He would not be clothed, substantially, with any larger power than the President's directive vested in Donald Nelson. As a matter of fact, if the able Senator will refresh his mind about the Presidential directive to Donald Nelson, he will observe that, except as to the agencies which are not included, for example, those handling economic stabilization and technological mobilization, Donald Nelson substantially has, or was intended by that directive to have, subject to the President's control, practically all power over the mobilization and the operation of our war activities.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is a fair statement, and it goes back to my original observation. I am not in disagreement and I am not in agreement; I am merely seeking information.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the Senator's attitude.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that what the Senator would really do would be to create two Presidents, one our regular, normal President, and under him the Senator would place a man to take the full responsibility of making the myriad

decisions in the ramified fields which the Senator has so ably described.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me, I agree, but with the deletion of the idea of "another President."

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be an unfortunate appellation, but I do not mean it in a political sense.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand what the Senator means. Getting at the substance of what the able Senator says, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Just as the Chief of Staff has broad powers over the control of the Army, just as the Chief of Naval Operations has broad powers over the Navy. The purpose of the bill, as the Senator correctly analyzes it, is to put in someone besides the busy person of the President the authority to reconcile the various conflicting and claiming agencies, and the authority to keep the whole thing in some sort of coordinated shape.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that if there were any dispute over manpower, over material, over economic stabilization, over technological information, and the four men at the top of the four divisions could not decide the questions or reconcile their differences, they would put any disputed point on the Director's desk, and he would say what was what; and that would be final?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct; except that the President would have the final say.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am greatly impressed with much of what the Senator has said. I do not know that I agree with all he has said, but I think his description of the problem is accurate and fair, and he has a solution for it, which is much more than many others have.

When it is all boiled down—and I do not mean this in any harsh or Nazi sense—the proposal is really to set up an economic dictator for the United States, with power to decide and act?

Mr. PEPPER. There again, we would be setting up a director of the war mobilization effort who would have the power to decide.

Mr. TYDINGS. To decide all these ramified economic questions, whether they touch men, or materials, or what not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is exactly correct. I am very much indebted to the able Senator for his inquiries and his statements.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with much interest to the distinguished Senator. As I understand, we are discussing the question whether Senate bill 607 shall be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs or go back to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. I am not a member of either committee. I have listened with much interest to what we might call the report of the Committee on Education and Labor, in which the distinguished Senators have set forth their idea as to what the bill should be. If I understand,

the bill now under discussion incorporates that idea?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, when the last session of the Congress ended, the committee had arrived at a conclusion, which is embodied in this report?

Mr. PEPPER. The subcommittee had.

Mr. WILEY. The subcommittee?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Had the committee adopted the report?

Mr. PEPPER. It had not, nor had the subcommittee concluded its hearings. It made a kind of an ad interim report.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that if the bill were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, it would agree substantially with the essence of the report which I hold in my hand. I should like to know what the difference is between the idea of the Senator and what the Military Affairs Committee wants.

Mr. PEPPER. The bill was reintroduced upon the convening of this session of Congress, not by merely the two Senators who had previously introduced the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps I can best put my question in this form: Why does the Senator fear the bill going to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator to permit me to finish the other statement. When Congress convened at the beginning of this session, instead of the bill being introduced by just the two Senators who previously introduced it, it was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for himself, joined by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], nine Senators in all, who joined in the introduction of the bill. I do not presume to say that those Senators have any preference as to the committee to which the bill should go, but we have the incident of this motion being made in the nature of a motion to discharge a committee engaged in the consideration of a bill. I was raising the question whether that was quite fair to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The able Senator might have asked his question the other way—what is it that the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is afraid of? Even assuming that the Committee on Education and Labor should not have had the bill in the first place, it was given the bill by the Senate, a subcommittee was appointed, the subcommittee went about the investigation, honestly, at least, if not wisely, coordinating its efforts with the work of other committees.

Then they made an ad interim report to the full committee, which the full committee has never had a chance to consider; and the subcommittee had not concluded its hearings. It never had voted to conclude them. I do not know whether any subcommittee might desire to go along further. Then, when the

last session terminated, at the holiday season, and the bill was on the calendar, and before the committee expired, no one thought of the subject as one that had been abandoned. While the committee had no technical right to conclude that their jurisdiction would continue, nevertheless the sponsors of the original bill, and the seven additional sponsors of the bill at this session when it was reintroduced, joined in its introduction. I suppose that some might have assumed that the bill would go back to the same committee which had already had jurisdiction of it, and was one of the committees which had a right to consider some of the subjects involved.

One Senator, the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], when the reference was about to be made, as I understand, to the Committee on Education and Labor, rose and raised the point that the bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Frankly, there has been quite a bit of skirmishing going on. I am prepared to say that, unless I am incorrectly informed, representatives of the Navy and War Departments have committed the gross indiscretion of trying to influence the action of the Senate as to the committee to which this bill should be referred, and that, I suspect, is a confirmable fact. I do not discredit anyone's motive or disparage anyone's purpose, but it is a serious question as to whether anyone from either the War or the Navy Departments should take any part in deciding the way in which the Senate refers its bills, unless they have a purpose in their effort.

Mr. WILEY. If I were seated in the gallery of the Senate and were not particularly interested in the mechanics of this matter, I should ask the question which I have asked the Senator, namely, What is all the controversy about? In other words, if what the Senator says is accurate, why does the Committee on Military Affairs want the bill, or why does the Senator want the Committee on Education and Labor to keep it? The Senator knows why he wants the latter committee to keep it. In other words, he wants the bill to come out substantially in the form in which it now is.

It seems to me that Members of the Senate, who are not members of either committee, are entitled to know what members of the Military Affairs Committee believe the bill should contain instead of what it does contain. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to add some further comments, but at this time I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Florida introduced Senate bill 2871 in the last session of Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; together with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. CHANDLER. How did it happen that that bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that a suggestion of reference was made on the floor by the able Senator from West

Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], if I am correctly informed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then, because of the request of the Senator from West Virginia, the bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my understanding. It was sent to that committee by the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Was that bill identical in terms with the bill now under discussion?

Mr. PEPPER. I think one might say that they are substantially the same. The sponsors think there has been some little improvement in the second draft over the first bill, although there has been no great departure in principle in the two bills.

Mr. CHANDLER. That was the basis on which the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which the Senator from Florida was chairman, proceeded to consider the bill and hold hearings on it?

Mr. PEPPER. When the bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor the chairman of the committee appointed a subcommittee, the personnel of which I named a while ago, and that subcommittee, in the manner I have described, began to hold hearings on the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand, this bill undertakes to create an independent agency, a brand new one, and place at its head a director, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] suggested a moment ago, who would receive \$20,000 a year, and who would not be confirmed by the Senate of the United States but would simply be appointed by the President. The new agency would take the place of all the presently constituted agencies of War and Navy, and all agencies which are now undertaking to make war on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. No, I would not be at all justified in assenting to what my friend the Senator from Kentucky has said. In the first place, if I understand correctly, Mr. Donald Nelson was not confirmed by the Senate. Neither would the director contemplated to be appointed under this bill be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. He would not be confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. He would be in charge, let us say, of four main divisions.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. The heads of those divisions would be under the director?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. The bill proposes that each of those administrators shall receive \$15,000 a year, and then it proposes that deputy administrators be appointed, as many as the Director deems necessary, and each deputy administrator so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of \$12,000 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Florida this question: If the Senator were the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or even the President of the United States—and the Senator might be either, or all, that is

one at a time, and fill very capably any one of those offices, I might say—

Mr. PEPPER. I think the able Senator from Kentucky for the imaginary compliment.

Mr. CHANDLER. In such event it would be the Senator's business to make war. The President of the United States, so long as he is President of the United States, is the Commander in Chief and the head of the Army and Navy of the United States, and it is his business to make war. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. The War Department—

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I am speaking of the President. It is his business to make war.

Mr. PEPPER. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the Constitution of the United States the Congress declares war, or the necessity for war, or says that we are in a state of war, but the Congress cannot make war. The President of the United States, under the Constitution, is the one who has to make war.

Mr. PEPPER. It depends on what the Senator means by the expression "make war." The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. He is the boss, is he not?

Mr. PEPPER. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Can he escape making any important decision, even if he should want to? It makes no difference whether he is in Casablanca or on Pennsylvania Avenue—he cannot escape making any important decision, can he?

Mr. PEPPER. I think he could have escaped making many decisions he has made if responsibility for making them had been properly delegated.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; but should he not make the important decisions?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me go further. If the Senator were Secretary of War, or Secretary of the Navy, and a bill was introduced in Congress which would tear up his Department, as the pending bill would do, or take from the Senator, as the head of the Department, the responsibility not only to assist the President in making the war, but to secure materials, and mobilize and train men, and make the war a success, he might feel that such a bill should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. I should think that such a bill should go to the Military Affairs Committee simply as a matter of plain sense. I do not understand why a member of the Military Affairs Committee should want to have the bill sent to the Committee on Education and Labor. One of the Senators who joined in introducing the bill is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER. Other Senators are also members of both committees.

Mr. CHANDLER. Why is not a bill which proposes virtually to root out the power and authority of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the

Procurement Division a matter of concern to Senators who are members of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I should be glad to answer that question.

Mr. CHANDLER. The fact that in another Congress a Senator suggested that a similar bill go to the Committee on Education and Labor does not mean that such a bill should go to that committee now. There was a time when Senators used to have bills referred to committees in which they thought they could get favorable action, and have the bills reported early. I should like to have bills in which I am interested so referred, and the Senator from Florida would also, but the rule with respect to the reference of bills has been changed. When I was a State legislator I tried to have bills in which I was interested referred to committees which would act favorably upon them, and that was done when I could persuade the presiding officer to do so. But here is a bill which a Senator suggests be sent to a committee whose main business is not helping to make war. On the other hand the main business of the Committee on Military Affairs is to help to make war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the question is a fair one, and I will try to make a fair answer to it. This bill includes the whole subject of war production. It covers naval matters as well as military matters. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee could just as well have made the motion as the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I interject at that point to say that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee wants the bill to go to the Military Affairs Committee. Is that persuasive to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Kentucky will allow me to answer his question, I will say that I knew that, and I knew that the reason the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee wanted it so referred was that the Navy Department apparently wanted it done.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the question is that of making war and making war successfully, and if we here in Congress could conduct the war I should be in favor of making it here, but I am not going to support a proposal of the sort made by the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has yielded to me, and I should like to finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky finish, and if he wants to speak in his own time he knows I am one who would like to hear him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not want to trespass unduly on the Senator's time.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I thought the Congress could make war more advantageously than the President of the United States, and the Secretary of War,

and the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff, very well. I think, however, that the creation of another agency to usurp the powers of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the head of which would be as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has said, an assistant to the President of the United States, would simply result in adding chaos to confusion. If the President wants that sort of an assistant he can appoint him. If I thought that the Congress could conduct the war better than the President of the United States can, that would be another thing; but, considering the fact that we are in the war now, and that we have a leader and responsible generals, we should leave the making of the war to them. We will not win the war by changing leaders.

If we cannot win with our present leaders the chances are we will be defeated. We cannot train new leaders now in the midst of the war. I do not want to support any bill which would result in hindering the war. We have a Commander in Chief, and I do not think we can change the Commander in Chief in time of war. We have to fight the war with him in command. At least we cannot change the Commander in Chief for the next couple of years, and if he runs for office at the end of that time I think he will defeat his opponents. Senators, we have a war on, and I think the Commander in Chief will defeat his opponents during the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Kentucky has spoken of the President of the United States, and the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, and he asked whether we thought that these gentlemen would be interested in a bill which would take away their powers or change their powers. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. He knows that the full Senate Committee on Education and Labor has not even considered this bill. Hearings have been held on a similar measure by a subcommittee of that committee. Does the Senator from Kentucky, first of all, think that the Committee on Education and Labor would report a bill affecting the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy without calling upon those gentlemen?

The next question is as to interest. If the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are interested in this bill, does the Senator from Kentucky imply that they are interested to the extent that they would do the discourteous thing of suggesting that the bill be taken away from the Committee on Education and Labor and given to another committee, instead of coming out and testifying why they are opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky does not imply that anyone would do a discourteous thing. I did not say anything that would imply it. The Senator from

Utah is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and the Senator from Kentucky did not imply that he would not give earnest and careful consideration to any proposal that was of interest to the conduct of the war.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask further why a motion should be made by the chairman of another committee that the bill be referred to it when that committee has not heretofore considered the subject matter of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will have to address that question to the Senator who made the motion, the Senator from North Carolina, who is the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Senators who listen to the discussion will find that there is a lack of understanding about certain things. Are the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy suspicious of the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will have to ask them about that. I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator brought their names into the discussion, Mr. President.

Mr. CHANDLER. No, I said, "assuming that the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy"—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The names of the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy were brought into the discussion.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not bring them in. They were already in the debate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The question is asked, Would they not be interested in a bill affecting them? Of course, they would be interested in a bill affecting them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I said so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would the Senator from Kentucky imply that they would be so discourteous as to suggest that they would not testify before a certain committee?

Mr. CHANDLER. I would not suggest that. I do not believe they are.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I heard only a portion of the discussion which has just taken place. I should like to clarify the record. I wish to ask whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] infers by his remarks that the purpose of the bill is to demote or kick out a general or all generals, and to change the leaders during the progress of the war. The bill has no such purpose whatever. The use in the RECORD of the words "general" or "generals" might be misconstrued.

Mr. CHANDLER. Obviously the Senator from West Virginia did not hear all of my remarks because there is nothing in them like that.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as the able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has said, the motion made by the distinguished chairman of

the Military Affairs Committee is in the nature of a motion to discharge one of the standing and major committees of the Senate engaged in the consideration of a bill before that committee has had an opportunity as a full committee to deliberate upon it or make any recommendations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The statement made by the able Senator from Florida is in error. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has just said that the bill has not been considered by the committee. It has not been considered because it was introduced only a short time ago.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I said that the motion was made before the subject had been considered by the committee as a whole. The subcommittee which had been considering it had made its report to the full committee, which has not had an opportunity to act.

Mr. CHANDLER. Even the subcommittee has not considered the new bill.

Mr. PEPPER. It has considered a bill which was the parent of the present bill, and substantially the same as the bill now being discussed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Several changes were made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate has already had an opportunity to see a little behind the scenes in this controversy. Let me put my finger where the flesh is tender and explain just what this is.

The bill would provide that procurement shall be in civilian hands and not in military or naval hands. It would set up a coordinating agency which would have three powers.

The first would be control of the critical materials, which is already vested in the requirements committee of the War Production Board, headed by a very able chairman, Mr. Eberstadt. The second power would be the power to schedule all production. The third power would be over-all production planning. Some of the military men have expressed themselves very strongly to me personally with regard to the struggle which is going on. They do not want the Services of Supply to be headed by a civilian, or to have a civilian vested with the principal procurement power in respect to the production program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to conclude as soon as I can. I do not wish to yield for debate. The Senator may speak in his own time, but I yield for a question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks that a civilian knows what caliber guns or what kind of ammunition the Army needs. I should like to ask him if he does not believe that the Army ought to be the one to say how many guns, and of what

caliber, as well as what ships and munitions it needs to fight with. Does the Senator believe that a civilian should make such decisions?

Mr. PEPPER. I believe that the answer to the first question is "Yes." The Army ought to have authority to prescribe specifications and the quantity of the equipment it desires, and should have the right to prescribe its character. It should also have the right to inspect it, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator think the Army ought to be required to debate with civilians as to whether its needs are real or imaginary?

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what would happen under an arrangement such as this.

Mr. PEPPER. The pending bill does not provide for such an arrangement.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator just said that it would take away those prerogatives from the Army.

Mr. PEPPER. I said that it would take away procurement. If the Senator will be good enough to allow me to complete my remarks I shall try to answer his question.

Mr. President, of course, the armed services should prescribe specifications for their equipment, and should have the power to inspect its production. They should also have the power to specify the material which shall go into the production, and determine the quantity which is needed.

Mr. President, let me ask a question in reply. Does any Senator believe that military and naval men are as well qualified as are the best production men in America to obtain production from factories throughout the country? That is the essential question.

There are two questions. The first involves putting at the head of the program a civilian who is a production man, who knows how to mobilize the production facilities of America. If I were making the decision I should put a civilian, instead of a general or an admiral, in charge of such a program.

Mr. President, the first question is whether or not we want some central head for the whole program. If we answer "yes" to that question I think we will all agree on the necessity for a head for the war production program in order to avoid multiplication and division of authority, conflicts of interest, prostration to a considerable extent in the effort, and potential disaster in the result.

Generally speaking, who is better qualified to be the head, a civilian or a member of one of the armed services? If a member of one of the services is to be appointed, he must be a member of the Navy, the Army, the Marine Corps, the Air Corps, or some other division of the armed forces. Does the Navy want an Army man in charge of its program? Does the Army want a Navy man over its program? Does any of the services want a member of some other service over its program? In the long run, if one man must be in charge, would they not want the best production man in America in

charge of the production facilities of America?

Let me give an illustration of the way this thing works out. Sometime ago we saw in the newspapers—and we received repercussions of it—evidence of the fight going on for Mr. Donald Nelson to get back the power which he had delegated to the armed services—power which the President gave him in the first instance, and which he ought never to have delegated. That was the power to schedule, the power to procure, the power to produce.

However, the War Production Board has not been a war production board. It has been an umpire among the claimant agencies for critical material. Donald Nelson has never exercised the power to command the production machinery of America, and to schedule production for the war effort.

A few days ago, while the President was in Casablanca, the rubber-production program was stymied for days while Mr. James Byrnes was endeavoring to reconcile the conflict among those who were claiming valves and turbines essential to the three programs of octane gas, escort ships, and synthetic rubber.

The Navy was afraid of the impairment which might result to its escort-vessel program, and yet no one in the Government could tell how many ships would be delayed, or whether any would necessarily be delayed. No one knew what valves or turbines were to go to what engines. It was like reaching out into the dark. It might be dangerous to run into a dark room, because one might hit something. We cannot have a hit-or-miss program and obtain maximum efficiency from the production machinery.

Mr. Nelson received a broad directive from the President. The President expected one man to be the boss—not a dictator, not an assistant king or assistant President, but in time of war the effective, courageous head of the war-production program, just as the Chief of Staff is the head of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations is the head of the Navy, and the President of the United States is the head of the Government and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Then Mr. Nelson saw the program breaking down and the President's goals not being met. We know that the President wanted more airplanes than he is going to get this year, because there was a bottleneck in aluminum production. All the Army had done was to make contracts with every aluminum company it could find to produce aluminum extrusions. There were not enough. The Army could not help it.

At that stage Mr. Nelson became disturbed because the program was out of balance and not coordinated. He set up a material control program to try to regain control over critical materials, to use the critical materials we had to the best advantage. He put an extraordinarily able man in charge of that program. He saw that was not enough, but that he had to have the power to schedule, to plan, and to procure if he would

avoid conflicts and get the best results. That story is not strange to the Senate or to members of Senate committees.

I think it ought to be said that Mr. Nelson, with the collaboration of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Under Secretaries, and with the support of the President, obtained the services of Mr. Charles Wilson and made him Vice Chairman of the War Production Board. On the whole, Mr. Wilson has been doing a magnificent job.

He was given the title of vice chairman of the War Production Board, but actually he was not put in charge of anything except radar and airplane production, going on the theory that with the gradual expansion of his authority it would be found that he was actually in charge of war production.

There is no head of the War Production Board except in respect to radar and airplanes. All the rest of it is divided up among various claimant agencies, and a limited power is vested in the distinguished chairman of the War Production Board.

When Mr. Wilson took that job he began to look around and see what was going on. He found a deficiency of aluminum extrusions. He did not stop merely because all the aluminum factories were choked up with contracts for the armed services. He looked for facilities. He found that some of the copper processing facilities were not fully employed in war production in processing raw copper, so he changed those machines over so that they would make aluminum extrusions. In a little while the deficiencies began to disappear, the airplane program was accelerated, and American boys began to have something to fight with.

I could give a dozen illustrations. Mr. Wilson saw, before he ever got here, that this conflict would occur among the claimants of facilities for the production of octane gas, synthetic rubber, and escort vessels, because they all called on the same facilities engaged in the production of valves and turbines, and there was not enough to go around. No one had anticipated that to make so many ships, so much synthetic rubber, or so much octane gas would require so many machines making valves and so many machines making turbines. Government officials said, "We will make so many ships, so many airplanes, and so much octane gas," without knowing whether or not they had the facilities with which to make them. All the procurement agencies would do would be to take the priorities permit which they had and go on a hunting expedition to see if they could find someone who could make the things they needed. The first thing they would know three claimants would be after one thing, and then the President would have to get Mr. Jimmy Byrnes—an able and distinguished man, and certainly I should be glad to see him in any capacity, however high; but here I am talking about principles, not personalities—the President would have to get Mr. Jimmy Byrnes or someone else to work on the matter.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator that I thoroughly agree with what he has said about the situation as it exists today, and I have great sympathy with his purpose; because before the so-called Gillette subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we have run into exactly the same difficulties which the Senator outlined a moment ago. However, the question in my mind, and the one which bothered me, is: Does not Mr. Nelson have the power to do the very things about which the Senator has been talking?

Mr. PEPPER. I should say "No" to the Senator, for two or possibly three reasons. In the first place, Mr. Nelson is just getting back, by the skin of his teeth, the powers which he once delegated, but he is getting them back impaired. In other words, if in the beginning he had actually exercised the full power vested in him under the President's directive, with the fair implications deducible from it, he would have been the head of it, as was Bernard Baruch the head of the War Industries Board in the last war.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. But our friend did not do so. Instead, for many reasons which may to him have seemed adequate and wise—I am not prepared to say as to that—he delegated to others the powers as to procurement and the making of requirements; and he himself really had only a sketchy authority over critical materials. In other words, for example, even as to critical materials he did not say to the claimants, "All right; you can have only so much, and I will follow it through to see where it goes, to see that you are not hoarding, to see that the prime contractors are not getting more than their share or are not delegating too much to some subcontractor." He merely divided it up, and let it go where it would.

The second point is that the President's directive, construed one way—which might be a possible construction—gave the chairman of the War Production Board only the power to direct as to a procurement policy. It did not give him the power actually to set up procurement machinery. The result was that, insulated from actual operations by the military personnel, which was a hierarchy, of course, of all the military categories, by giving only a directive he did not get all the results which perhaps he anticipated achieving when he wrote the directive.

The third answer to the question as to why the power referred to is not already in existence is that under the terms of the bill the Director of the War Mobilization Board would be vested with some authority not included in the present directive—for example, economic stabilization, scientific and technical mobilization, and control of the manpower supply. Those are three fields which are not now dealt with by the War Production Board.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, let me say that

the President now has the power to do substantially the things provided for in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; he has the power.

Mr. WHEELER. So it seems to me that there is a question whether we should pass legislation on the subject. I understand that when Mr. Nelson was first appointed the President gave him the power. It is true that Mr. Nelson delegated a part of his power to this man and a part to that one, and as a result we did not get from the War Production Board the kind of services which we should have had. I agree that the War Production Board has been in a rather bad state of affairs, and it has not improved to any extent over a period of 6 months at least. I think that something must be done about that. I do not think there is any question that something must be done about it.

However, the point I make is that at the present time the President has the power to do the very thing for which the Senator from Florida is contending; so the question is whether we should pass legislation to do something which the President already has the power to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to comment on that phase of the matter.

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

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

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I think that the Senate has gone far afield in this matter. The motion before the Senate is one to refer the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I happen to be a member—and, by inference, not to refer it to the Committee on Education and Labor, which during the last Congress considered the corresponding bill. I think it is a most unusual thing for the Senate by vote to take a bill away from a committee which has not yet had a chance as a whole committee to consider it, before that committee has really had an opportunity to act upon it, and by an action of the Senate itself to transfer the bill to another committee.

If conditions were reversed, and if the bill had been under consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs, I should feel exactly the same way. I think it is an unusual precedent which the Senate is trying to set by taking the bill away from the Committee on Education and Labor which has been holding hearings on the corresponding bill, and which has not as yet had a chance as a committee to vote on it, and arbitrarily to refer the bill to another committee for exactly the same consideration. For that reason I shall not support the motion of the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. My question may be far afield, but I should like to ask the Senator another question on the bill, if I may do so. My question is in line with that propounded a moment ago by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I was about to ask the Senator whether

at the present time the President has the power to do the very thing for which the bill would provide? The answer of the Senator from Florida to the question propounded by the Senator from Montana was "Yes."

Mr. PEPPER. The bill contains certain provisions for authorization for appropriations, and the like, and I think it supplements the administrative power; but substantially the answer to that question is "Yes."

Mr. LUCAS. In addition to the authorization to set up the War Production Board, and giving Donald Nelson the power which he has under the directive, the President had the power to issue the directive at any time and to give the power to anyone.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no question about that.

Mr. LUCAS. Now I want to deal with the provisions of the bill as to functions and transfers of functions among agencies. I take it that is the meat of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is one of its provisions; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, section 7 (a) of the bill provides:

There is hereby transferred to the Office of Production and Supply the functions and personnel of (1) the War Production Board and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

A number of the powers of the War Production Board would be transferred to just one of the agencies of the War Mobilization Board; would they not?

Mr. PEPPER. That power would exist—the power to make transfers to this framework of an organization.

Mr. LUCAS. Whatever power is now lodged in the War Production Board would be transferred to the other agency; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The War Production Board would go out of existence so far as the War Production Board itself is concerned; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As to the Senator's second point—and as to it I see the trouble in connection with the bill, that it will not eliminate very many of the difficulties which we are trying to eliminate—let me read further from section 7 (a) of the bill:

(2) Those subdivisions of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, of the Maritime Commission, and of the Office of Lend-Lease as shall be determined by the Director, subject to the approval of the President, as being related to, engaged in, or concerned with the procurement, manufacture, or other provision of war matériel.

My question is, Will there not be the same conflict and the same trouble between the various agencies named in subdivision (2) and the new agency provided for by the bill, insofar as those agencies may attempt to dominate or control the supply of various materials and various things which are set forth in that particular paragraph?

Mr. PEPPER. I should say "No" to the able Senator; because the War Mobilization Board, as adviser, and the Director of the War Mobilization Board, as Director, would have the power to recon-

cile all conflicts between the many subordinate agencies.

Mr. LUCAS. But they would not have the power to take the power away from the President, would they?

Mr. PEPPER. Of course not. No power is to be taken away from the President. Of course, he is the head of it all.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and in section 7 (a), subdivision (2), of the Office of War Mobilization bill, reference is made to—

Those subdivisions of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, of the Maritime Commission, and of the Office of Lend-Lease as shall be determined by the Director, subject to the approval of the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I make is that when the Director determines whatever is necessary, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Lend-Lease, and all of the other agencies will start all over again the trouble which we are having at the present time, and the President will be between two fires, just as he is between two fires at this very moment.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I would not agree with the Senator as to that point; because the Director of the War Mobilization Board would be the effective operating head of war production, and would have the power to lay down policy or to give instructions which would avoid or reconcile conflicts.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator as to that; but the Senator's statement does not answer my question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate has been very kind, and I wish to approach a conclusion of what I have to say.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to comment on the remark of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. The bill which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] introduced, for himself and other Senators, in the last session, was not referred by the Senate to the Committee on Education and Labor. It was referred to that committee under the old rule whereby a Senator could write on the bill the name of the committee to which he wished to have it referred and by which he wished it considered.

The reference moved by the Senator from North Carolina would not result in having the Senate take away from a committee a bill which had previously been referred by the Senate, because the bill was never referred to the committee by the Senate.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, if that is not exactly what happened—that the bill was referred to the committee by the Senate—I do not know what we could call it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, Mr. President, if I wanted to have a certain committee conduct hearings on a certain subject, under the old rule I would pick out the committee which I thought would give me the best run for my money. I have no objection to that; but the bill which is the subject of the motion of the Senator from North Carolina is a bill which

should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs in the first place.

Mr. TRUMAN. Not necessarily; any one of three or four committees could have had jurisdiction of the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the Senator and I do not agree about that. I say that the bill should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs; I say it should have gone to the Committee on Military Affairs in the first place. However, it did not go there. I cannot help that but I am going to do the best I can to see that it now goes to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, there can be plenty of argument on that matter, because any one of four committees could have had the bill referred to it; any one of them has just as much jurisdiction of the subject as any of the others; and the chairman of any one of the other three committees could make the same motion the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me say that it is my judgment that, as between the various committees, the Committee on Military Affairs should have had the bill originally, rather than the Committee on Education and Labor. However, the bill was not at that time referred by the Senate to the Committee on Military Affairs. This is the first time that the matter has been before the whole Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to conclude what I have to say. As the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has pointed out, the bill, having to do with the matter of war production, would properly come within the scope of a number of different Senate committees.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection if the other two want to get in, but it happens that two of us are contending, and it is my contention that as between the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor, while the latter had it originally, yet if the question had been submitted to the Senate, I believe the measure would not have been sent to that committee; but inasmuch as the question was not submitted this is the first time the matter has been before the whole Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I started to say—and I should like to finish my remarks—as the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has pointed out, this bill having to do with the whole program of war production would probably come within the scope of a number of different Senate committees. I mentioned a while ago the Naval Affairs Committee, because, of course, the bill affects the Navy in the prosecution of the war. The Military Affairs Committee, for obvious reasons, might also be included, and I might likewise include the Foreign Relations Committee, because it affects lend-lease. I could also include the Banking and Currency Committee, because the bill affects the Office of Price Administration, the legislation for which has been constantly handled by the Banking and Currency Committee. I might also include the Committee on Education and Labor, which has had to do with legislation pertaining to labor and vocational training.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Where the Senate has taken any position with regard to the reference of bills which include several subjects which, if separated, might have gone to other committees, the Senate has not, even under its own loose rule, adopted the practice of sending a bill to a committee which has jurisdiction merely of something which is more or less incidental to the proposed legislation and which might have been sent to another committee if it had been introduced separately, but where there has been any rule at all it has been the practice to send the bill to the committee that had jurisdiction of the major portion of the subject matter covered by the measure, although it included many subjects which, if separately introduced, could have gone to other committees. In the case of an omnibus bill, such as this is apparently, dealing with a good many subjects, which might have been dealt with separately by other committees, the Senate has ordered—and I think properly—the Presiding Officer to send the bill to that committee which had jurisdiction of the major portion of the subject matter under consideration.

It would be impossible to send this bill or any similar bill to all the committees which might have jurisdiction. If so, we never would get anywhere in finally enacting legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able leader if he knows of a case where a committee which actually has jurisdiction of the subject and which had been given consideration of a bill has been discharged from the consideration of it unless the Senate felt it had been delinquent in its treatment of the measure?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot, without looking up the records, refer to any such situation, and I am willing to concede it has never occurred; but the question is where the bill ought to go and not where it was sent at the request of the author. The Senator from Florida will recall that when the former Vice President announced that obiter dictum from the Vice President's desk that any Senator could have a bill referred to any committee he wanted it referred, I challenged his statement; I protested against such a rule. It is not a rule, and it does not make for orderly procedure in the Senate. I protested against it and urged the Vice President then not to announce any such rule.

Later, when we came into the present session, the steering committee unanimously instructed me to protest to the Vice President against adherence to any such announcement as that heretofore made and to exercise the right to send bills to committees to which they should be sent.

I am not injecting myself into the argument of the Senator; but, in view of that action, I myself do not feel bound by any improper reference of a bill introduced at another session, if it was improperly referred at the time it was introduced. Whether I take any part in this debate or not is not material, but if I should do so I should feel

myself called upon to discuss that point because all pending measures die at the end of a Congress; every bill that has heretofore been introduced and not acted upon by both Houses has to be introduced anew. What the Senate would have done originally if this matter had been submitted to it when the bill was introduced by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from West Virginia I do not know; I would not prophesy as to that, although I presume we would then have been debating what we are now debating as to the propriety of the jurisdiction of two committees or any committee. I myself, however, do not feel bound, from a parliamentary or legislative standpoint, by any action of a previous Congress if the action was an improper action or if the reference, made under that loose rule, was an improper reference; and it is for the Senate to decide about that.

I do not feel bound by action taken, as might be said by unanimous consent, because no question was raised. When a bill is introduced and the authors of the bill name the committee to which they want it referred, as a rule, nobody makes any objection. Probably, as a rule, Senators do not know to which committee a bill is referred when it is introduced. When a bill is introduced, and the Chair says "the bill will be appropriately referred," Members do not inquire, as a rule, or have not heretofore, as to where the bill would go. If the question had been raised at the time the bill was originally introduced, the Senate might have acted differently; but, whatever it might have done, I do not feel its action applies now to my position as to the reference of this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. It seems to me that what the Senate would be disposed to do would be to reserve the power, which of course it has after the Committee on Education and Labor has concluded its investigation and after the full committee has had an opportunity to pass upon the bill and make its recommendations, to refer it to the Military Affairs Committee or any other committee before it came to the Senate floor. That is not an unusual procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not desire to prolong the discussion, but I think it would be better for the Senate deliberately to refer this bill to the wrong committee, and let it stay there, than to refer it to the wrong committee with the understanding that it could vote it out and then the Senate could send it to the right committee before acting on it, assuming that the Committee on Military Affairs was the right committee, and the Committee on Education and Labor was the wrong committee. I would make the same statement as to any other committee.

I think the question of jurisdiction of the legislation itself ought to be settled by the Senate. I think it has brought about and is going to continue to bring about confusion and chaos and duplication. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] said this morning, as well as what other Senators said, that the Senate of the United States has got sense enough to decide where

legislation of this kind ought to go. It should settle the question once and for all, so that we would not have four or five committees investigating the same subject, which is not only expensive but the committees are likely to bring in conflicting reports, so that we would have difficulty in knowing which horn of the dilemma to take. I think it is exceedingly important for the Senate to decide the question of jurisdiction. When it has decided that question, I think the bill should remain in the committee to which it is decided it should go.

I cannot myself adhere to the suggestion that if for any reason a bill ought to go to one committee when that committee reports to the Senate it should then be referred to another committee for another report. Suppose the Committee on Education and Labor reported it favorably, and it went back to the Military Affairs Committee and they reported adversely, where would we be?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is not an unthinkable experience where several different committees have legitimate jurisdiction of a bill that it should be submitted to more than one committee before it actually comes to the Senate floor. I know of a good many instances of that kind. For example, we had a treaty before the Foreign Relations Committee to set up an international bank in Central and South America. The Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably upon that proposal, but, upon the request of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Glass], the bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and was subsequently considered by that committee, but was not reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that grew out of the fact that there was an international question involved of which the Foreign Relations Committee felt it had jurisdiction, and, at the same time, there was a banking question involved over which the Committee on Banking and Currency had jurisdiction; but before the bill was referred to any committee, as I recall, it was understood that it would be referred later to the Banking and Currency Committee if the Foreign Relations Committee reported it. I may be mistaken but that is my recollection.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is in error there because it was only after the Foreign Relations Committee had considered it that the request was made, if I recall correctly, that the treaty be sent to the Banking and Currency Committee. The situation prevailing there is just the situation prevailing here. The Committee on Education and Labor, by virtue of having jurisdiction over labor legislation, is a legitimate holder of a part of this jurisdiction just as the Foreign Relations Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and other committees of the Senate.

Mr. President, all I was saying was that I thought it might be possible for a standing committee to conclude an investigation it had begun upon a subject with respect to which it had con-

current jurisdiction. We might as well settle that question also while we are settling the question, Is the Military Affairs Committee going to handle the whole manpower problem including civilian labor legislation because we happen to be in a war and it has jurisdiction over military supplies?

A few days ago the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead] indicated a desire to propose a study of the subject of manpower. It is now being carried on by the Committee on Appropriations, because that was the only committee which had over-all jurisdiction. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had jurisdiction over agricultural labor, the Committee on Education and Labor had jurisdiction over labor legislation, the Committee on Military Affairs had jurisdiction over military personnel. But today the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is passing on the nominations to the War Manpower Commission, who are literally and exclusively civilian personnel. Does that mean that the military is to operate the civilian functions, as well as military?

A few days ago this same conflict arose between the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Military Affairs. I ventured to make the point on the floor of the Senate why nominations of civilian personnel should have to go before the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not questioning the personnel of that committee, which could not be improved on, but if we are to talk about fairness respecting the jurisdiction of the several committees, surely some of these other committees have a legitimate right, as well as our distinguished Committee on Military Affairs. If our committee, or if any other committee, had come in and made a motion to oust the Committee on Military Affairs from jurisdiction, I dare say very serious consideration would not have been given to the effort.

We are not trying to keep the Committee on Military Affairs from getting the jurisdiction, although it is singular that all of a sudden such great interest has been developed on the subject by the Committee on Military Affairs, and efforts made to take jurisdiction of the subject, notwithstanding the fact that it is being considered by another committee, and notwithstanding the fact that the question is not whether they shall consider it before it goes to the Senate or not. The question is whether one committee shall be stopped from considering it and the other committee given exclusive jurisdiction to consider it.

I am not coming here to block any other jurisdiction. I am not saying that there should not be half a dozen committees considering the subject. It affects a great many of them. Here is an over-all bill, and a committee is considering an over-all bill. Let me say it is a pretty general adage of the law that a man cannot sit in his own case. We are talking about taking power away from the Military and Naval Establishments in the public interest. I do not know but that that question can be better considered by a committee not so intimately related to those Establishments. We are

talking about over-all civilian production for war, and these agencies cannot be expected to support a measure which contemplates a diminution of their power. Yet, when the question of the diminution of their power is brought up, committees which are intimately and inextricably related to that subject personally, philosophically, and legislatively are called upon to make the sole decision.

Mr. President, I venture to say right now that production and procurement are likely to be affected if some agency which does not have that intimacy of relationship does hear other people, and approaches this matter from another point of view.

Small business is suffering in the United States because of the procurement program this Government has been following already in this war, and economic casualties are paying a terrific price because we have not really someone in charge of war production with the power to coordinate the procurement of the whole United States Government. I say that if something like this bill is not enacted, the war will be prolonged, and American soldiers and sailors and gallant airmen will pay in their blood for the deficiency of the Government and its agencies.

Able Senators have asked whether the President did not have power to do what is proposed. Yes; he does have the power. Should not the President have done it? Yes; he should have, if I may venture to say so. I make this as a constructive suggestion, as a friend of the President and of this administration. People are tired of frustration, and I am tired of it with them, and as a faithful Democratic New Dealer I am going to try to cure the deficiency of this administration; and it is a matter of principle and not of personality when I do it. I do not like to appear in the role of being critical of these distinguished gentlemen, every one of whom I admire and esteem, but I do not think the Army can handle procurement as effectively as I think civilians can handle it, if it is properly set up; and feeling that way, it is my duty to say so.

Consider what the Army did. They used to have six or eight different procurement agencies. What did the President do? He put them all into one. He divided the whole Army up into three branches only—air, ground forces, and procurement. Can the officials deny that a principle applicable to the Army is not well applicable to the whole production effort? We have consolidation of the control of critical materials under Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt—the critical materials of the whole country. We have concentration of authority over manpower—manpower of the whole Nation. Is it not well that all these various agencies be coordinated under some head? Can the President do everything personally? Or should not the Congress help him in trying to set up an effective administrative organization?

Mr. President, I had no idea of taking so much of the time of the Senate. I have seen these conflicts in the hearings we have had in the Committee on Educa-

tion and Labor. I saw the Army and the Navy call on the Procurement Service to take doctors out of the civilian population, and they took them without the slightest regard for the effect upon the civilian population of those doctors being taken into the service.

When we were leaving some of our areas, like some of those in the South, with 1 doctor to every 7,000 or 5,000 people, when some States were contributing over 200 percent of their doctor quota, there was not anyone who had anything to do with the coordination of that program to the civilian and the military and naval economies. But when we made this investigation and pointed out what was going on, we discovered the situation, and the services themselves later came in and said that the matter should be corrected. Finally Mr. McNutt, given command over both civilian manpower and the acquisition of service doctors, said to the services, "Gentlemen, I am going to keep one doctor to every 1,500 people. That is all there is to it. You have to make the best use you can of these doctors you have." There was a case in which everyone was doing his job perfectly honestly, but the results were not coordinated until Mr. McNutt was made the head.

Right now we are discussing the size of the Army. No one has been considering just what actual effect the size of the Army would have on agricultural and industrial production. Finally it winds up in the Committee on Appropriations, who are trying to make some over-all disposition of the matter. Someone should have been able to come here from the administrative agencies and say, "Gentlemen, this is the way it works out. Take so many from here and so many from there. This is what we have left. This is what we have obligated ourselves to do. This is the way we plan to supply the deficiency." That would be control of the manpower resources of the Nation, and not a slipshod control of the effort.

If the Senate does not find that the committee has been lacking in diligence, or in the sincerity of its approach, if it has made some contribution to the subject, naturally the committee would like to continue until it feels that it can bring the matter to the attention of the Senate, or of some other committee.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Merely for the sake of the record, I should like to say I was a member of the subcommittee which made this report, and, without passing on the merits of the bill, I declined to approve the report, because I considered the evidence before the committee insufficient to support either the report or the bill. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator, and thank the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to take but a few minutes of the time of the Senate, on a matter which has already consumed a good deal of time. I have often wondered, during the course of the afternoon, whether we were discussing the question of the committee to which the bill should be referred, or were discussing the merits of the subject itself.

The subject matter of the bill has much merit, and I should be one of the first to agree that steps can be taken and should be taken to coordinate and centralize the control of our production set-up, and that we must take the necessary steps to avoid duplication and waste. But I do not believe that is the question which is at stake here this afternoon. We have before us the simple question of the committee to which the bill is to be referred. It is a simple question, and it is not at all an unprecedented question. I have known of a similar question arising during my fairly brief service in the Senate. It is not a question of insulting anyone.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So that we may follow the Senator's argument, will he please cite a case in his experience like the instant case?

Mr. LODGE. While I have not looked it up, I can remember a similar case in 1937 or 1938, when there was a question of referring a bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency or to some other committee. I cannot give the details now, but I shall be very glad to look the matter up and furnish the details tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me ask a Senator whether at that time one committee had taken the bill, had held hearings running into thousands of pages, and had brought out a preliminary report?

Mr. LODGE. I do not recall as to that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me ask a further question of the Senator from Massachusetts, since he referred to the fact that a similar situation had arisen very often. Does he know of a single occasion when, in the midst of hearings and before a bill had actually been considered by the full committee to which it had been referred, the chairman of another committee rose in the Senate and asked that a bill under consideration be referred to his committee?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that is what is happening now.

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

Mr. LODGE. I do not yield at the moment; I wish to answer the question of the Senator from Utah.

I do not think that is what is happening here. There is no intention of taking the bill away from a committee in the middle of hearings. The last Congress came to an end in December. We have in the new Congress many new Members. We started in afresh in the beginning of January this year. It is not a question of taking a bill away from a committee in the middle of hearings.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. During the last session a bill was introduced which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The bill was introduced by the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and others of his associates on his committee took the bill away from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, after the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had had possession of a similar bill for a considerable time, and had done considerable work on it. The bill to which I referred was taken away from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, after it had considered similar proposed legislation, and it was referred to the same committee which now proposes to take jurisdiction of the bill under consideration. I make that statement to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kentucky will continue to refresh his memory completely. It seems to me that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor had the housing question before it at the time to which the Senator refers. That committee had considered the legislation establishing the United States Housing Authority. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor found no objection at all when housing matters were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. But there came a time when it was suggested that the original committee should carry on. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor took no part at all in that controversy, except to vote.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made the motion, and the same committee which is now trying to get jurisdiction over the pending bill, took over the other bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should rather continue with my statement now. I did not mean to get into a discussion as to past dealings in referring bills to committees, because I do not think that is a very significant aspect of this matter. It is a perfectly simple procedure, as we all know, for a Senator to write the name of a committee on a bill, and then to have the bill referred to the committee he indicates, unless some point is raised. It is perfectly well known that when the new session of Congress begins we start in afresh. We have a great many new Members; and it is not a question of taking a bill away from a committee, and it is not a case of reflecting in any way upon any committee. Certainly there is no better friend of national defense than the Senator from Utah. He is also a very faithful and valuable member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and there is no question at all of in any way reflecting on any member of his committee.

Moreover, I think the Senators who introduced this bill have performed a service in bringing up the subject. It is a subject which was brought up in the Stettinius report back in 1939, the contents of which, unfortunately, were not made available to the American people. The subject of coordinating and centralizing the control of the production of weapons is an old subject, and it is a great pity that there has been delay on

the part of the administration in coming to grips with it for so many years. So as far as the measure being referred to the Committee on Military Affairs is concerned, there is no question of burying it. It will be considered. There would be no question of not reading all the testimony and going ahead.

I agree that there is no committee which has over-all jurisdiction, and that a bill of this kind raises so many different questions that one cannot say with any definiteness that it belongs in this committee or does not belong in that one.

A great many different factors are involved; but there is one factor which, in my humble opinion, has not been given due weight here this afternoon. We have heard about defense migration; we have heard about defense housing; we have heard about small business; we have heard about many different factors that are connected with war production, but there has not been sufficient emphasis, in my judgment, placed on the question of getting weapons for the soldier, and that is what this is all about. That is why this subject has always been considered primarily a military subject, because the goal and objective of all this effort is to supply weapons for the soldier.

When we look at the history of this war up to date, and look at the weapons the soldier has received, insofar as I have had any chance to have any personal experience, I think the job has been extremely well done. The weapons have been good. I think that in tanks, for example, we are ahead of the rest of the world. I call Senators' attention to the 105 caliber, self-propelled mount, which has had such a decisive effect in North Africa. One of the reasons why that weapon has been as good and satisfactory as it has been, and has given the soldier the best chance of coming out alive on the battlefield, is that the uniformed services have had control of the procurement of that article, because they have had the right to go into the factory and take a piece of chalk and mark the thing up, and get the thing done exactly the way they wanted it done. That is a tremendously important factor.

I do not say that perhaps the power of the Army should not be curtailed, or that the power of the Navy should not be curtailed. I do not say that the Senator from Florida is not right in saying that we should take it away from them, though he would have to be more eloquent than he has been this afternoon to convince me of it. But I do say that when that question is raised it should not be treated in a left-handed manner or as an incident. We should realize that we are making a major decision, and that we want to have it before a body which will entertain the views of the War Department as well as the views of others.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] earlier in the afternoon said that his sole object in asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor was so that we could get prompt action; that the Committee on Education and Labor had had the subject before it; that the committee had taken 1,400 pages of tes-

timony on it; and that it had heard all the witnesses, and is ready "to shoot."

Then, Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] comes along and points out, I think very interestingly, that his committee had not heard all the witnesses interested; that they had heard largely from representatives of airplane factories, but they have not heard from the War Department or the Navy Department, and they have not heard from a number of agencies whose views, whether we agree with them or whether we do not, are entitled to be heard, are entitled to be weighed, and are entitled to be analyzed.

So it seems to me that we ought to be happy that this bill has had the consideration that it has had at the hands of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. We ought to be happy that we have gotten the testimony from the airplane manufacturers; but we ought also to recognize that there is a positive need for the bill to be considered from other standpoints from which it has never been considered at all. So for that reason I hope that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Could not the objective which the Senator from Massachusetts has stated very ably, and I think quite properly, be completely accomplished and all interest expressed here today be at the same time satisfied by allowing the Committee on Education and Labor to finish its study, for whatever it may be worth, and then allow the bill to go to the Committee on Military Affairs for such consideration as that committee might want to give to it, before it comes to the Senate floor?

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is the principal introducer of the bill. I am one of the cointroducers of the bill. Several other Senators are cointroducers of the bill. We are not in any sense of the word denying the right and the duty of the Committee on Military Affairs to consider those aspects of the measure which it deems important to consider, but would the Senator from Massachusetts think it inappropriate for other aspects to be considered also before the matter is disposed of? I was wondering if the Senator would not think that the best interest could be served by letting the study which is being made of the matter by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be finished, and then let us have an understanding that immediately thereafter it be ordered by the Senate that before the bill shall come back to the floor it shall go to the Committee on Military Affairs for its consideration?

Mr. LODGE. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say that the subcommittee action had virtually been completed.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; excuse me—

Mr. LODGE. Then there is a difference of opinion between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the able Senator from West Virginia probably was not wholly correct in his surmise. The very reason that the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor had not called the Government's representatives was so that we could confront them with the major criticisms and instances of dissatisfaction and insufficiency that might have been experienced in the country by people who were participating or who were really effective in carrying on this production program. We intended in time, as soon as we got the other data before the committee, to give those people an opportunity to be heard. All we are asking now is that certain aspects of the matter in which we are interested be considered also. We are not trying to deny the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee, but are asking that that committee wait a little while in claiming its jurisdiction, until we shall have finished our study.

Mr. President, I do not see how it could do any harm to have the bill referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. If that is not done it will mean that we shall be stopped in the middle of what we have contemplated to do, and that we will not get a chance, of course, to say anything more about those aspects in which our committee is interested.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that one of the merits of the committee system in the Senate is that after a good many years it educates the Senators who are members of committees. I know that has been true in my case. A Senator serves on a committee and comes in daily contact with a certain set of problems and becomes educated in connection with them and obtains a certain familiarity with them. I am delighted that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor who have had a constant contact with questions of manpower and questions of civilian personnel have had a chance to study this bill. I think now the Senate would be best served if the committee which has been educated along military lines, of thinking of the soldier and thinking in military terms, should have a chance to pass on the measure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two before the vote is taken, in order that we may keep the record straight with reference to what we have done as a committee.

First of all, I wish to say that a jurisdictional dispute is something which I have always tried to avoid. It is something into which I, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, after having sat through 2 full years of discussion about jurisdictional disputes, would never attempt to enter unless I found it to be unavoidable.

So far as we are concerned, the whole point of the controversy seems to hinge on the question of whether the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor has done a good job. If there is any question on that score in the mind of any Senator, I shall remain on my feet for some time and present to the Senate some of the information which the subcommittee has obtained. I do not be-

lieve there is any question about it. There could not be.

At the last session a bill similar to the one under discussion was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I do not know whether it was referred to that committee by request, but it came to me, and, as chairman, it became my task to appoint a subcommittee to consider it.

The subcommittee was appointed with care and forethought. It will be noted that because there seemed to be a conflict—especially with regard to the important question of manpower—between the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Military Affairs, the chairman saw to it that one of the coauthors of the military manpower bill was appointed as a member of the subcommittee. Then, in order that the Military Affairs Committee might not be put at a disadvantage in what it was doing, I deliberately chose another member of that committee to serve on the subcommittee. In that way ample opportunity was afforded to prevent duplication so far as the hearings were concerned.

Mr. President, any Member of the Senate who will examine the hearings of the Military Affairs Committee on its manpower bill, as well as the hearings on the bill conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor, will discover that there has been no duplication. The Committee on Education and Labor has been interested primarily in the discovery of manpower resources in the United States.

The Committee on Military Affairs has properly been interested in manpower from the standpoint of seeing that nothing is allowed to interfere with the proper growth and development of our Army as well as its proper care.

The chairman of the Education and Labor Committee happens to be a member of the Military Affairs Committee. There could not be any conflict in his mind with regard to jurisdiction. It seems to me that if the Senate is to enter into this type of controversy regarding jurisdiction, and the pending question is put to a vote—especially since there have been implications that certain persons who are sometimes called bureaucrats are interested in having the subject of the bill taken from one committee and transferred to another for their purposes—it will be one of the most dangerous things in which we can indulge.

Two or three days ago, Mr. President, I heard an extremely eloquent speech delivered by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], wherein he said that the issue before the people of the country is a simple one, namely, whether the Government of the United States shall be taken from the bureaucrats and given back to the people.

Mr. President, I shall watch with all the care that I can exercise how the voting on the pending question is done on the other side of this Chamber, because Members there know that an attempt has been made by certain persons, whom they label "bureaucrats," to have the subject matter of the bill transferred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee. We discussed the bill in

that committee. I do not believe that the suggestion of the pending motion had its origin in the Military Affairs Committee. That committee would not have thought of making such a suggestion if it had not received requests to do so. I do not believe that members of the Military Affairs Committee have read the hearings or even the report of the subcommittee on the bill.

From the standpoint of what the Senate should do in the matter, the question is quite different from that which has been argued this afternoon, namely, whether the bill should become law. I return to the question which I asked the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If any of the persons to whom he referred desired to take care of their interests, would they not think that the proper way to do so would be by suggesting that the subject of the bill be transferred? As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have a telephone. I am on pretty good terms with the heads of the departments. I have not had any trouble with them, and I would be as reasonable as any man on earth in seeing that full opportunity was given to the head of any department to present whatever appropriate argument he cared to present to the committee.

The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor recalls very distinctly that at the last session the chairman of the Committee on Finance called attention to the fact that a part of a certain bill which our committee had reported vitally affected his committee. We never made any objection, and neither did the chairman of the subcommittee make any objection to the bill being referred to the Committee on Finance. We have never been jealous of any other committee.

In the last session, both the junior and senior Senator from Texas introduced separate bills pertaining to labor, and had them referred to the Judiciary Committee. Not one word of protest came from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not one protest will come now.

If the bill under discussion goes to the Committee on Military Affairs, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will take part in the deliberations concerning the bill, and will attempt to inform the committee relative to the facts he obtained when hearings were held before the Committee on Education and Labor.

It seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said exactly the right thing. All committees of this body are merely committees of the United States Senate. They have no final jurisdiction over anything. They merely report to the Senate. They all have an equal task. They act for the Senate in making preliminary arrangements, making reports, holding hearings, and making recommendations.

Mr. President, I trust that as a result of the vote which is about to be taken there will not go out from this Chamber the implication that a committee of the Senate is being reprimanded for the way in which it has handled a certain bill, and

that another committee of the Senate has decided to take possession of the bill because it does not like it. Without a duplication of effort, how can the Committee on Military Affairs consider the bill except by either starting over again or building upon that which the Committee on Education and Labor has already done?

Shall we ignore the work which has already been done, and turn the subject over to another committee, to start from the beginning? Shall we completely turn our backs upon that which has already been accomplished?

Mr. President, everyone knows that the bill is as controversial as any that can come before the Senate during wartime. Everyone, therefore, realizes that any chairman would like to be rid of such a bill. It would have been a joy had the matter been handled in the right way, and had jurisdiction been requested. A telephone call would have taken care of it, I am sure. However, that was not done.

Mr. President, the Committee on Education and Labor stands before the country rebuked by Members of the Senate who have not read the committee's reports or its deliberations, and have not given the committee an opportunity to make a report on the bill.

This matter is out of the ordinary, and every Senator knows it to be. I should not be fair to myself, my committee, or my subcommittee, if I did not say what I have said.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was the Senator a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on this matter?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah is chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and appointed the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill. At the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, who had to be absent, the chairman presided over one hearing only.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Were hearings held, and was testimony taken?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Hearings were held and testimony was taken. Two volumes of the hearings have been printed and are available to Senators. One preliminary report has been made. The Senator has a copy of it on his desk.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator feel that the subcommittee finished its hearings and covered the ground?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the subcommittee has not finished its hearings. As soon as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor was informed that the bill had been ordered to lie on the table he asked the chairman of the subcommittee not to hold any more hearings until a meeting of the full committee could be held, otherwise hearings would be going on at this time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me ask how long it has been since the subcommittee ceased holding hearings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The subcommittee ceased holding hearings with the end of the last Congress.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me say that I have just read the preliminary report of the subcommittee. It seems to me it raises some very important questions. I should almost say that it is a severe indictment of our program of carrying on the war.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, does not that merely bear out all that I have said? That is talking about the bill itself. The bill has not had consideration by the committee; and until the committee has considered the bill it seems to me that the subcommittee and the committee itself should not be chastised for not considering it properly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further debate on the motion I suppose we might proceed to a vote. I think it desirable to dispose of the motion this afternoon. I think we should have a quorum present at the time when the motion is disposed of. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Stewart
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brewster	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Langer	Tobey
Burton	Lodge	Truman
Bushfield	Lucas	Tunnell
Butler	McClellan	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Capper	McNary	Van Nuys
Caraway	Maloney	Wallgren
Chandler	Maybank	Walsh
Chavez	Millikin	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Murray	Wiley
Danaher	Nye	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	
Ferguson	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. Not knowing how the Senator from New York would vote on this motion, I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is necessarily absent on official business. He has been paired by transfer. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—39		
Austin	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Barkley	George	Reed
Bilbo	Gerry	Reynolds
Bridges	Gurney	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Butler	Lodge	Tydings
Byrd	Lucas	Wallgren
Chandler	McClellan	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wiley
Danaher	Moore	Willis
NAYS—28		
Aiken	Kilgore	Shipstead
Andrews	La Follette	Taft
Bankhead	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bone	McFarland	Truman
Brewster	Maybank	Tunnell
Capper	Millikin	Vandenberg
Caraway	Murray	Van Nuys
Chavez	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	Overton	
Hawkes	Pepper	
NOT VOTING—29		
Bailey	Downey	Hatch
Ball	Eastland	Hayden
Barbour	Gillette	Johnson, Calif.
Buck	Glass	McCarran
Connally	Green	McKellar
Davis	Guffey	Mead

Murdock
O'Daniel
Radcliffe
Revercomb

Robertson
Scrugham
Smith
Thomas, Okla.

Wagner
White
Wilson

So Mr. REYNOLDS' motion was agreed to, and the bill (S. 607) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 93) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the membership of the special committee authorized by Senate Resolution 160, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to July 10, 1935, to investigate the production, transportation, and marketing of wool, as extended, is hereby increased to six members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the terms of the resolution, the Chair appoints the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] a member of the committee.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn to Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

Carl J. Werner, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William Ryan, deceased.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. John R. D. Matheson, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

LXXXIX—39

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Aaron S. Merrill to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of September 1942.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Clara G. Ross, Bellamy, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bobbie B. Hardegree, Talladega, Ala., in place of W. B. Hardegree, deceased.

Effie Sego, Waterloo, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARKANSAS

Kenneth B. Lasswell, Helena, Ark., in place of L. J. Wilkes, deceased

Lucy A. Stedley, Heth, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Oscar A. Teague, Hickory Ridge, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John S. Moses, McCaskill, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

David A. Massey, Palestine, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Alice E. Simmons, Alpine, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bessie K. Gore, Glen Ellen, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Oliver W. Parkison, Felton, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary C. Tierney, Freedom, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Michael L. Mery, Jr., Inverness, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Florence M. Smith, Laws, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Myrtle D. Jennings, Mount Eden, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary L. Cogan, Santa Margarita, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Janet D. Watson, Tahoe, Calif., in place of J. D. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

W. Howard Skinner, Vista, Calif., in place of A. D. Lawhead. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

COLORADO

Ethel A. Pfost, Arapahoe, Colo., in place of J. A. Pfost, resigned.

Flora G. Hier, Castle Rock, Colo., in place of F. G. Hier. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marie E. Greenwood, Stratton, Colo., in place of E. V. Logan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

Virgil C. Geddes, Brookfield, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John P. Mahoney, Long Hill, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clarence H. Davenport, Washington, Conn., in place of C. H. Davenport. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

Mildred K. DeLegal, Oakland Park, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

Marjorie C. Barineau, McRae, Ga., in place of P. H. Girardeau. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942

Hattie C. Williams, Pinehurst, Ga., in place of H. C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary H. Campbell, Plains, Ga., in place of M. H. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bernard A. Dayries, Port Wentworth, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IDAHO

Lola Rossi, Idaho City, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ILLINOIS

Myron Craig, Alma, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Carolyn Carter, Ashmore, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bernard G. Finnegan, Bradford, Ill., in place of B. G. Finnegan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lillian W. Tice, Chatham, Ill., in place of G. R. Bradley, transferred.

Fred O. Grissom, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fern Conard, La Moille, Ill., in place of Fern Conard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Raymond M. Hartman, Mount Carroll, Ill., in place of K. P. Wilkerson, removed.

Roger C. Morris, South Pekin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clark R. Morris, Xenia, Ill., in place of Croy Howard, resigned.

INDIANA

Jacob N. Hight, Etna Green, Ind., in place of J. N. Hight. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ted E. Dill, Francisco, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grover Wilson, Hebron, Ind., in place of J. V. Gidley, removed.

Emma Belle Wells, New Washington, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Esta Hildenbrand, Pine Village, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arthur Miller, Uniondale, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IOWA

Hans E. Eiel, Buffalo Center, Iowa, in place of H. E. Eiel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rita A. Thomas, Keswick, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Michael E. Griebel, Lone Tree, Iowa, in place of M. E. Griebel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rollin J. Gilchrist, Marengo, Iowa, in place of R. J. Gilchrist. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gertrude C. Ward, Melrose, Iowa, in place of G. C. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Pearle M. Nelson, Modale, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rose A. Stalder, Nodaway, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Joe H. Kout, Ocheyedan, Iowa, in place of A. B. Callender, retired.

Orlow L. Goodrich, Scranton, Iowa, in place of O. L. Goodrich. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KANSAS

Hugo A. Simonton, Alta Vista, Kans., in place of H. A. Simonton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jesse T. Poland, Barnes, Kans., in place of J. T. Poland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Albert F. Cassell, Beverly, Kans., in place of A. F. Cassell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James W. O'Connor, Chapman, Kans., in place of J. W. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Menard, Clyde, Kans., in place of J. J. Menard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Cyrus H. Wadsworth, Cottonwood Falls, Kans., in place of C. H. Wadsworth. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elmer R. Eymann, Deerfield, Kans., in place of E. R. Eymann. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mae S. Hodgson, Downs, Kans., in place of M. S. Hodgson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry A. Mason, Gypsum, Kans., in place of H. A. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Margaret A. Nelson, Lebanon, Kans., in place of E. C. Biggs, transferred.

William A. Harris, Le Roy, Kans., in place of W. A. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jack W. Boyle, McDonald, Kans., in place of J. W. Boyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nellie F. Walsh, Mayetta, Kans., in place of N. F. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mathias A. Arnoldy, Tipton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Raymond E. Simmons, Wellsville, Kans., in place of J. R. E. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ernest B. Hedge, Whiting, Kans., in place of E. B. Hedge. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Donald B. Hughes, Hardin, Ky., in place of D. B. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

W. Randolph White, Kuttawa, Ky., in place of C. W. Burnley, resigned.

LOUISIANA

T. Lucian Ducrest, Broussard, La., in place of T. L. Ducrest. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1942.

Flavia H. Wootton, Fisher, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Doris F. Williams, Good Pine, La. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Edgar O. Joynes, Newlano, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Kate P. McDonnell, Pelican, La., in place of K. P. McDonnell. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Leo L. Ehrhardt, Simmesport, La., in place of A. L. Dupont, transferred.

MAINE

Christine G. Davis, Eliot, Maine, in place of G. G. Plumpton, resigned.

Bertha M. Plummer, Raymond, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MARYLAND

Calvin L. Miller, Gambrills, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William F. Keys, Mount Rainier, Md., in place of W. F. Keys. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Parker E. Wilson, Bryantville, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Susan S. Rogers, Manomet, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nina M. Burr, Mendon, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lawrence D. Quinlan, Northfield, Mass., in place of L. D. Quinlan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ralph F. Manley, Teaticket, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Josephine Salsbury, Alto, Mich., in place of Josephine Salsbury. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clare E. Richardson, Augusta, Mich., in place of C. E. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Verne R. Moran, Carney, Mich., in place of V. R. Moran, transferred.

John P. Kelley, Deckerville, Mich., in place of J. P. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles L. Burns, Eau Claire, Mich., in place of C. L. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leonora Johnson, Ferrysburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles N. Davis, Hamburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Robert F. Allan, Holly, Mich., in place of R. F. Allan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John E. Rengo, Kaleva, Mich., in place of J. E. Rengo. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry A. Saur, Kent City, Mich., in place of H. A. Saur. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John E. Hogan, Linden, Mich., in place of J. E. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Sally A. Schulmeyer, Martin, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maude E. Doane, Pewamo, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Max A. Hill, Vicksburg, Mich., in place of M. A. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hilan E. Pray, Williamsburg, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MINNESOTA

Anna C. Dallaire, Ah-Gwah-Ching, Minn., in place of A. C. Dallaire. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Joseph G. McRaith, Belle Plaine, Minn., in place of J. G. McRaith. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Antoinette D. Hall, Campbell, Minn., in place of A. D. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Catherine C. Burns, Glenwood, Minn., in place of C. C. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eugene R. Sheridan, Hamel, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Tillman A. Brokken, Harmony, Minn., in place of T. A. Brokken. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Flora P. Lowry, Hollandale, Minn., in place of F. P. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Anton Malmberg, Lafayette, Minn., in place of Anton Malmberg. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.

Robert A. Collopy, Lake Elmo., Minn., in place of R. A. Collopy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Everett J. Kelly, Lake Benton, Minn., in place of F. L. Brady, resigned.

Reginald F. Ferrin, Mantorville, Minn., in place of R. F. Ferrin. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1942.

Michael H. Wadley, Millville, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John Claude Gowan, Ortonville, Minn., in place of J. C. Gowan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary J. Cain, Oxboro, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Otto J. Scharber, Rogers, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Andrew T. Sanvik, Starbuck, Minn., in place of A. T. Sanvik. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Lillian A. Peterson, Villard, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Esther E. Flynn, Westbrook, Minn., in place of M. G. Klasse. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1941.

MISSISSIPPI

Roy Scott Barber, Lake Cormorant, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alice L. Robertson, Pope, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James Vertner Gage, Port Gibson, Miss., in place of Joseph Davenport, resigned.

MISSOURI

Andrew J. Henson, Bell City, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Daniel C. Selvidge, Collins, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lulu M. Williams, Marston, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Roswell P. Lane, Naylor, Mo., in place of R. P. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elmer S. Foster, Neelyville, Mo., in place of E. S. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugh I. Holmes, St. Charles, Mo., in place of H. I. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Albert B. Iffrig, St. Peters, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles F. Halligan, Union, Mo., in place of C. F. Halligan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Max C. Jensen, Bridgeport, Nebr., in place of M. C. Jensen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bert Winters, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edith E. Fahrlander, Brule, Nebr., in place of E. E. Fahrlander. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Tobie H. Wilken, Bruning, Nebr., in place of T. H. Wilken. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Curtis B. Bengler, Callaway, Nebr., in place of C. B. Bengler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Kenneth R. Newcomb, Cambridge, Nebr., in place of K. R. Newcomb. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William H. Leff, Carleton, Nebr., in place of W. H. Leff. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gladys J. Brown, Crookston, Nebr., in place of G. J. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lloyd H. Metzger, Culbertson, Nebr., in place of L. H. Metzger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Don Dey Ermand, Dalton, Nebr., in place of Don Dey Ermand. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Russell Mooberry, Dorchester, Nebr., in place of Russell Mooberry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Paul W. McCoy, Edison, Nebr., in place of P. W. McCoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter O. Troxel, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar C. Thomas, Franklin, Nebr., in place of O. C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

E-yan J. Snyder, Fullerton, Nebr., in place of B. J. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George L. Koehler, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koehler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John H. Holden, Gordon, Nebr., in place of J. H. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clifford R. Frasier, Gothenburg, Nebr., in place of C. R. Frasier. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Urv V. Dobbs, Grant, Nebr., in place of U. V. Dobbs. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dorothy M. Porter, Haigler, Nebr., in place of D. M. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry T. Dunn, Harrison, Nebr., in place of H. T. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George A. Kittle, Hayes Center, Nebr., in place of G. A. Kittle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clyde Yardley, Hemingford, Nebr., in place of Clyde Yardley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George H. Looschen, Hooper, Nebr., in place of G. H. Looschen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles L. Schunk, Kenesaw, Nebr., in place of C. L. Schunk. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugo Stevens, Kilgore, Nebr., in place of Hugo Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Heen M. Cramer, Leigh, Nebr., in place of H. M. Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Andres P. Peterson, Lindsay, Nebr., in place of A. P. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Juna M. Daly, Lisco, Nebr., in place of J. M. Daly. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel L. Ossenkop, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James C. Nelson, Mason City, Nebr., in place of J. C. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary Walsh Morrow, Merna, Nebr., in place of M. W. Morrow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Max R. Herrington, Millard, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

LaVern A. Breeden, Minatare, Nebr., in place of L. A. Breeden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eva G. Quick, Morrill, Nebr., in place of E. G. Quick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Almira R. Boblitz, Oconto, Nebr., in place of A. R. Boblitz. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Franklin D. Strobe, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strobe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Matthew T. Liewer, Osmond, Nebr., in place of M. T. Liewer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James T. Haffey, Oxford, Nebr., in place of J. T. Haffey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Stanton A. Troutman, Palisade, Nebr., in place of S. A. Troutman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar A. Pilger, Pilger, Nebr., in place of O. A. Pilger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Martin Sorenson, Plainview, Nebr., in place of Martin Sorenson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William M. Goding, Potter, Nebr., in place of W. M. Goding. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bert S. Amos, Sargent, Nebr., in place of B. S. Amos. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Amos Frieden, Shickley, Nebr., in place of Amos Frieden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bessie L. Baughan, Stamford, Nebr., in place of B. L. Baughan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Josh B. Keene, Sumner, Nebr., in place of J. B. Keene. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter P. Flynn, Ulysses, Nebr., in place of W. P. Flynn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Leo E. Kraft, Unadilla, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lula Newman, Wallace, Nebr., in place of Lula Newman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John Q. Kirkman, Wood Lake, Nebr., in place of J. Q. Kirkman. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

S. Lucy Weeks, Chocorua, N. H., in place of C. B. Weeks, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Michael A. Nigro, Berkeley Heights, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grace V. Willard, Crosswicks, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edward M. McIntyre, Gibbsboro, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Georgia A. Barth, Landisville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edward J. Wagner, Marlton, N. J., in place of E. J. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Annie Lester, Monmouth Junction, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jeremiah B. Beaton, Mount Ephraim, N. J., in place of J. B. Beaton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Salvatore Verde, Northvale, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mervil E. Hass, Riverton, N. J., in place of M. E. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Smith Kennedy, Roseland, N. J., in place of Smith Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Anthony J. Savarese, Woodcliff Lake, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

Callie C. Marshall, Bennett, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rosalie Byrd, Elida, N. Mex., in place of Rosalie Byrd. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ovid Pullen, Harmony, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Marshall M. Tilley, Hoffman, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

W. Edgar Johnson, King, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Taft S. Putnam, Lawndale, N. C., in place of A. C. Burns, resigned.

Jessie B. Williams, Manchester, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harold J. Young, Nantahala, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Dallas Lowdermilk, Norman, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John A. Williams, Oxford, N. C., in place of J. A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John W. Ivey, Sevensprings, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Andrew O. Williams, Bottineau, N. Dak., in place of A. O. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles C. Shearer, Flasher, N. Dak., in place of C. C. Shearer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Altha B. Waddell, Forbes, N. Dak., in place of A. B. Waddell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George A. Swen, Gilby, N. Dak., Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George W. McIntyre, Jr., Grafton, N. Dak., in place of G. W. McIntyre, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Karl E. Fischer, Hague, N. Dak., in place of K. E. Fischer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Francis O. Johnson, Hillsboro, N. Dak., in place of F. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

J. Benus Kinneberg, Leeds, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Kinneberg. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John E. Hunter, Mayville, N. Dak., in place of J. E. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Louis J. Allmaras, New Rockford, N. Dak., in place of L. J. Allmaras. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Arthur W. Hendrickson, Walcott, N. Dak., in place of A. W. Hendrickson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hans C. Nelson, Washburn, N. Dak., in place of H. C. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OHIO

Fred Durr, Bradford, Ohio, in place of Fred Durr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Farland A. Humbert, Howard, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas Kyer, Jackson, Ohio, in place of Thomas Kyer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Perry L. Heintz, Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of P. L. Heintz. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ethel S. Reames, Lynchburg, Ohio, in place of E. S. Reames. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Garrett W. Bowen, Newtown, Ohio, in place of G. W. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nelle Stinebaugh, Republic, Ohio, in place of Nelle Stinebaugh. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frankie Junkerman, Sugar Grove, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Laura Belle Williams, Braggs, Okla. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

William T. Gaddis, Catoosa, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Gladys M. Walker, Choctaw, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ida C. Courtney, Copan, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Verna Russell, Dill, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Loula M. Amick, Jefferson, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OREGON

Edwin Allen, Forest Grove, Oreg., in place of Edwin Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1942.

Frank C. Allen, Lake Grove, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles W. Allen, Bedford, Pa., in place of H. E. Cuppett, resigned.

Clarence W. Scheuren, Collegeville, Pa., in place of C. W. Scheuren. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eugene K. Richard, Elysburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nelle Boyle, Freeland, Pa., in place of Neale Boyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Margaret Mary Hughes, Greensburg, Pa., in place of J. T. Painter, retired.

Harry A. McIntosh, Hollidaysburg, Pa., in place of H. A. McIntosh. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter A. Tiffany, Kingsley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Fred W. Patterson, Lattimer Mines, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Robert P. Carson, Madera, Pa., in place of R. O. Lamborn, resigned.

Maude E. Culp, Maytown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nona Tolbert, Millerton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joseph L. Meehan, Montrose, Pa., in place of J. L. Meehan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frank J. Murphy, New Albany, Pa., in place of L. T. Cullen, transferred.

Russell W. Mosteller, Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of R. W. Mosteller. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

Samuel G. Thomas, Fort Kennedy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary A. Turner, Pricedale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Leonard Buranovsky, Ramey, Pa., Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Paul A. Martin, Roaring Spring, Pa., in place of P. A. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jean Burke, St. Michael, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John F. Siegel, Saylorsburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harold I. Haines, Thompsontown, Pa., in place of H. I. Haines. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lorena E. Port, Thorndale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rosanna McGee, Towanda, Pa., in place of Rosanna McGee. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1942.

Gwilym Evans, Trucksville, Pa., in place of N. A. Staub, resigned.

Frederick A. Entrot, Union Dale, Pa., in place of F. A. Entrot. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rose C. Pierson, Villa Maria, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary A. Brunski, Wanamie, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Hazel M. Herbert, West Decatur, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Margaret B. Glomb, Wexford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Edward C. Hardt, Wildwood, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Richard Hancock, Williamstown, Pa., in place of J. R. Hancock. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances B. Maines, Woodland, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Frank A. Crippen, Youngsville, Pa., in place of F. A. Crippen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PUERTO RICO

Cesar Rossy, Ciales, P. R., in place of Cesar Rossy. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul F. W. Waller, Myers, S. C., in place of P. F. W. Waller. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walker B. Graves, Pageland, S. C., in place of C. M. Graves, deceased.

Louise P. McCain, Richburg, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Reuben Vance Lanford, Woodruff, S. C., in place of R. V. Lanford. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Orion D. Strawn, Hillsboro, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Claude L. Swaggerty, Kimberlin Heights, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Kathryn N. Suttle, Pleasant Hill, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Vance S. Reese, Raleigh, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alma L. Wells, Sherwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

TEXAS

Ferris S. Gault, Agua Dulce, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Paul V. Bryant, Canadian, Tex., in place of P. V. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fern C. Fields, Clint, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jack M. Wade, Dalhart, Tex., in place of J. M. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary V. Rollings, Dodson, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

A. Warren Dunn, Fort Stockton, Tex., in place of A. W. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Samuel C. Rhinehart, Iraan, Tex., in place of S. C. Rhinehart. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Lizzie Baker, Karnack, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grace L. McKay, Madisonville, Tex., in place of G. L. McKay. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary F. Wakefield, Midway, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joe W. Hartfield, New London, Tex., in place of B. D. Vick, transferred.

Benjamin F. Hobson, Paducah, Tex., in place of B. F. Hobson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mazel M. Reasoner, Pearland, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grundy F. Wimberly, Sr., Perrin, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mills Awbrey, Presidio, Tex., in place of Mills Awbrey. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Marvin G. Prewitt, Ralls, Tex., in place of M. G. Prewitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lucile Cline, Seabrook, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John L. Brunner, Taylor, Tex., in place of J. L. Brunner. Incumbent's commission expired April 11, 1942.

Frederick I. Massengill, Terrell, Tex., in place of F. I. Massengill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

UTAH

Hyrum A. White, Beaver, Utah, in place of H. A. White. Incumbent's commission expired June 25, 1940.

Mildred G. Allen, Escalante, Utah, in place of M. G. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ewell C. Bowen, Hiawatha, Utah, in place of E. C. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Arnold C. Richins, Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of F. D. Atwood, deceased.

VERMONT

Anson S. Hawkins, South Shaftsbury, Vt., in place of A. S. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

VIRGINIA

John T. Trevey, Big Island, Va., in place of J. T. Trevey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lena S. Perkins, Cedar Bluff, Va., in place of L. S. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William H. Smith, Jr., Charlotte Court House, Va., in place of W. H. Smith, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rufus G. Roberts, Culpeper, Va., in place of R. G. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clarence M. Sale, Falls Church, Va., in place of C. M. Sale. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Beveridge B. Cox, Gate City, Va., in place of B. B. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert E. Rodgers, Hampden Sydney, Va., in place of J. W. Rodgers, retired.

Edna H. Jennings, Hickory, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James G. Albert, Honaker, Va., in place of J. G. Albert. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph S. Rasnick, St. Paul, Va., in place of J. S. Rasnick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rufus W. Garris, South Hill, Va., in place of R. W. Garris. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Warren P. Clarke, Woodbridge, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WASHINGTON

Mary E. Theler, Belfair, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bernt A. Hansen, Chinook, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Omar H. Snow, Cusick, Wash., in place of J. F. Lavigne, retired.

James B. Robertson, Kettle Falls, Wash., in place of J. B. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Anna I. Foy, Lacey, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Tormod A. Myklebust, Lacrosse, Wash., in place of T. A. Myklebust. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry A. B. Gavin, Malott, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maston W. Carleton, Seahurst, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Pearl B. Burrill, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., in place of P. B. Burrill. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Connie C. Wall, Winlock, Wash., in place of C. C. Wall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Torrence Cook, Amherstdale, W. Va., in place of Torrence Cook. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Tamburini, Bayard, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas M. Deegan, Benwood, W. Va., in place of T. M. Deegan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

S. Cleveland Underwood, Bethany, W. Va., in place of S. C. Underwood. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mark V. Brown, Bridgeport, W. Va., in place of M. V. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Katherine C. Brannen, Cabin creek, W. Va., in place of K. C. Brannen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clark E. Heckert, Cairo, W. Va., in place of C. E. Heckert. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Anna S. Been, Camden on Gauley, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James H. Moyer, Cass, W. Va., in place of J. H. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Maude Langdon, Chapmanville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Margaret C. Farry, Eastbank, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arthur J. Duncan, Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. J. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George O. Sinsel, Flemington, W. Va., in place of G. O. Sinsel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Walker, Follansbee, W. Va., in place of J. J. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John C. Blanton, Freeman, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clarence L. Perkins, Gassaway, W. Va., in place of C. L. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William O. Umstead, Grantsville, W. Va., in place of W. O. Umstead. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mayme E. Marquette, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George W. Kilmer, Hedgesville, W. Va., in place of G. W. Kilmer. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1941.

Carl Hinton, Hinton, W. Va., in place of Carl Hinton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dorothy Webb Proffit, Kingston, W. Va., in place of D. W. Proffit. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Della A. Kelly, Montgomery, W. Va., in place of D. A. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Justus O. Eakin, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Russell W. Casto, Nitro, W. Va., in place of R. W. Casto. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Foster Mack Kiger, Paden City, W. Va., in place of Mack Kiger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Vesta Lee Connell, Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of V. L. Connell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Wilbur S. Moore, Pine Grove, W. Va., in place of W. S. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Julia T. Bradley, Power, W. Va., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

Durward P. Currey, Sandyville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Newton S. Wood, Valley Head, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Chris Kartman, Cassville, Wis., in place of Chris Kartman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marie Gunn Dunham, Cumberland, Wis., in place of M. G. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Will Riley, Darlington, Wis., in place of Will Riley. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Frank J. Shortner, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Tessa B. Morrissy, Elkhorn, Wis., in place of T. B. Morrissy. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1942.

Reginald L. Barnes, Greenwood, Wis., in place of R. L. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Frank M. Doyle, Ladysmith, Wis., in place of F. M. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Edward L. Murphy, Middleton, Wis., in place of H. A. Victora, deceased.

Viola Klassy, New Glarus, Wis., in place of F. J. Marty, retired.

Celestine D. Kaltenbach, Potosi, Wis., in place of C. D. Kaltenbach. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William Murray, Prescott, Wis., in place of William Murray. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Solon A. McCollow, River Falls, Wis., in place of S. A. McCollow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John C. Reinke, Stone Lake, Wis., in place of J. C. Reinke. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Charles M. Dunn, Taylor, Wis., in place of C. M. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Arnold A. Conklin, Vesper, Wis., in place of A. A. Conklin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WYOMING

Edward N. Greff, Chugwater, Wyo., in place of E. N. Greff. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Lena M. Wilson, Midwest, Wyo., in place of G. W. Nance, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1943:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite his name:

Claude S. Gillette, May 13, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who art the Father of our spirits, before whose eyes nothing is concealed, we rejoice that Thou dost know us and dost consider us in mercy. We pray for the discouraged, for the tempted and for all who are far from the covenant of promise. Give us the tranquillity of those feelings which rise above aspirations born in the things of time. Quicken us not only with a creed but with an experience, with inspiration rather than with restraint. Do Thou make us strong, have pity on what we are, reveal to us what we should be and with Thy saving presence help us to translate our visions of righteous duty into abiding reality.

Oh, crown us with the sacrificial spirit of service and with a living faith that cannot fail and which is ready to battle against those iniquitous lands which are staining the seas of the world with innocent blood. Oh, sustain our country with an unwithering and with an un-

wasting power of her great soul, that all dreams of a good world shall not perish from the heart of man. We pray for our chivalrous President, our Speaker, and all Members of the Congress; guide us through working hours and at evening time give us peace. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 1498, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. GEORGE P. DARROW

Mr. SCOTT. 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. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor from the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the Honorable George P. Darrow, is 84 years of age today. He is full of years, fruitful years, of service to others. Those of you who know him, know that this, his birthday, will be a day of recollections and fond memories of those with whom he served in this House during 24 years. I know on the occasion of my visits to him that he valued most of all those recollections; and may I take the liberty of suggesting to those Members of this House who served with him that it would make his heart very happy indeed if you were to send him some communication on this his eighty-fourth birthday.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As one who served with Mr. Darrow for probably two decades, I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that no man who has ever served in this House was held in higher esteem. You may send him this message, and I am sure it reflects the feel-

ings of the Members at least on this side of the aisle. That we all wish for him an abundance of those things which Shakespeare said should accompany old age. Honor, love, obedience, and troops of friends.

Mr. SCOTT. And I know he will be glad to receive your message, and many similar expressions of good will from both sides of the aisle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

A PACIFIC WAR COUNCIL SHOULD BE CREATED

Mr. ROLPH. 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. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, a separate Pacific war council should be set up at once. Every day of delay is dangerous. Every day of delay gives the Japanese precious time to dig in and fortify those areas so ruthlessly overrun. Nothing is more vital to the preservation of our American way of life than the defeat of Japan's war lords. Their ideologies and ours cannot exist side by side. We tried it. Pearl Harbor is the answer. As early as 1900 the citizens of San Francisco sponsored anti-Japanese legislation. In 1904 national sentiment had crystallized to the extent that the American Federation of Labor adopted resolutions asking permanent exclusion of the Japanese. We of the Pacific coast know whereof we speak. I cannot urge too strongly the supreme importance of the Pacific war area to our country's very existence.

LABOR DISTURBANCE IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Billings Gazette published in Billings, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an item on lard from the Farm Journal.

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

There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and the public must know by this time that ample production of food for our armed forces is essential if we are to win this war. We hear on the floor of the House every day, complaints against the several departments of Government, because the responsible departments have done little or nothing to help solve the agricultural problems or the man-labor problems of this Nation.

I hope you will read the resolution which I am asking to be printed in the RECORD. This resolution was presented by the farmers of western Nebraska and suggests the solving of certain problems in connection with agriculture if crops are to be planted and harvested. The need for more help on the farm will become more and more acute unless something is done to relieve the shortage. The farmers of America must be provided with sufficient farm machinery and parts for repair if they are going to produce the food so badly needed for our fighting forces. The farmer must also be guaranteed a profit for the crop he raises. Under the present conditions the farmers are finding it impossible to compete with defense industry in the matter of wages and hours of labor.

It is a responsibility of Congress to do everything possible to assist agriculture. Let us pray God that it will not be necessary to have several million hungry stomachs in order to make those in authority take the proper steps in seeing that the farmer is not only given the necessary machinery but a profit for his efforts and labor for the production of food.

MEETING OF THE HOUSE AT 11 O'CLOCK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during the session of the House in connection with the aviation bill.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the San Francisco Labor Council signed by John F. Shelley, president, and John A. O'Connell, secretary, and attached statement with reference to interference on the part of the National Labor Relations Board with contracts now in existence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Lions Club of Riverton, Wyo.

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

There was no objection.

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

MOVING THE CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES WEST

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, one of the Washington papers, the Washington Times-Herald, carries an editorial, Move the Capital, and proposes that the Capital of the country be moved to some point in the Middle West.

In this connection may I recall the fact that the White House was established and operated in the Black Hills of South Dakota for 3 months in the summer of 1927 and it was operated out there very successfully. I recall a special press conference for the National Editorial Association at which President Coolidge took occasion to comment on how easily he kept in touch with national and international affairs, having that morning dealt with a problem arising at a conference in Switzerland.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I recall very vividly while the White House was in South Dakota, President Coolidge complied with my request and removed a man by the name of Fenning who was plundering the crazy soldiers in St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. CASE. There is no question but that the Coolidge experience proved that the idea is feasible. There is no question but that a more truly American and representative approach to our problems would result if the seat of government were more nearly in the heart of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to print an article by Frank Kent.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address of the Governor of the State of Arizona.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article that appeared in the Sunday New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because the salesman for Jergens Lotion undoubtedly has forgotten to mention it—he was so busy calling 14,000,000 Americans damn fools last Sunday night that it slipped his mind—I want to read a brief excerpt from the Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, page 42:

MISREPRESENTING COSMETICS * * *

Jergens-Woodbury Sales Corporation, Cincinnati: This respondent was ordered to cease and desist from representing its face powders and creams to be germicidal while in use or that its face creams and soap have any beneficial effect on the skin by reason of their vitamin content.

It is possible that Jergens-Woodbury Sales Corporation, of Cincinnati, is a different organization than the Andrew Jergens Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, and that the former is just a sales agency for the latter, or that there is no connection between the two, and that one or the other, or perhaps both, will in time disown the New York snooper.

For some time many people have known that, in addition to being a key-hole peeper, a purveyor of ofttimes false, salacious gossip, and of old, shop-worn, so-called news items which he distributed as advance, confidential information, Winchell was, as we used to say, "a mite teched—just a little queer." As a salesman, he certainly distinguished himself last Sunday night, when, as a representative of a Jergens product, he insulted some of that company's customers by calling them damn fools.

Members of Congress who are married should tell their wives, while those who are unmarried should be sure to give to

their lady friends the information just quoted from the report of the Federal Trade Commission. The ladies will certainly be interested in learning that a seller of face powders and creams was ordered to desist from misrepresenting its merchandise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OPERATIONS UNDER FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY EMERGENCY RELIEF APPROPRIATION ACTS, 1942 AND 1943

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943, I present herewith a report of the operations under funds appropriated to the Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, fiscal years 1942 and 1943, to the end of the calendar year 1942.

This report is supplemental to that portion of the report presented by me to the Congress on January 11, 1943, which is related to operations to the end of the fiscal year 1942 under funds appropriated to the Work Projects Administration by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, and for fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1943.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Norton
Beall	Gross	O'Leary
Bland	Hagen	O'Toole
Bolton	Hays	Rabaut
Bradley, Mich.	Horan	Richards
Brehm	Jones	Rivers
Buckley	Kennedy	Shafer
Cochran	Kirwan	Short
Creal	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Cullen	Lesinski	Starnes, Ala.
Domengeaux	Lewis, Colo.	Summers, Tex.
Douglas	McGregor	Weichel, Ohio
Ellis	Marcantonio	Whichel, Ga.
Ellsworth	Miller, Pa.	Winter
Engel	Morrison, N. C.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1648, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, such time as he may desire.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of the supply bills. It is the first appropriation bill of the session and of the Congress—the first of a long line of bills appropriating money from the Treasury which it will be necessary for the committee to present to the House for your consideration during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

At this time I wish to express appreciation of the way in which the bill has been handled. I do not believe I have seen an appropriation bill more painstakingly prepared or more ably presented than the one here submitted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], with the assistance and cooperation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the ranking members of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], in collaboration with the other majority and minority members of the subcommittee. I have no doubt that the chairman will agree that the clerk of the committee, George Harvey, has also borne a share of the burden.

This bill is a legislative milestone. It marks the end of a notable legislative period and the beginning of what promises to be a still more notable period in the fiscal relations of the Nation and the conduct of the war. For that reason, it is appropriate that we pause for an instant at this time and take stock of where we stand; that we make an appraisal of what has been accomplished in the session just closed and outline future objectives.

The Committee on Appropriations has established a unique record. Never before has a committee of the House reported out bills carrying such extraordinary amounts—amounts unequaled in the budgets of the American Congress and unapproached in the records of any parliamentary body in the history of the world. Seldom, if ever, has a committee sat more continuously and through longer hours and may I venture to express the hope, Mr. Chairman, that measured also by the criterion of efficiency its work in the Seventy-seventh

Congress also ranks high in the annals of the House.

And lest there be some question on that score, permit me to submit a factual summary based on the ultimate disposition of these appropriations in terms of service and material. Inasmuch as all values are relative, let us take as a yardstick similar accomplishment programs in the last two wars; the Spanish-American War and the First World War. Of merchant ships built in World War No. 1 we supplied a total of 257 units with a combined tonnage of 1,606,000 tons during the period from August 1, 1917, to July 31, 1918, a period of 1 year.

As against that we have built in 1 year of this war a total of 727 units, nearly three times the number in the first year of World War No. 1, and over 8,000,000 tons, which is about five times the tonnage in the first year of the last war. In the total inventory of military airplanes—and that is the weapon upon which this war turns—we produced in World War No. 1 during the entire period of the war a total of 12,000 planes, to be exact, 12,089 planes as against a total of 47,689 planes in the first year of this war.

In machine guns, coming down to the weapon of direct contact, we produced throughout the duration of World War No. 1, 226,000 machine guns, whereas in the first year only of this war we manufactured 670,000 machine guns, about three times the entire production of the First World War over the entire period of its duration. In small-arms ammunition, the vital common denominator in war matériel, we produced 3,500,000,000 rounds in the First World War, and against that item in the first year of the present conflict, 10,250,000,000 rounds. In artillery ammunition we provided in the First World War a total of 18,000,000 rounds, and by way of contrast, in the first year of the present war 181,000,000 rounds. That is a fair measure of production secured in the two wars.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible at this time to put into the RECORD a complete tabulation showing production and delivery of all classes of armament and munitions, but for military reasons we are not permitted to divulge at this time, data indicating the extent of our remarkable progress in preparedness in other branches of the service. Suffice to say that, as compared with the last World War, the results secured in provision for this war more than bear out the ratios already cited.

In taking care of the personnel, there has been corresponding improvement. Whereas in the Spanish-American War there were recurrent scandals incident to the serving of spoiled meat, which will be remembered as the "embalmed meat scandals of 1898," there has been no instance in this war of any complaints either as to the quantity or of the quality of the rations served.

In 1898 we sent our forces into a tropical climate in winter uniforms. In this war, of all the millions of men we have outfitted, for every clime and region ranging from the Arctic Circle down to

the Equator, there has been no complaint about the character or suitability of the clothing issued to our men. In the previous war the men were paid \$13 a month. In this war we are paying \$50 a month. The camps of 1898 fostered disease from yellow fever to dysentery, and, in the First World War, contagions of influenza carried men away by the thousands. There has been no report in this war of any infection or contagion, and the Army and Navy maintain a health rate that even surpasses that of the civilian population. Measured by any criterion, we have prepared for war, more expeditiously, more efficiently, and with less mistakes or maladministration than ever before in the history of American arms. We have inducted more men into the service under better conditions, better fed, better clothed, better housed, better paid, better hospitalized than in any previous war in this country or in any other country.

It is a matter of record. There it stands—a record that cannot be disputed or denied. The war record of the Seventy-seventh Congress, unequalled, unchallenged, unimpeachable, and unassailable.

It is not a partisan record. On the contrary, it is a nonpartisan record, a bipartisan record, an American record. And I want to here make due acknowledgment of the service and participation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations and all minority members of the committee in that record. But for the warm cooperation of the gentleman from New York and his colleagues, their wise counsel, their patriotic collaboration, the task of the committee and the House would have been immeasurably more complicated and infinitely more difficult. It is a record in which all of us on both sides of the aisle may take satisfaction, and one of which every American citizen may be proud. It is a record which has turned the tide of the war. During this first year of the war we have passed through the entire gamut from crushing defeat and disaster on to the way to ultimate success and victory. We have now in every theater of the war passed from the phase of defense to that of attack.

The Seventy-seventh Congress laid the foundation on which the Seventy-eighth Congress will rise to victory.

The military experts of every nation, including Adolf Hitler himself, agreed that the turning point of the war would come in 1942. The Fuehrer announced over the radio to the people of Germany and the Axis Powers that in order to win the war they must win in 1942. Nineteen hundred and forty-two has passed, and they did not win. The year 1942 marked the turning point in our march toward victory. By the 30th day of June we will have completed out of funds provided by the Seventy-seventh Congress practically all of the construction work needed to carry out the war program. By the end of this fiscal year we will have designed, contracted, erected, equipped, tooled, and manned the facilities necessary to produce the matériel and the arms with which to win this war. From now on it is

merely a matter of keeping these facilities in efficient operation, in achieving and maintaining peak production in those plants, shops, and factories already provided.

The Seventy-seventh Congress was the war Congress. The Seventy-eighth Congress is the victory Congress. The Seventy-ninth Congress should be the peace Congress; but both the victories of the Seventy-eighth Congress and the enduring peace to be negotiated by the Seventy-ninth Congress would have been impossible without the unparalleled achievements of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Had the Seventy-seventh Congress failed, America would have failed; the world would have failed.

But the war is not over. While victory is in sight, it is yet a long way off. It is still in the far distance, and we face now the most ruinous, gruelling phase of this war, heartbreaking losses, and emergencies in which every effort must be marshaled, every resource utilized. Especially must we husband the Nation's revenues.

While we must continue to provide ample appropriations for military purposes, we must in every way possible reduce nonwar expenditures. Already we have made a record in that respect. Notwithstanding the pressure under which we worked in the last Congress, we were able to cut by more than a billion dollars the nonwar appropriations which would have been made in normal times. Even under the urgent impetus of war, and carrying the heavy burden placed on the committee and on the House, we made record retrenchments. We hope to effect even greater reduction in nonmilitary appropriations in the coming session. In the last Congress under the whip of impending attack it was necessary at times to close our eyes and appropriate for war purposes generously. In many instances we had no choice but to take the recommendations of the Army and the Navy inquiries which involved delay. Money was necessary immediately, and we were not in position to deny it. On such occasions we proceeded on the theory that it was better to appropriate too much, better to be too soon and too generous rather than to run the risk of appropriating too little and providing that little too late. We could not gamble on the outcome. There was too much at stake. The maintenance of the Nation and the preservation of civilization was wavering in the balance. And be it said to the credit of the great Army and Navy leaders on whom we relied, we were never misled. Viewed in retrospect, the appropriations of the Seventy-seventh Congress were more than justified.

But now that the burden of the first phase of the war has been lightened, now that the construction era is passed, and the pressure of the emergency is somewhat relieved, we can return to the established routine of investigating fully before appropriating. We now propose to again scrutinize carefully every proposition to spend. In the bill before you, prepared under the able direction of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from New York [Mr.

TABER], we have scrutinized carefully all appropriations, and especially all nonwar appropriations. We expect to appropriate as accurately as possible, but on war appropriations, if we make any mistake, it still will be to make the mistake of being too generous. But on nonwar appropriations, if we make any mistake, it will be the mistake of cutting too deeply.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I wish the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee would tell us if in the judgment of the committee you will also scrutinize unexpended balances and not vote for so much money that these departments do not even have to come to us but can defy us in the future because they do not need any money, they have plenty already.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman can be assured that the committee examines into the balances on hand when we are considering new money. Also funds are appropriated on a fiscal year basis so that if they are not obligated in that fiscal year they will lapse and cannot be used and must revert to the surplus fund of the Treasury unless they should be reappropriated by action of Congress.

Of course, there are instances in which we have to follow a legislative mandate. There is legislation under which we have no authority except to appropriate; the money is automatically required under the law and we cannot stop it. In the matter of interest on the public debt, for example, that is a permanent appropriation, automatically recurring each year, without annual action by Congress. It is something over which Congress does not exercise any annual review. It would not accomplish anything to do so as the debt is a certain amount and the various interest rates are fixed and bondholders must be paid their interest. In the matter of veterans' benefits the rates are fixed by law and the appropriation automatically fixes itself by the number who qualify.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman spoke about retrenchments and cutting down the amount of the appropriations. Will the gentleman tell us, if that is correct, why it is for 1944 there are \$1,938,000,000 more appropriated here in this bill than there was for 1943?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The figures to which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] refers are the permanent appropriations which I have just referred to. The principal amount in the figure he has quoted is increase for interest on the public debt and it is automatic. We exercise no control over the amount. The volume of debt and interest rates govern it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The appropriation bill itself.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amounts to which the gentleman refers are not contained in this bill. They are the so-called automatic appropriations and are printed in this report for information purposes. They have been appropriated by statutes previously enacted and will continue until repealed or modified. They are in the nature of fixed charges and are not subject to much, if any, discretionary determination.

We are not controlled by the Budget estimate. The fact that an estimate has been sent up to us for any amount, or that any amount has been asked for, does not mean we are going to grant it. When these estimates finally pass through the mill of the committee you will find that all surplus water has been squeezed out and all surplus money has been eliminated.

We have had the cooperation of the President. We have been furnished tables showing the amounts impounded by the Executive after the money was provided, where it was found possible under changing conditions to retain some of that money. The President in 1941 and 1942 impounded a vast sum, and we expect him to follow the same plan in the coming Congress.

For example, in the fiscal year 1943, out of every dollar spent by the United States, 94.8 cents goes for war purposes, and only 5.2 cents is for non-war purposes. We expect to continue that course and are outlining that as our policy. We are setting that as our objective. We are going to try to do even better in this Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Are the sums that the President has impounded turned back to the Treasury and do they come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly, at the end of the fiscal year they revert to the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They can be reappropriated only by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They can be appropriated by the Congress only with the concurrence of the gentleman himself and his colleagues.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a good many factors are involved in the consideration of this bill. It is not possible to make as large a percentage reduction in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill as in some of the other bills, but a great many reductions have been made and a great many more should be made.

We found one place where a bureau was afflicted with the same type of governmental employee that constitutes the great bottleneck in the defense effort. Nothing has done more to impede, harass, and slow up the war effort than the presence of so many alleged economists on the Federal pay roll. They are in this bill in the item for expenses of loans,

having to do with the promotion of the sale of Government securities. There they are messing things up, there they are holding up progress, there they are doing things that are keeping people from buying bonds and stamps, instead of promoting their sale.

In the Office of Price Administration they are delaying for weeks and weeks decisions on applications made by manufacturers and retailers and farmers as to prices, without having the slightest knowledge about the matters they are holding up. In the War Production Board they are doing the same thing, holding up and delaying the decisions with reference to priorities.

It is up to us just as far as we are able to get rid of those persons who have absolutely no business on the Federal pay roll, who are no asset but instead are a decided, direct, and positive liability to every bit of the war effort.

The other day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] gave us a long list of people who, he said, are afflicted with communistic or subversive tendencies. Frankly, I have not been able to cover the ground with reference to them so that I would want to say whether or not the charges are correct. I do know that as to those whose records I have been able to cover, I have covered them in one way, and I have failed to find one of them who is performing a real service in the department, the bureau, or the agency to which he is assigned. I think every one of them will be found to be either a drag on the efforts of that bureau or department or totally incompetent and absolutely doing nothing and producing nothing. I know some of them are in that category. No harm would be done to governmental efficiency if every one of them was wiped off the pay roll.

The largest part of that group of so-called economists whose activities come under this bill are covered in the item relating to expenses of loans, are supposed to promote the sales of securities. This item was \$13,636,739 for this current year. The way it is set up, after the cut the committee made, it is \$9,347,000, and with that they will have more money than they will know what to do with in an efficient and intelligent way.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are the members of the group to which the gentleman refers just useless in that particular department, or does the gentleman mean that they should not be in the Government service anywhere?

Mr. TABER. Those alleged economists who are on the pay roll and who are holding up the war effort the way they are in the Office of Price Administration, in the War Production Board, and in the sales promotion efforts of the Treasury Department, should not be on the pay roll anywhere. They are totally inefficient and ineffective. They are doing more damage than good. Their only effectiveness is as a bottleneck to prevent things from being done. Sometimes they do things wrong, I will hand them

that; but they have no grasp of the economic situation in this country, they have no capacity whatever to perform real service for the Government of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just one further question. The gentleman recalls that last year the Congress did name certain individuals and provided that none of the money appropriated in a particular bill under discussion should be expended to either pay or compensate them for any service or expenditure, and then those individuals were taken over into other departments.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any way to reach those people no matter where they may be, say, by a general bill providing that no funds appropriated or now on hand should be paid to any of them, naming them?

Mr. TABER. The only way you could keep them off every pay roll would be by limiting the payment in every single appropriation bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could we not pass a general act?

Mr. TABER. We could, but the President could veto it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But suppose he does?

Mr. TABER. You would not be safe unless you placed an amendment in every appropriation bill and took them off the pay roll as you went along.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But we never could keep up with them.

Mr. TABER. Then they cannot get on any pay roll at all if the amendment is on every bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But they could be put back under the lend-lease or on some money on blank checks.

Mr. TABER. But there will not be any blank checks this year—not enough to carry the derelicts.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HARTLEY. I ask the gentleman's indulgence in order that I may read a letter from a constituent of mine whose name I shall withhold, to demonstrate the confusion and trouble that is being caused by these crackpots who pass themselves off as economists. This letter reads as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARTLEY: This is a voice crying in the wilderness.

We employ about 60 people and are doing practically 100 percent war work. It is hard for us to determine our own importance but from the requests which we have had from the War Production Board and the Ordnance Department for shipment of materials to the Aluminum Co. of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, respectively, at least some of our products must be essential.

Since the first of this year we have had to complete and file:

SS-1a. Quarterly Federal old-age benefit return.

940. Annual Federal unemployment tax return.

UC-18A. Quarterly State unemployment return.

UC-27B. Quarterly State unemployment return.

WPB-732. Monthly Federal census report.

WPB-1440. Monthly Federal shipment and order report.

WPB-919. Monthly Federal salvage report.

BLS-790. Monthly State volume of employment report.

BLS-1219. Monthly Federal labor turn-over report.

We also have requests to prepare:

WPB-788. Semimonthly Federal machine capacity report.

PD-669. War Production Board notification of machine ordered.

PD-670. War Production Board notice of machine shipped.

PD-25F. War Production Board changes in P. R. F. requirements.

Next month we start on our income-tax return, with its attendant annual information return and report on Form 1099 covering individual earnings. In addition we are acting as collectors for the Victory tax and salesmen and collectors of War bonds.

And now we are working on the reports required by the controlled-materials plan. This is the prize of all the regulations which have been issued by the various governmental bureaus. If ever a Philadelphia lawyer was required to analyze and interpret the phraseology of a document, he is needed to determine the meanings of the rules and regulations covering the operation of the controlled-materials plan.

We in our plant, and I believe in industry generally, are straining every resource to produce whatever is given to us by the various war agencies, and we should devote our energies to production rather than to the preparation of many documents of questionable value. The services of an executive, familiar with the details of a business, are necessary to properly and accurately prepare the requested reports. This works a distinct hardship on a small organization such as our own where we do not have and cannot afford a large corps of highly paid executives.

I realize that certain reports are absolutely necessary for the conduct of the business of government and we cheerfully prepare and forward such reports. But I do request that you use your influence to have the number of required reports reduced, and to have those which are necessary phrased in language which can be understood and interpreted by the average layman.

I think it is high time that we did something about this thing.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has called attention to one of the worst things that the so-called economists and crackpots pull off. It is one of their ways of getting in the way of the steam roller. They have gotten so far out that the people of this country can see them, and I believe that we are going to have full support of the people in the efforts that we make to get rid of them and get rid of that type of governmental derelict.

Mr. Chairman, there are a good many items in this bill but I am going to refer to only a few of them. Take the item for reimbursement of mortgage interest to the Federal Farm loan bank. That was cut \$1,000,000, because it did not figure out that they needed all the money that they asked. Then there is the item for the Farm Loan Corporation, which was cut \$800,000 for the same reason. The Foreign Funds Administration in the Treasury was cut \$200,000. Frankly, with the advent of the Alien Property Custodian and his taking over a large part of the business end of the business enterprises, that the Foreign Funds control had under their jurisdiction, I do not believe they need so much money. There is too much duplication between the operations of the two units, and I believe that they could take a further cut.

The Tax Research Division which is set up for the first time as a separate unit, was cut \$59,810, down to \$116,000. That outfit appeared before our committee, and it did not satisfy me that there was anything in the nature of competency. My only check on their capacity has been their appearances before our committee and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee of the Senate, besides what they showed before us. Before these committees they told different stories upon several items in connection with the facts. They failed to have any grasp of reports that were filed as to earnings or anything of that kind with the Federal Communications Commission, and their evidence was entirely useless. My information from the Ways and Means Committee people is that they are of very little value. I question if we have not given them too much money.

The Customs Service we cut only \$43,900. The earnings of the Customs Service today are down probably to less than one-half of that of last year, and about a third of the year before. That means that they have not anything like the items coming in and going out that they did have. I am getting reports from all over that their activities are nothing like they used to be, and that their help are in such a position that they are unable to find enough to do, and that we might save some money along that line. When we reach that item I expect to take it up.

I call attention to one item in the bill that is rather unusual, and that is the tax-refund item, the customs refund. Tax refunds we appropriated for at the rate of \$59,000,000 last year. This year we have to bring in an unlimited amount, whatever is required, to meet the refunds that are required. We have to do that because with the Victory tax and the way it reads, there will be an enormous number of refunds that will have to be made, and it might run even as high as \$300,000,000 or \$500,000,000 because with the people with small incomes they have a \$1,200 exemption in the income tax and only \$624 exemption in the Victory tax, and they are entitled to whatever shows and whatever reductions they have on their income beyond that in the nature of taxes, interest, and that sort of thing. So that this item is entirely beyond our control at the present time.

Customs refunds are carried at the same amount they have been, \$19,000,000.

There the refunds are required because items come into this country, the duty is paid and the goods go to manufacturers and are made up into products and again exported, and when they are exported the duty is refundable up to a certain percent—I think 99 percent. So that there we have a very large item of refunds on customs that we have not had in days gone by.

In the Post Office Department the only item of any moment that might require explanation is that of post-office inspectors. There we allowed 25 because of the war situation. They have run up since 1925 from 535 to 750 at the present time. There are 175 doing war work, of

that increase. With this number they will have at least 100 more than they did have, in addition to those who are doing war work; but with all that number of inspectors, as appears at pages 358 and 359 of the hearings, the number of inspections of post offices has dropped down. We only allow them 25 additional on a temporary basis, and we have said in the report that they must do the main job that they have to do, that is, the inspection of post offices, and get it done.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman familiar with this pamphlet on Trends in Nonwar Expenditures, issued by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. TABER. I have seen it. I have not had a chance to read it yet.

Mr. BENDER. I suggest the gentleman read this, because it is a whitewash of these non-defense expenditures. The gentleman knows that the Bureau of the Budget is nothing more or less than an arm of the executive department. This publication was issued for the purpose of throwing sand in the eyes of the country and Members of Congress, and creating the impression that these non-war expenditures are not nearly as bad as they are made to appear.

Mr. TABER. When we have it from the Budget and the Executive that the W. P. A. has to be wiped out and the money impounded, that the National Youth Administration has to be sneaked into the manpower set-up to cover up its existence, and that the Farm Security Administration is trying to hide under several other aliases, we do not expect that the people of this country will be dumb enough to absorb too much of the apology from the Bureau of the Budget on that subject. We all know that non-defense appropriations have run absolutely wild. We have a lot of them. Every single one of these agencies that has the worst record, is running around trying to take on other activities to cover up their past sins. When they are given other activities they will develop new sins that will be worse than the ones before, because if those people who have such a bad record in the civil activities of the Government once get their fingers into a defense program or a war program set-up, they will run hog wild and there will be absolutely no controlling the operations they indulge in. The only way we can get along with that kind of people is to wipe them out. They do not have any place in government employ.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. While the gentleman is explaining a few of these controversial items I believe he will recall we had this before us in the committee the other day, just why is it necessary to give to the city delivery two and a half million additional over the appropriation for 1943? And the second part of my question, just why is it necessary to add \$1,200,000 to the Special De-

livery Service above that which we appropriated last year?

Mr. TABER. I will take the special delivery first, because that is easier to answer.

The special-delivery item was cut by the committee a small amount, but the special delivery item is a statutory matter, where the person who makes the delivery is entitled to a specific fee—I think it is 9 cents—on each special-delivery letter delivered. He is entitled to that, regardless of whether we make appropriations or not. The recent increase was allowed because there is an estimated deficiency in the current year. People have been obliged, because of the slowness that has developed in the Postal Service—and I am not criticizing that particularly because the facilities are not available to make it any better—people have been obliged to put special-delivery stamps upon a great many letters that they did not before. Because there have been so many issued and sold and so many more special delivery letters, the fees have piled up, and there will be a deficiency of all of that increase for this year.

Now, on the letter carrier proposition, the same situation applies. The city letter carriers are required to carry a great deal more mail. The volume of mail has gone up terrifically. I could show you from some papers I have on the table items that have been sent out by the promotion activities of the Government—great big, thick, heavy packages. It is estimated for 1944, unless we do something about it, that the cost of handling the penalty or free mail will run upward of \$82,000,000. That is a fair sample of the way these things are going up, and that is one of the reasons why we are getting such a big increase.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I bring up this question because while we acknowledge a great increase in mail, immediately following these two particular items you will note \$92,200,000 for rural route carriers. Of course, that great increase of mail should apply to the country. God knows we have had plenty of literature going out to the country. My point is if we give any increase at all for city delivery why is not some consideration given toward increasing the load on the rural route carriers?

Mr. TABER. The statement was made to us, as I remember it—I may be wrong, but the statement was made that there had been an allowance for all the most meritorious cases for extension of rural delivery routes provided here in this bill, a continuance of the allotment for new service in the Rural Free Delivery, and it is just as much as it was in the last 4 or 5 years. They are going to be able to spend probably double the amount that was set up in our bill of last year for extensions of Rural Free Delivery Service. I think we have a provision for a couple of hundred thousand dollars for those extensions, and I think they are going to spend at least \$400,000 in this current fiscal year. They are effecting some savings on the operation of rural

routes due to consolidations and an occasional discontinuance, but there have not been many discontinuances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One further question in conclusion, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not criticizing what the gentleman has to say; fundamentally it is correct, but there comes to my mind an instance on my own home route. I am one of the few Members of Congress who live on a rural route, and this route is back in Minnesota. I have been refused by the Post Office Department consideration of four short extensions which would bring to these 12 neighbors of mine the opportunity not to have to travel three-quarters of a mile through knee-deep snow to get their mail. I feel, consequently, especially when I think of our apartment down here in Washington where they have cut city delivery to once a day that perhaps this \$2,500,000 extra comes under the heading of nonessentials.

Mr. TABER. I can see why the gentleman feels as he does, but I do not think the items the gentleman refers to should have been denied; I think they should have been granted; I think they are in a position where, if the roads are so the carriers can get through, there is no question but what on meritorious matters they should give these rural route extensions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Coming back to the first question, that in regard to special delivery, did I understand the gentleman to say that the increase in special-delivery mail is such that the increased revenue resulting from the sale of special-delivery stamps offsets the increased appropriation?

Mr. TABER. There is no payment out of this appropriation for the delivery of special-delivery letters except 9 cents on each letter—and the special-delivery stamp costs 10 cents; so there is 1 more cent going into the general pool of the Post Office Department or to the Treasury out of the sale of each special-delivery stamp. I will say that I have to use special-delivery stamps on my own letters if I want to get them to my home town in 1 day. I can get 2-day service by regular mail, but for 1-day service, I have to use a special-delivery stamp.

Mr. CASE. And for this \$1,800,000 the Treasury will collect \$2,000,000?

Mr. TABER. On \$800,000, the Treasury will collect \$900,000, the appropriation is \$12,200,000, and the Treasury will collect about \$13,500,000.

Let me say that I believe the committee has done as well as it could with this bill in every way, everything considered. There are some things upon which we did not agree entirely and some things that may have to be worked out here on the floor. There are a lot of problems. We probably have not discovered everything that might have been discovered

in connection with this bill—one never does—but I may say that we have had complete, full hearings and have been permitted to go just as far as we wished. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], chairman of the committee, has been very gracious and has done the best he could to cut down appropriation and still allow funds to operate. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] sat at all the hearings of the committee and were very helpful. I appreciate very much the work of my two associates, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSIAK], have done upon the bill. I hope the Committee of the Whole, if it does anything to the bill, will improve it before we report it back to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the last 10 years many strange doctrines and ideologies in derogation of our national Constitution have been practiced on the American people. From a republican form of government we have been gyrating to a government by bureaucrats, to a concentration of power in the administration which closely approaches a dictatorship and has greatly curtailed and restricted constitutional American freedom.

Since we have been in the war this has been greatly intensified; and not only that, but those of the American people who are most zealous in the protection of constitutional American liberty, have practically disarmed themselves, in their willingness to concentrate in the bureaucratic administration, at the risk of their liberty, all governmental power that is necessary to win the war. And yet, even in wartime, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and while it is our duty to delegate to the administration all powers necessary to the winning of the war, it is equally our duty to resist the ideologies and usurpation of power which are foreign to both the war effort and our form of government.

One trend in this subversive movement has become very popular in the last year or more. Last Monday's newspapers reported speeches on it and it is the constant subject of radio commentators and others. This is the slogan that we are fighting for the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

Administration leaders and bureaucrats adroitly use this slogan, or parts of it, as the panacea for the ills of the people of the United States or the peoples of the world, depending on the occasion.

A more insidious and dangerous ideology and propaganda could scarcely be invented or disseminated.

That document signed on August 14, 1941, somewhere in the Atlantic by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, was not and did not purport to be a charter of rights, but a statement of peace aims.

A charter is a grant of special rights from an absolute and sovereign monarch, from a dictator to his subjects. It is confined to rights and privileges granted in the charter and by implication excludes all rights and freedoms not so granted.

Such a charter, as we know, was granted by King John to the English people in 1215 and was known as Magna Carta, or the Great Charter. It marked the beginning of constitutional government. Under it Englishmen were for the first time entitled to certain rights in spite of a totalitarian monarch, such as trial by jury, a voice in tax matters, and certain other specified privileges. So there have been charters granted by the sovereign power to cities, colonies, and similar bodies politic.

I do not believe that either President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill ever referred to that document as a charter, and certainly they both know that they are the servants, not the sovereigns, of their respective peoples, and, as such, cannot make a grant of any rights whatsoever.

In the second place that document stating the peace aims of the respective representatives of Britain and the United States says nothing about the "four freedoms" as such. The only reference to freedoms in that document is contained in the sixth peace aim, which reads:

After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Obviously the fear and want referred to in this sixth peace aim is the fear and want caused by war, and the threat of war by the wanton attack, looting, raping, and murder of greedy aggressor nations such as has been suffered by the vanquished and stricken peoples of Europe and suffered to a greater or lesser degree by all depending nations from gangster peoples. Not by the remotest stretch of imagination can this be construed as a guaranty to the people of our Nation, or any other nation, as freedom from want and freedom from fear as a socialistic scheme of internal economy. And, mark you, freedom of religion and freedom of speech were in no wise mentioned in that document.

In the third place those so-called "four freedoms" are not freedoms in any sense unless accompanied and vitalized by a fifth and it should be the first and fundamental freedom, and that is economic freedom. Now remember that a charter is a grant of special rights and freedoms and excludes any right or freedom not expressly granted. And, therefore, as I said before, those "four freedoms" are not freedoms at all, or, if I may speak paradoxically, they are the freedoms of the slave.

Imagine, if you will, a slave before the days of the Civil War. His master, his owner, his dictator, had, or at least should have, no objection to allowing the slave freedom of speech or freedom of religion. He could have any religion or superstition he wished, he could talk

or prattle to his heart's desire, provided, however, and with the always present limitation, that he must never indulge in those freedoms to the extent of saying or claiming that he was made in God's image and therefore the political equal of his master. He must never indulge in the concept of free speech and religious freedom to the extent of claiming that he was entitled to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, to come and go as he pleased or that he was entitled to a wife and family of his own. No, indeed; those and similar rights constituting economic freedom were denied that slave and in place of them the slaveholder guaranteed him freedom from want and freedom from fear just as he extended these to his other chattels, his cattle. I say to you, my friends, the so-called "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter are a myth and a snare to shackle the unwary, the bait for which is greatly extended social security, and unless the American people are vigilant the bureaucrats will have the shackles riveted on their limbs before they realize it. For these "four freedoms" are exactly the freedoms of the slaves of totalitarian states.

Mr. Chairman, the liberty of Americans is not confined to the "four freedoms" and finds its source not in a charter granted by a prime minister, a president, or a potentate, or bureaucrat. The foundation of American freedoms is found in the Declaration of Independence, in these words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The guaranty, the security of these rights, rests, not in a charter, but on a compact between freemen, the preamble of which reads:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

These are the rocks upon which our temple of liberty, with its tripartite form of government, and its Bill of Rights, has rested securely for a century and a half. We are not restricted to a charter or "four freedoms," but to the enjoyment of all freedom by every individual inherently, restricted only by the requirements of a like freedom in every other individual.

And do not think when I call attention to the vice and danger in that ideology and propaganda of the so-called "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter, I am dealing only in remote and future danger.

The gyves are already on our ankles. The ground has already been broken in an assault on the Bill of Rights and the frittering away of religious freedom.

A little over a year ago a case was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States involving a claimed

right under the Bill of Rights, and a religious freedom guaranteed thereunder. Unquestionably the sect which claimed this right had very narrow views. And the Supreme Court in an 8 to 1 decision held that their views were too narrow; that they were not entitled to what they claimed as religious freedom under the Bill of Rights.

But on June 8 of last year the same sect was again before the Supreme Court on another phase of their religion, which they claimed as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Again they were convicted, but this time only by a 5-to-4 decision. But—and this is the point I want to emphasize—three of the four dissenters frankly confessed, "We helped make the law in the first case, but we now believe that that case was wrongly decided." However that may be, both cases are now the law of the land, and, according to four judges—three of them repentant—for the first time in over a hundred and fifty years we have taken two steps on the road away from the religious liberty guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. As Chief Justice Stone, in his dissenting opinion, said in substance, we are adopting tactics better adapted to the effective suppression of speech and press and religion, despite constitutional guaranties, than those which were a moving cause of the American Revolution.

There is now pending in the Federal courts a prosecution by the Department of Justice against the Associated Press, which is a free association of a free press to gather news for its members. In this prosecution the New Deal administration is seeking to destroy the freedom of the Associated Press and make it subject to Government domination and control, just as it dominates our railroads and other common carriers. This is, of course, seeking another step in the same direction.

These trends and ideologies have no bearing on and make no contribution to the war effort but are purely a quest for concentration of power by the bureaucrats bent on making over our Government. They should, however, offer a touchstone by which we may test the genuineness of many of the absolute powers sought by the administration under the guise of war powers. A constantly increasing number of the people are becoming awake to these trends and dangers, and there can be no question but that the last election constituted a mandate to the Congress to beware of foreign freedoms and especially the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter and similar ideologies.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair kindly inform me how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 36 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York has 1 hour and 18 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] 30 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 years the shortage of gasoline and fuel oil on the North Atlantic seaboard has been an acute fact.

The annual consumption in that section was normally about 1,600,000 barrels per day. Before the submarine menace, the ocean tankers supplied more than 95 percent of that consumption. Under present conditions the tankers are eliminated entirely, and inland transportation of various types have been resorted to, all of which has been inadequate for the emergency. Railways, inland waterways, highways, and pipe lines have been brought into service, but all combined can only transport about 60 percent of the normal needs.

To supply the necessary transportation facilities for the movement of these essential commodities involves enormous expenditures of money, and the conversion of vast amounts of critical materials badly needed in the war effort. It also involves delays, the consequences of which cannot be foreseen.

The major portion of the shipments are now by rail but the roads were poorly equipped for the burden. Owing to the fact that rail transportation of petroleum and its products is too costly to compete with pipe lines and waterways, the roads have heretofore refrained from making large investments in equipment for handling such commodities. The tank cars now in use are practically all owned by the oil companies, and for the use of which the roads are paying a rental.

I am not advised as to the number of tank railroad cars now engaged in the movement of petroleum to the East. According to the report of the Temporary National Emergency Committee of the hearings held in 1939, as published by the American Petroleum Institute, there were then 141,949 railroad tank cars in existence, 130,985 of which were owned by oil companies. I am advised that many of these cars are old and in bad order, and some of them impracticable for use. Their capacity was said to be 8,000 gallons, or more, each, or about 191 barrels per car.

Mr. J. J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, stated before a Senate committee on January 27 that the railroads were hauling an average of 770,000 barrels per day, and he expected that to be increased to 900,000 barrels. In addition to tank cars in use, they had borrowed 200,000 drums from the Army, and expected to get 500,000 additional drums, with capacity of about 600,000 barrels. These drums, filled with oil, were being hauled in box cars. Mr. Pelley also stated that he had asked the War Production Board for 878 new locomotives, in addition to the 1,000 requested the year before, but did not expect his request to be granted for more than 600 additional locomotives.

A 24-inch pipe line has just been completed from east Texas to a point in southern Illinois, and its extension to the eastern seaboard has been authorized. Its general course is to parallel the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. When completed, it will have a capacity of 250,000 to 300,000 barrels of oil per day. It is expected to have it in operation in time to furnish fuel oil to New England for the fall season of 1943. Its cost is esti-

mated at \$95,000,000, and 355,000 tons of steel will be required for its completion. Work was commenced sometime last summer. The course of this pipe line is several hundred miles longer than it would have been to have taken a more direct route. This, of course, adds to the cost of construction and operation, and adds enormously to the amount of necessary war materials involved.

If, instead of paralleling the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the pipe line had first been laid from the Ohio to the eastern seaboard, the delivery of 300,000 barrels of fuel oil per day to New England could easily have been now in operation. The necessary wooden barges and tow boats for operation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers could have been built in the same time the pipe line was being laid; the cost would have been far less than the cost of the transcontinental pipe line, and it could have been in operation for the present winter season.

We have a splendid intracoastal channel from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Trenton, N. J., with the exception of a 92-mile missing link across Florida, from the Gulf to the St. John River. This channel across Florida has been authorized by Congress, but opposing interests may be successful in delaying the construction indefinitely. For temporary use Congress also authorized the laying of a pipe line across Florida, but those in charge have only provided an 8-inch pipe to serve local needs.

We have heard a great deal of praise for the railroads for the part they have performed in moving oil and gasoline to the East. It is true, they have done a great work, and have accomplished much more than their operators themselves at first thought possible. They have also succeeded in moving many millions of tons of other war materials for which they have received no public acclamation, though the accomplishment was equally meritorious.

In transporting oil and gasoline, the railroads have done what they were employed to do, and for which they have received the regular compensation. In view of the fact that the cost of this transportation is approximately nine times greater than it would have been by water, this increased cost had to be met.

Such costs are usually paid by the consumers, but in this case the consumers have been relieved of that burden and rightfully so as I believe. They were in nowise responsible for the conditions that brought it about. The oil shippers pay to the railroads the regular rail charges for transportation. The differences between those charges and the water costs are refunded to them by the Government acting through the Defense Supplies Corporation.

The oil shippers, as I am advised, submit their claims for reimbursement to this corporation. Upon examination 75 percent of the claim is paid by check, and 25 percent withheld for more complete audit. The amounts paid for the month of December totaled, as I am advised, \$15,666,000, representing 75 percent of the claims presented. When the

other 25 percent is paid it will be seen that the Government is actually paying more than \$700,000 per day on account of the oil shipments by rail.

When these oil shipments by rail are enormously increased as outlined by Mr. Pelley, the refunds will be correspondingly increased. An editorial in the Houston Post of January 28 calls attention to the fact that boxcars loaded with drums of oil as contemplated carry only 6,545 gallons whereas the tank cars carry 7,000 gallons or more. The editorial states that a Houston shipper had called attention to the fact that shipping drums of oil in boxcars would entail considerable extra cost which would be borne by the Government.

As will be seen from the refund payments made to the oil shippers for the month of December the Government is actually paying more than \$250,000,000 annually on account of having those shipments go by rail. When the rail shipments are increased to 900,000 barrels per day, as the program now contemplates, and as stated by Mr. Pelley, then these refunds will be increased to approximately \$400,000,000 annually. This extra cost can be eliminated in a comparatively short time if Congress will, without delay, construct the barge channel across Florida. If Congress should fail to construct this channel, this enormous burden will be upon the taxpayers for an indefinite period.

The cost of the canal is estimated at \$44,000,000. The cost of 2,286 wooden barges and 1,143 steel barges, together with the cost of 1,170 tugboats, will amount to \$260,550,000. This is the equipment estimated by engineers as necessary for the movement of 900,000 barrels of oil and gasoline per day from Texas to the northeastern area. The cost of this equipment is estimated at \$40,000 each for the wooden barges, \$60,000 each for the steel barges, and \$95,000 for the tugboats.

These estimates are not of my own making. They have been prepared for me by very competent engineers. They will show conclusively that for each dollar in cost of equipment and each ton of steel used, the barge system will transport more petroleum than any other known system of transportation.

Petroleum and its products constitute one of the most essential commodities of this Nation in both war- and peacetime. Before the war it constituted slightly more than 50 percent of our traffic upon the high seas. I am advised by high authority that it now constitutes approximately 70 percent of the supplies going to our Armies and Navy overseas. Yet our internal transportation system is such that a few German submarines on the Atlantic Ocean have been able to almost completely paralyze this most essential industry. It is all due to a few missing links in our transportation system which can easily be eliminated. Just how long the American people will continue to permit such conditions to exist remains to be seen.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the fine work he has done in regard to the development of our inland waterways and our harbor facilities. I note what he says in regard to the necessity for building this canal at the earliest possible time in order to provide fuel oil facilities for New England. I was told today that during the next 5 or 6 weeks—and this comes to me from a high authority in charge of our distribution program—the people of New England are going to suffer a good deal of hardship and privation during the next 5 weeks because they cannot get fuel oil. In line with the suggestions heretofore made, the gentleman has suggested this barge canal. We from New England have followed that suggestion during a long period of time and every one of us voted for the original authorization, as I understand it; but there seems to be a great conflict of opinion as to when this canal can be finished. We were told on the floor of the House yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], of the gentleman's own committee, that the Chief of Engineers says it will take 3 years. We were told by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] yesterday that he has it on reliable authority that it can be finished in less than a year and if necessary he can get from the War Department engineers an estimate of completion that it will take less than a year.

What has the chairman of the committee to say in regard to the possible time that it can be finished, through which barges can operate to bring fuel oil to the New England area?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. In reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I may say that the estimates vary from 8 months to 3 years. The Chief of Engineers states that in accordance with the usual procedure of securing appropriations from time to time, and in view of the fact that priorities have to be given for war materials, he estimates it will probably be 3 years before this barge canal can be completed. The head of the Arundel Corporation of Baltimore, perhaps the highest authority in this country on matters of this kind, a company that has done more work of this nature than any other concern in the United States or any place else, tells me that they can do it with the machines they have within 10 months. General Summerall, ex-Chief of Staff of the United States Army, a gentleman of great ability who succeeded General Pershing in that position, I believe, a graduate of West Point, and an engineer of great distinction, tells me he has from prominent contractors the highest assurance that it can be constructed in less than 1 year with the machinery that may be made available. It is all a question of machinery.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. With the information the gentleman has, does it appear to him that the Chief of Engineers is not taking that source of information as authentic or reliable?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The Chief of Engineers is a very careful man and very able man. He estimates, according to the way Congress usually appropriates the money for these purposes, that it will string out through a period of years and he takes that into contemplation when making his estimates. They invariably do that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors ever suggested to the Chief of Engineers, or asked him if the Congress should immediately appropriate the forty or fifty million dollars required, how long it would take him to complete that job? What is his answer to that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I have not conversed with him along that line.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. So that the original estimate of completion date so far as the Chief of Engineers is concerned, is 3 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That was the Chief of Engineers, yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He has not changed his opinion from that time to this?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That will not help us very well in New England.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No, but this bill provides for a pipe-line across there. They could have put a pipe-line across there, about 195 miles, that would be conveying oil to New England today, instead of building a 2,000-mile pipe-line, clear across the continent.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What would the capacity of that pipe-line be?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It depends on the size and it depends on the pressure. If they put in the same size as they put in from Texas up to Illinois it would convey from 250,000 to 300,000 barrels a day.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We do not care how we get oil up to New England. They are desperate for oil in order to keep warm and there is a great deal of suffering. If this barge line is going to take 3 years to build, as the Chief of Engineers says, it will not be of any value to us. If it can be built in a year's time, it will be of value.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I asked the Chief of Engineers the other day if it could not be built in 2 years and he said yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why does not the gentleman get a statement from the Chief of Engineers and put it in the RECORD showing just what he does say, so there will be some incentive for us in New England to give consideration to it?

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not possible for this canal to be used for the transportation of oil before all the locks and things are completed?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The bill provides for temporary works. They can build those locks for temporary use and they will serve for a period of many years.

Mr. WHITE. That would greatly shorten the period?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes and it would eliminate the steel that is necessary for the war program.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would like to ask the gentleman two very brief questions and I will let him answer. Is it not true that General Reybold, in his testimony on this canal, said that it is an emergency and should be started at once? Did that not appear in the record of the hearings?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I think so; yes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], spoke on this and he said that if we were going to have a canal, that there is already an existing canal in the State of Florida. I have always voted for the improvement of our waterways down there and for that existing canal that he speaks of, extending from Fort Myers to Stewart. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas, what are the possibilities of providing this canal in lower Florida to get oil to the eastern seaboard?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It would probably be 10 to 20 years before a canal could be constructed there that would be practical, and after you had it there is no approach to it from the west coast, or from the Gulf coast, except by tankers. That would not be an inland route and it would not be safe.

Mr. HENDRICKS. They would be subject to submarine attack?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes. Submarines have been sinking ships in the Gulf within 4 miles of the mouth of the Mississippi River.

The channel across there was adopted on a survey ordered in a bill from the Committee on Flood Control. If you recall, 15 or 18 years ago there was a terrible hurricane that blew the water out of Lake Okeechobee, killed several hundred people west of there and destroyed a great deal of property, and then went off into the Everglades. This was started as a flood-control project. The main part of the authorization and of the cost was for levees around Lake Okeechobee. Then we amended the bill so as to make a navigation channel there, but it is only 6 feet deep and 80 feet wide. It would cost many, many millions of dollars to make a practical channel of it, 125 feet wide and 12 feet deep, to correspond with the other. It runs through Lake Okeechobee and over to Stuart near the east coast, and from there up to Jacksonville there is a channel that is only 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

On that project you would have to order surveys and investigations and have hearings and all that through a long period of years, and then decide sometime in the future whether or not this would make a practical navigation channel and would be justified. It is 543

miles longer than the channel adopted by Congress. It would be 600 miles farther to go to the east, even if you had a channel all around, than the channel that has been recommended by the engineers.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman tell the committee what is the maximum amount of the annual subsidy now going to the railroads under the present arrangement?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The oil shippers are paying the railroads just their regular rates. The railroads cannot very well afford to haul it any cheaper. I am not blaming the railroads, for they have done a great work and are doing all they can, but that is the condition. They cannot haul it for any less. The cheapest they can afford to haul it for is nine times or eight and two-thirds times the cost of shipping the oil this way.

Mr. CULKIN. What is the estimated maximum amount of the subsidy?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It depends on how much oil they transport.

Mr. CULKIN. At the present and probable rate of transportation, as estimated by Mr. Pelley, it is approximately \$400,000,000 a year.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I made that estimate on the supposition that it will be increased to 900,000 barrels, as he says. It is only about 700,000 barrels a day at the present time.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman sanguine about getting a bill through that will eliminate that subsidy?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The bill has already been passed by Congress, but the money has not been appropriated.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman realizes the forces that are at work against that project, representing the railroads?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; I understand all that. I have had no misapprehension about that for 20 years.

Mr. CULKIN. They have spent some \$31,000,000 last year for advertising and probably \$100,000,000 for lawyers. I do not like to indict my own cult, but the lawyers got a great killing on that. Does the gentleman think he can overcome that?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. You cannot blame the railroad lawyers. I used to be one myself.

Mr. CULKIN. May I say to the gentleman that I believe the statement the gentleman has made is a definite challenge to the Congress. It should remember that good Americans are freezing to death in the Northeast.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. A year ago last September I wrote to Mr. Pelley suggesting that he use two railroads down there to transport this oil across Florida. One of them was 240 miles in length and the other was 317 miles in length. Engineers informed me that those two roads could easily transport 200,000 barrels of oil a day. Mr. Pelley did not take to the proposition. He wanted to haul the oil clear across the

continent, and said it would make no problem for the railroads. He sent me a copy of his testimony before a Senate committee given that same day, in which he took that view. He did not seem favorable to the short haul across Florida.

You can take these railroad cars on that short haul and see the difference in hauling oil 200 miles as against 2,000 miles from Texas to Boston. Those cars go up there and then go back empty. They cannot go under burden both ways. You have to count the round trip in computing the time. It is the same way with the barges, although the barges could have return cargoes on their decks.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The bill authorizing the construction of the Florida barge canal became law at the last session of Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; last summer.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman tell us what, in his opinion, is holding it up? Is not an authorization by the Congress usually considered by the Committee on Appropriations to be a mandate?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The Committee on Appropriations has not made any appropriation since that time for the civil functions of the War Department. These appropriations usually come in the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, and those appropriations are made in the spring. This bill was passed last summer, and there has not yet been considered a civil-functions appropriation bill.

Mr. MOTT. Then the Committee on Appropriations has not had an opportunity to pass on this question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It has not had an opportunity to do so; no.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In the address of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] yesterday he made the statement that he did not want to embarrass any engineer or anyone else in the War Department, but that he could get an opinion from the War Department that this canal can be constructed and have barges going through it within the period of a year. This discussion has been going on for a year. We are very much interested in this project, and I should like to know about it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman from Florida has ever asked anybody in the War Department for such an opinion.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. May I say to the gentleman that yesterday I said that I did not want to embarrass anyone in the War Department, but I said that I could get an opinion from someone in the War Department. I want to say this, and I cannot name the engineer, but he has given his opinion, one of the engineers, that this can be done in 10 months.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why should not the Chief Engineer acquiesce in that?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not know.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. GREEN. For only one observation, as to the time element. This contracting concern is a strong reliable concern and they say that they will enter into a contract and guarantee to build it within that time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. Has not this Florida ship canal been before us for a good many years?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The Florida ship canal is not before us now.

Mr. BENDER. Is not this just window dressing for that project?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is not, if the gentleman will take my word for it.

Mr. BENDER. How much money has been spent in the last decade for river and harbor improvements?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I can answer that in the RECORD. I have not the figures now, but if the gentleman desires I shall put them in the RECORD.

Mr. BENDER. And this is for civilian functions?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. It is not an emergency war matter or appropriation?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Oh, that is up to the Congress. It is nothing to me whether they appropriate the money or not. I am not as much interested as dozens of others.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the priorities for the steel be secured? As I understand it everything is all ready for the pipe line.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Everything. There will be very little steel used if they use temporary material.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So it will be an economical unit?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes. At one time they used nothing but wooden locks, but, of course, steel is better, but in an emergency we do many things that are not the best.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are taking additional oil and kerosene away from us in New England.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time I have, 3½ minutes, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, when we reach the reading of the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill,

under the 5-minute rule, I propose to offer an amendment on page 12, line 22, as follows:

Page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens, Frederick L. Schuman, Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., Paul R. Porter, John Herling, Paul F. Brissenden, David J. Saposs, Maurice Parmelee, Harold Loeb, Sam Schmerler, Emil Jack Lever, David Lasser, Tom Tippet, Henry C. Alsberg, David Karr, Guiseppi Fauci, David Wahl, Hugh Miller, Walter Gellhorn, Karl Borders, Jack Fahy, Nathaniel Weyl, Robert Morss Lovett, Merle Vincent, Alice Barrows, Arthur F. Goldschmidt, Marcus I. Goldman, Leonard Emil Mins, Henry T. Hunt, Mary McLeod Bethune, Harry C. Lamberton, T. A. Bisson, Katherine Kellock, Jay Deiss, Milton V. Freeman, George Slaflf, A. C. Shire, and Edward Scheunemann."

This amendment is a bit unusual in that it includes William Pickens, who would be directly affected by this bill, and a list of the names of other people who would be affected later and this is the reason that I wanted to give the House notice that I was offering this amendment.

You may well ask why I include the other names in the amendment if William Pickens is the only man who would be directly affected by this bill under the present circumstances, and I want to explain the reason. The reason is to prevent hedge hopping. When we were working on the W. P. A. bill in 1941, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered an amendment which was adopted by the House and retained by the Senate and was enacted into law. The amendment provided—

That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser.

As I said, the amendment was adopted and I want to ask you where do you think Mr. Lasser is at this moment? Mr. Lasser has now been employed by the War Production Board as senior economist, and with an increase in salary. When he was eliminated from this appropriation bill he was receiving \$4,400 a year. He is now receiving \$4,600 a year. And Mr. Lasser's case is not the only one. I want to cite some other cases in which hedge-hopping has been done. In other words, when one of these gentlemen has been reported as having views not healthy to our form of government and has been discharged from one branch of the Government he just hedgehops into another branch. On March 28, 1942, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman DIES, wrote a letter to Hon. HENRY WALLACE, Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, calling his attention to the Communist affiliations of eight of his employees, and made particular reference to one Maurice Parmelee, principal economist of the B. E. W., at a salary of \$5,600 a year. Mr. Parmelee had written several books advocating the practice of nudism in America. Two days later Parmelee was dismissed from the B. E. W. He was reemployed, however, on November 2, 1942, at the Railroad Retirement Board as an economist at \$4,600 a year.

In 1938, David J. Saposs, chief economist of the National Labor Relations Board, was exposed by the Dies committee, and in 1939 by the Smith committee, investigating the N. L. R. B. As a result of these exposures David J. Saposs was dismissed from the N. L. R. B. He was later reemployed as an economist in the office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and just recently appointed assistant to the chief of the labor division of the War Production Board at a salary of \$8,000 per year.

In 1938, Henry G. Alsberg was director of the Federal writers project of the W. P. A. This project was exposed by the Dies committee as being a tool of Communist propaganda, and in 1939 the House abolished the agency, which automatically removed Alsberg from the Federal pay roll. Alsberg has recently been reemployed by the Federal Government and is now senior feature writer in the Office of War Information at \$4,600.

In 1935 Sam Schmerler was dismissed from the F. B. I. on account of his Communist activities. Several weeks later he was employed by the Social Security Board, and has worked there ever since. At present he is employed as a policy consultant at a salary of \$3,800 a year.

In 1941 the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in a letter to the President, exposed the Communist affiliations of Emil Jack Lever, then employed in O. E. M. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was never advised as to what action was taken against Lever; however, he is now employed as head labor adviser in the War Production Board at \$6,500.

In the debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] said, in effect, "It is time that we indicate to the heads of the departments that we are not going to stand for these men being employed in the Government." But you will see it makes no difference what indication we give—that they will get around it some way—because Mr. Lasser is still on the pay roll.

I have heard leading Members of this House say that they believe action ought to be taken, but this is not the proper way to take it. Well, I want to disagree heartily. Any other measure that we may pass could be considered by the courts as an infringement upon the powers and prerogatives of the executive branch but an appropriation bill originates in the House of Representatives, and the House is entitled to put any limitation that they so desire on these appropriations.

The list of the names that I have included in this amendment are the ones which were given to us last Monday by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who is chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. If this amendment is adopted certainly none of these people can hedgehop from any other department to the department for which this appropriation is made.

If this amendment is adopted, I propose to offer the same amendment, including the same names, to every appropriation bill, large or small, which comes

before the House of Representatives in the future, and if the amendment is adopted we will know then that none of these men can hedge hop from one department into the other because they will be eliminated from all appropriations.

The time has come when the Members of this House should decide whether we do or whether we do not. In 1938, I believe it was, this House created by legislative action the committee known as the Committee on Un-American Activities, and from that time until the present that committee has spent \$470,000, and I find now that there is a resolution for the continuation of this committee for another 2 years, and that the committee will no doubt ask for \$75,000 more to continue their work, which will make a sum total of \$545,000, or over a half-million dollars. We should either decide that we are going to accept the responsibility thrown upon us by this special committee when they submit these names to us as having improper views concerning our form of government and eliminate them from the appropriation bills, or we should decide that the committee is serving no purpose and cease to make further appropriations. The amendment which I shall offer when we come to the reading of this bill under the 5-minute rule will give every Member of this House the opportunity to decide that one thing. I sincerely request that every Member give this his careful consideration. If there is any other way to have these undesirables eliminated from the pay roll, certainly I shall be glad to know of that way, but up to the present time no one has suggested a method other than this, and under these circumstances I believe this is the only way and that the amendment should be adopted.

I propose to discuss the records of the people mentioned in this amendment at the proper time so that Members of the House will be able to determine themselves whether or not they are the people we desire on the pay roll of the Federal Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record. There are some things I did not have time to state.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I deem it a privilege to be able to serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly this subcommittee, because of the opportunity it gives to serve with those distinguished members who have given years of service to the supply bills for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

Unfortunately for me, the hearings began early in December, prior to my assignment to this committee, so that I did not have an opportunity to listen to those hearings, to the various witnesses, and to the justifications which were presented during the hearings, which continued for about 6 weeks. Consequently,

I am not qualified at this time to give you any specific information dealing with this particular bill, but I shall take a few minutes to present to you a few of the observations which I have made as a Member of this body prior to my assignment to this committee and which have been confirmed to some extent during the past few weeks while helping to write up this particular supply bill.

This observation is that ordinarily the Budget as submitted, as was pointed out a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], is more or less considered sacrosanct. Those estimates come up from the executive department and then hearings are held. Witnesses are called to justify those requests for funds. Ordinarily it is difficult for members of the Appropriations Committee to be well informed on those requests, so that they may act intelligently thereon.

Recently the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], submitted a resolution providing that personnel be made available for the committee so that help might be employed to investigate those requests which are submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, so that when the supply bills are submitted to this body for final consideration and action we shall know definitely that there has been no unnecessary duplication and unnecessary waste and extravagance which might well be eliminated.

Our committee chairman about an hour ago eulogized the Seventy-seventh Congress as the War Congress because of the gigantic sums which had been appropriated and made available to the executive departments with which to administer the various aspects of our war program. I am in accord with the statement made by the distinguished chairman, because I believe the Congress is not only providing ample funds but probably a surplus or excess of funds, for the use of the various executive departments. It is true that we cannot stint in our efforts in any way in making available funds for the War Department and the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission, and for that matter

other bureaus and agencies dealing directly with the war effort. Yet I wonder if this body has considered whether or not those executive departments have done the same kind of an efficient job in expending those huge appropriations which are approved by Congress. We hear many criticisms, and there is a Nation-wide demand for greater efficiency and more economy, not only in our non-war expenditures but likewise in our war expenditures, because most of these billions of dollars are devoted directly to war activities.

There are many committees of this body now making investigations and studies of the various programs under these war agencies. We have been told that probably \$2,000,000,000 have been saved through the renegotiation of war contracts. Almost every day those various committees are holding hearings to determine whether or not there is that efficiency, and whether or not these mandates for economy by this body are being carried out as successfully, as the American people are now demanding. Unfortunately it is difficult to effect retrenchment or reductions in these personnel supply bills, because there are certain obligations which must be met, but I should like to devote a few minutes at this time to a discussion of the report issued just a few days ago by the United States Civil Service Commission as of November 30, 1942.

We will recall that during the first World War, 1917-18, the peak of employment in the civil branch of the Federal Government was approximately 918,000. At that time we only had about four and one-half million men in the armed services. Today we have approximately one-third more men in the armed forces of our country, but this report of the United States Civil Service Commission states that as of November 30, 1942, there was a total of 2,750,101 persons employed in the civil branches of our Government.

I shall ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table from the report showing employment in the year ending November 1942:

That figure of 2,750,101 is approximately three times the peak reached during the First World War, notwithstanding the fact that we have only about one-third greater personnel in the armed forces today. I should like to read one or two paragraphs from this report. I quote:

Civilian employment in the entire Federal service totaled 2,750,101 at the end of November 1942, compared with 2,687,093 a month ago and 1,546,131 a year ago. This was a net gain of 63,008 employees, or 2.3 percent during November—the smallest net change in recent months. The net increase of 1,204,970 employees over the 12 months elapsed since our declaration of war may be attributed largely to an expansion of civilian personnel of the military agencies. The War and Navy Departments combined increased by 1,048,019 during the year, most of which occurred in field establishments outside the Washington area. Total Federal employment in the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area increased 42.6 percent from November 1941 to November 1942 in contrast to 83.2 percent in all other areas combined.

Although war activities have resulted in increases in nearly all branches of the Government service, the combined employment of War, Navy, and war agencies more than doubled during the 12-month period while all other agencies together expanded only 7.4 percent. In November 1942, all war establishments combined showed employment gains of 58,444, representing a substantial proportion of the net gain during the month. The War and Navy Departments alone constituted 64 percent of all civilian employment in the Federal Government this month as compared with 46 percent 1 year ago.

We all recognize the necessity of employing extensive personnel in these war agencies such as the Army and the Navy, but it is significant that the War Department total of 1,213,088 is far in excess of the total civilian employment of all the executive branches and bureaus and departments during 1918. I quote from this report further, giving you first the figures of the past year as compared with November of 1941, which is approximately the date of Pearl Harbor, presenting a picture for the first year of our participation in this war:

War Department: 1,213,088; a year ago, 431,082. Navy Department: 547,786 compared with 281,773 a year ago. Maritime Commission: 6,667; a year ago, 2,856. Office of Censorship: 12,283 with no employees a year ago. Office of Price Administration: 37,817, with no personnel a year ago. War Production Board: 20,843, with only 5,268 in November of 1941.

We have heard much criticism in this body during the past month reflecting the Nation-wide resentment against this effort to regiment, and coerce, and control the activities of millions of Americans who are loyally cooperating and who are eager in every way to assist in our war program; yet we find the Office of Price Administration on November 30 with 37,817 employees. Is there anyone in this body who can successfully contend that this huge number might not be reduced to 25 percent of that total with better and more efficient administration as a result? Then they might successfully

Civilian employment and pay roll in the executive branch of the Federal Government

Month	Number of employees			Pay roll ¹		
	Entire service	In Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Outside Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Entire service	In Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Outside Washington, D. C., metropolitan area
1941						
November.....	1,545,131	199,283	1,345,848	\$237,398,486	\$33,938,499	\$203,459,987
December.....	1,670,922	207,214	1,463,708	254,453,319	35,931,301	218,522,018
1942						
January.....	1,703,059	273,493	1,480,616	250,404,945	38,717,067	220,687,878
February.....	1,805,186	233,403	1,571,783	262,106,949	39,626,787	222,480,162
March.....	1,926,074	238,801	1,687,273	309,764,679	41,258,486	268,506,193
April.....	1,970,869	248,100	1,722,769	317,207,094	42,582,221	274,624,873
May.....	2,066,873	256,457	1,810,416	336,568,306	43,921,811	292,646,495
June.....	2,206,970	268,383	1,938,587	353,304,409	45,286,667	308,017,742
July.....	2,327,932	274,001	2,053,931	382,373,859	48,021,151	334,352,708
August.....	2,450,759	275,362	2,175,397	391,502,171	48,124,986	343,377,185
September.....	2,549,474	281,423	2,268,051	414,594,644	48,591,176	366,003,468
October.....	2,687,093	283,692	2,403,401	445,135,852	50,001,609	395,134,243
November.....	2,750,101	284,158	2,465,943	454,415,055	48,833,436	405,581,619

¹ In the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area last pay-roll period ends on various dates. Pay-roll figures accordingly represent the total monthly pay-roll cost.

enlist the united cooperation and support of the American people at this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. I just wanted to observe that this House authorized an investigation of the civilian personnel in October of last year. I am very happy to see that for the first time in more than a year the November figures show a smaller increase than those for any of the preceding 12 months.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; but this report shows that during that year there was an average increase of about 100,000 employees each month, and there was a consistent increase. The gentleman might be interested in knowing that a year ago the total pay roll for the 1,545,000 Federal employees was only \$237,398,486—that is the monthly pay roll; whereas on November 30, 1942, the monthly pay roll had jumped to \$454,415,055, or approximately doubled. Bringing this down to an annual basis involves a total of about \$5,500,000,000 annually as the amount required to meet the civilian pay roll of our Nation—not taking into consideration our armed forces.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Are the figures the gentleman just quoted for the country as a whole or just for Washington?

Mr. DWORSHAK. They are for the country as a whole. The Federal pay roll for the city of Washington for last November was \$48,833,436, an increase of about \$15,000,000 as compared with November of the preceding year.

I call attention to these figures because I believe that manpower is today one of the most vital issues confronting our Nation. It is true we cannot economize much in curtailing this Federal pay roll; nevertheless, today, as there is a Nation-wide demand for manpower on the farms, in the mines, and in our armed forces and our production plants, we must recognize that it is not only a matter of dollars and cents but that the Federal executive departments should immediately discharge all those employees who are not required at this time.

Mr. Chairman, manpower is the most vital factor today in achieving a military victory; not only must our armed services be adequately implemented but in our factories, in the shipyards, on the farms, and in the mines adequate personnel is essential if we are to coordinate our war efforts successfully. Every man, woman, and child must contribute something toward winning the war.

It is demoralizing for Americans to know that on the Federal pay roll are thousands of persons whose services are almost completely lost because of failure to adopt greater efficiency in the executive branch of Government. There is unrefuted evidence indicating widespread duplication of effort, overlapping of bureaus, and faulty supervision. I do not charge Federal employees with being less loyal or less patriotic than other persons because they have as much at stake in this present conflict. The war

must not be used as a subterfuge for cultivating a bureaucracy as sinister and as menacing to the preservation of constitutional government as the threat of the Axis Powers.

One million persons can be discharged in the executive bureaus and agencies of Government without jeopardizing our national war effort. If the executive departments fail to act in a forceful manner, Congress must take drastic action through sizable reductions in appropriations, and thus keep faith with those on the battle lines and on the home front. This war cannot be won in Washington, but it might be lost here. It is our responsibility to prevent such a debacle.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, general debate on an appropriation bill provides a wide latitude of discussion. Subjects that are likely to become controversial usually are discussed during general debate on an appropriation bill. It is an occasion that usually provokes some tinge of partisanship. Some of us are critical of and others are defenders of policies.

It seems to me that it might be well under this first appropriation bill to try to establish something that might be said to be the tempo of discussion for this session of the Congress; in other words, to try to find a latitude, the latitude that will enable the minority to discharge its obligations as the opposition party and then, of course, according to the majority, that defensive position which it may feel necessary to resort to as the attack becomes pointed and pertinent. With that in mind, and especially in view of the presence of my beloved and distinguished majority leader here, I want to express the hope that, during the present session, as we indulge in the debates the majority will not adopt the attitude which was resorted to at a meeting of the Democratic National Committee a few weeks ago. When a certain diplomatic post was under consideration for appointment and when criticism was directed against the proposed appointee, according to the New York Times, the Democratic National Committee declared that the criticism of the appointment was, "A dastardly, treasonable plot to hamper the Commander in Chief."

Having the confidence that I do have in my very esteemed friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, I feel confident that he will at no time resort to an expression such as that or, even, have the spirit which found expression in that statement as we debate the merits and the demerits of any bill. Hearing no objection, I assume that that latitude will be accorded to us and that we need have no fear that a similar slurring, smearing statement will be laid at our door.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I will always yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact the gentleman hears nothing has prompted me to feel that my distinguished friend from

Pennsylvania is of the opinion that being present his observation merits recognition by me. May I say that any observation made by my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania who has the floor merits not only recognition by me but profound respect for his opinions, even when I might disagree. Without regard to discussing the quotations of the Democratic National Committee, but coming to the other observation made by my distinguished friend as to debates in the House and their relationship to myself, may I ask my distinguished friend if he has ever observed any indication on my part of an attempt, an honest attempt to engage in anything other than what might be considered debate that has met with the profound respect for the views of others, those on your side and those on my side with whom I might disagree?

Mr. DITTER. I should answer the distinguished majority leader by saying, and I attempt no flattery in this, that I know of no man who embodies a finer spirit of tolerance and a more complete sense of what democratic processes should be than my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. He commands my respect, my regard, and my esteem. There was no fear on my part as to what the distinguished majority leader would say in answer to my inquiry. However, I was fearful lest the enthusiasm of others on the majority side might not permit the same degree of tolerance that my friend from Massachusetts has always shown. Since my friend is taking a part in the debate, may I say to him that I had intended to refer to him and to pay him a compliment today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Before my distinguished friend proceeds, he may put me in a position where I might be precluded from making this observation temporarily.

Mr. DITTER. He will never be precluded from making any observation when I have the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. I realize that, but it might be that the gentleman from Massachusetts may feel precluded from making it temporarily because he would not want the gentleman to yield at that time. May I say that I join, not only as majority leader but as a humble Member of this body of which I am so proud to be a Member, in everything that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has said about the debate being upon a high level, no matter how much we may disagree. Now, I do not want to make this a Damon and Pythias stunt, but my friend from Pennsylvania and everyone who has served with us before, knows of the profound respect I have for him, and that I think he is the ablest advocate of clean politics and an outstanding example of a high type of gentleman that I have ever met.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman, and again I am inclined to blush.

The reference that I want to make to the distinguished majority leader is a quote in the New York Times as of January 5, 1943, in which the majority leader is quoted as having said:

If too many Republicans start thinking of 1944 politics, it will interfere with and prevent the Congress from making its maximum contribution to the successful prosecution of the war.

On behalf of the minority I think that we should thank the majority leader for the advice that he gave to the minority; but then I feel that we should remind him that since he was most generous in admonishing the minority, we hope he will not lose the opportunity of bringing the same counsel and advice to the Members on the majority side. Under present circumstances my impression is that few Republicans need worry about 1944 and that most of the worries as to 1944 are on the majority side.

If November 3 of last year points the way, then we need not start thinking of 1944, for the people did the thinking and started the ball rolling themselves. The majority is more concerned than we are over the problems of the 1944 campaign. I hope my friend will admonish the majority as he has admonished the minority.

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

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a little justification for boasting.

Mr. DITTER. I attempted no boasting.

Mr. McCORMACK. That construction might reasonably be put on it. However, I did not rise for that, I rose to suggest to my friend that I hope he will eliminate the word "admonished" and substitute therefor the word "advised."

Mr. DITTER. Having regard for that nicety for words my distinguished majority leader has at all times, I shall be glad to make the correction. I confess that as a member of the minority and realizing the position of the majority, I thought it was in the nature of an admonishment. If the gentlemen intended it as advice we will accept it as such.

In his message on the state of the Union, the President held out the hope to the American people that the cumbersome and complicated administrative procedure which the New Deal forged as shackles on efficiency in government would be simplified. That was indeed an encouraging note. It was encouraging to the burdened taxpayers who have carried on their backs the costs of this ever-increasing weight of nonsensical red tape. It was encouraging to the baffled and bewildered businessmen who have striven to survive, despite the avalanche of intricate forms and confusing questionnaires heaped on their desks almost daily by ambitious administrators. It was encouraging to those few courageous souls who having ventured as officials into the labyrinth of administrative procedure, soon found themselves in a maze of contradictions and conflicts from which they could see little hope of extricating themselves without inviting invective and abuse.

The cumbersome and complicated administrative procedure which the President promises to simplify has not come into being as a result of the war. True enough, it has become more irksome as each new agency connected with the war effort has added its contribution to the spider web of authority and power which

has been spun here in Washington. The web, however, was well under way long before the war clouds gathered in Europe.

Many of us were apprehensive when the initial moves were made which have resulted in the present complications. Despite the warnings which we sounded and the objections which we registered, resort was had by the New Deal to every possible excuse for the creation of additional alphabetical agencies. Every new agency meant a new administrator. Every new agency meant a new jealousy. Every new agency meant a new ambition to exercise authority and to wield power. A keen competition was the natural result. Every new agency provided an additional opportunity for rewarding the faithful. The mushroom growth of administrative agencies was reflected in the ever-increasing number of Federal officeholders as patronage privileges were passed out with a generous hand. Defeated candidates for public office blossomed over night into full blown administrators and deputy administrators. And in passing we might add that the overnight miracle continues despite the proposed simplifications.

Parenthetically, I may say that I am sympathetic to those who fell by the wayside on November 3. My sympathy goes out to them. I can well understand why overnight blossoming is called for.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman wishes to amplify the suggestion I have made about this "Miracle Whip" program, I shall yield to him.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I do.

Mr. DITTER. Miracle Whip is a commercial product. I am reminded of Miracle Whip as I see these administrators and deputy administrators blossom overnight, after they were brushed aside by the voters last November.

Now I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I should like to advise the gentleman that in the Democratic cloakroom there is a box of Florida oranges which I have just caused to be placed there. I should like to have the gentleman go back there and eat a couple of them, and I extend that invitation to all the other Members of the House.

Mr. DITTER. May I say that the offer is in line with the usual hospitality I have enjoyed at the hands of my distinguished friend from Florida at all times.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. DITTER. I have enjoyed the hospitality of his home. May I say to the gentleman that I think his present generosity is due in no small measure to the fact that he has a charming wife who leads him in the right way.

The jealousies, the ambitions, the competition, to say nothing of the system of rewards, which was a vital part of the development, provided fertile fields for the harvest of confusions and complications that we are reaping today.

The President's assurance of simplification serves as an admission that the warnings, which were sounded in the

past against the dangers of bureaucracy, were well founded. Obviously, there would be no need for simplification were there no complications. If the wheels of this gigantic administrative machine were moving smoothly, if the cogs in the wheels were meshing together, the process would need no correction. There would be no advantage to holding out the hope of simplification.

Nevertheless, it is refreshing and heartening to have this admission of fallibility. A studied effort has been made to clothe the imperfections of the New Deal with garments of omnipotence and infallibility. Some were inclined to insist on a pledge of fealty which had the substance, if not the form, of an earlier day when loyalty demanded of the subject the declaration that the king could do no wrong. To have, even at this late day, the admission of fallibility in administrative procedure augurs well for the future. It should mean that criticism is invited, that suggestions are welcome, that mistakes are possible, and that the New Deal is subject to the same human frailties as is every other man-made device.

Once we come to this point, we have come a long way. I want to impress that upon the new Members. For a long time the impression has prevailed here that this thing called the New Deal was far beyond the fallibility of human frailty, that it was something out of reach, almost wholly above us at times, a sanctum sanctorum that we had to approach with a great deal of trepidation and with obeisance. But this admission brings it down to the human level. Shortcomings and mistakes are possible. It is not infallible. It can be criticized. It can be subjected to the searching light of inquiry and investigation just as any other human institution can be.

Obviously, if the assurance of the President is to be carried out, radical changes must be made. There can be no simplification if the conditions which brought about the complications are permitted to continue. In fact, I doubt whether anything can be accomplished unless there is a change in some of the fundamental philosophy of the New Deal. The pantomime, which we are witnessing today, of the spenders of yesterday treading on each others' heels as they hurry to find a convenient place in the economy corner, will not simplify administrative procedure. Something more substantial and realistic must be done. There must be an about face on New Deal thinking—a change in what the New Deal conceives to be the place of the Federal Government in our system of government and in what it has assumed to be its place in the daily life of every citizen. There can be little hope of simplification if the sovereign rights of the States are to be absorbed by an ever-growing, colossal, centralization of power. Nor can there be such hope if every opportunity is seized upon by the Federal Government to extend its control over the thinking and the acting of every man and woman in the country. A supergovernment, such as has been imposed upon us, cannot be simplified. Certain policies make certain sequences

Inevitable. If what we think, and what we wear, and what we eat, and what we earn, and where we go, and what we do, are all to be policed, I question the possibility of simplification.

I am not dismissing from my mind the claim which I know is made that much of this policing is a part of the war effort. Some of it undoubtedly is. But, the regulating and regimenting of today, the intrusions on the lives of the individual citizen by a varied assortment of Government agents, differ only in degree from that which was set in motion when the "blue eagle" first screeched its praise of the N. R. A. An administration which conceived codes of fair competition as coming within the framework of our constitutional Government could hardly be expected to look with disfavor on ration books and the all-over regulating of the individual citizen.

If administrative procedure is to be simplified there must be a disavowal of the philosophy which found expression in the declaration that we will "spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect." Need I remind the House today of the place presently occupied by the disciple of the New Deal who coined this phrase as the marching song of the spenders a few short years ago? I confess that I find it difficult to reconcile a disavowal of a doctrine with a promotion in power and responsibility of the expounder of the doctrine. Disavowals do not take that form.

The "spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect" program was a part of, and a very important part of the development of administrative procedure. The two fitted together perfectly. In fact, they were dependent on each other. As one after the other of the administrative agencies were created additional excuses were available for more and more Federal spending which had to be met in part at least by more and more Federal taxing. The electing part of the process became the simpler as the spending became more widespread and the appointments to jobs became the more plentiful.

The war has brought home to the average American citizen the full force of the term "simplify." He has come to know just what it means in his everyday life. To him, it means doing without. Doing without many of the things that he considered indispensable—necessary for his convenience and comfort. And doing without is what simplify must come to mean to the New Deal if the cumbersome administrative procedure with which we are now weighted down is to be lightened. If every citizen is expected to tighten his belt, it is not too much to ask the administration to do the selfsame thing.

The responsibility for putting into effect the assurance of the President is divided. The Congress must do its part. But it cannot do it alone. If every executive agency resorts to subterfuge and cunning, if they avail themselves of every excuse for the continuation of activities, if they set out to intensify the frictions and complications so painfully apparent

to every American, if they conceal the facts and figures which are pertinent to their operations, if their paramount purpose is the perpetuation of their own place in the sun, and if they are permitted to do these things by the President the Congress may find it impossible to accomplish very much toward simplification. I take the position that the executive branch of the Government shares with the Congress the responsibility for simplifying administrative procedure.

I am convinced the Congress stands ready to discharge its duty. I believe it understands fully the mandate of last November, when the American people registered so emphatically their disapproval of a continued course of incompetency, waste, and profligacy and demanded the restoration of sanity and common sense in government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress permits the regulation issued by the Manpower Commission the day before yesterday to stand, we might as well admit that we are helpless to act as a legislative body through this emergency. Certainly there is not a Member of this House who will contend that the Selective Service and Training Act was ever intended to be used for the procurement of industrial labor. This new regulation will create a very difficult situation in my own congressional district. Within that district we have several large defense industries, such as the Colt Patent Firearms Co., Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Corporation, Pratt & Whitney Tool Co., and others, and we also have there the home offices of many of the country's largest insurance companies. These companies, for the past several months have found it difficult to keep their employees, as many of them have been attracted by the wages paid in defense industries. About the only inducement the insurance companies have been able to offer their employees has been future security. Now those who pass up the chance of going into defense plants and the opportunity of receiving higher wages find that they must now go into the military service, regardless of the fact that they are married with young children to support, or else go into a defense plant. I am at a loss to understand how anyone in the executive branch of the Government can issue such a far-reaching regulation when it is certainly contrary to the laws passed by Congress.

When the Seventy-seventh Congress last amended the Selective Service Act, when it left this House, it had very definite language defining what proceeding would be carried on by local draft boards. It was very clear that no married man with children should be called into the military service while there were men without children subject to military service within that State. Somewhere along the line, either in the other body, or in the conference, that language was stricken out, but if the

intent of Congress means anything, and I have usually understood that it does mean something, then certainly those in the Manpower Commission know definitely now that it was not the intention of Congress that married men with children should be drafted ahead of single men.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard in the past month numerous speeches from Members on both sides of the aisle objecting to the actions of some of the so-called bureaucrats in Government service. We have heard a lot about bureaucrats and bureaucracies. Frankly, I do not think that we can blame the bureaucrats for all of our troubles. This Congress must assume some of the responsibility itself. We should not sit back and wait for the bureaucrats to solve the problems we now face. For a long time we have known that this manpower problem was acute, but now, 14 months after Pearl Harbor, we have not solved the manpower problem by legislation.

I also want to refer to another problem that we failed to solve—the problem of how to make the best possible use of the facilities of our colleges throughout the country. I have in mind one medical school in Boston where last September they had seven applicants for every student they could accept in their medical school. These young men were perfectly able and willing, with the help of a scholarship in many cases, to go through the medical schools. But now I understand they are telling them that they will be taken into the military service and put in uniform, and instead of paying their tuition themselves, the Government will pay not only the tuition but give them a soldier's pay. By so doing we have not increased the number of doctors who will be available 4 or 5 years from now. Those men were willing to accept Reserve commissions and go into active military service upon completion of their education, but if this plan that is being discussed and has been proposed is carried through, and every graduate of a medical or a dental school in the United States is in the Army not only after he graduates, but while he is in school, where is our future supply of civilian doctors coming from? We know that the Army and Navy cannot take and should not take all of the doctors and dentists that the civilian population requires.

While we are talking about problems that this Congress must solve, I want to call your attention to a problem that we must face very, very soon, and that is the problem of providing adequate care for those who will be coming home from the hell of modern warfare, wounded and disabled. I do not want to see this Government make the same mistake that was made in 1918 and 1919 when men were brought back from the war and discharged immediately upon reaching the United States, and sent home with only a few dollars in their pockets, so few dollars that if they wanted to eat the second week they had to go to work the first week they were home. Thou-

sands of veterans of the last war are now in mental and nervous hospitals and institutions who never would have been there for any length of time if they had had adequate and proper treatment during the first year they were home. Men were discharged from the Army who even a layman knew were nervous if not physical wrecks. If those men could have had 4 or 6 or 8 months in some kind of a convalescent home, in some camp or even in a hospital, to allow themselves to become adjusted from the terrific strain of modern warfare to the comparatively simple civil life, many of those men who broke down later never would have broken down.

So I urge upon the members of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to start in now making plans to provide sufficient beds and sufficient care for those men who are so soon coming back to us broken in mind and body. In my own congressional district we have a fine veterans' hospital at Newington, Conn., containing 304 beds. The power plant and all of the utilities, the nurses' home and operating rooms were built with the thought in mind that that institution would be expanded to a 500-bed hospital. Incidentally, General Hines has, on numerous occasions, testified before committees of this House that a 500-bed general hospital is the most economical unit to operate.

I urge that we now provide funds to increase that hospital from 304 beds to 500 beds.

The additional 196 beds can be added at a lower cost per bed than can be done by building a brand new hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, these are discouraging days for Congressmen. In my mail this morning there was a picture of an elderly man, a storekeeper in a small village near my home, looking at a questionnaire from the Government and saying, "I am selling out. I am done. I cannot fill out all these questionnaires of the Government. I am giving up."

In the same mail from the same village came a letter asking me to ask for an appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 to reimburse the people for their expenses in going to and fro to get their fuel and rationing cards. He made a careful list of his expenses, forced upon him because he must go personally to the central authority. The amount of gas he used to get his gas-rationing card used up much of his allowance. Numerous, indeed, are these complaints. It is more discouraging because we cannot seem to do much about it, except vainly protest.

I received in the same mail yesterday a communication stating that 1,000 people in one end of my small city were unable to get any kerosene for heating and cooking. I fear the patriotism of my people has been badly scorched. No wonder you worry about bureaucratic government on the majority side. We heard the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas on yester-

day, and speeches that have been made by other gentlemen on his side, but do not their faces get red when they recall how they voted for the last 8 years?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will look at the votes I have cast, I do not think he will find any cause to take exception to them in hewing to the lines of democratic and American principles.

Mr. GIFFORD. I said that because I well knew that you had voted contrary to your party's program many times and I thought you would have been disciplined by this time. But you would not like to apologize for the other gentlemen's votes, would you—for instance, the gentleman who has lectured us so much lately?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Exactly who do they have in mind by bureaucrats? Do they have in mind Mr. Brown or Mr. Wickard, or who is it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I cannot particularize.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There are probably 3,000,000 of these bureaucrats.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is such a hateful name to me. I do not indulge in name calling anyway.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do you think that now since we are going to have our former colleague, Mr. McKeough, from the Kelly-Nash machine in Chicago out there in the Midwest where they produce food, he will be able to iron the thing out any better?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know; I presume he will do the best he can; he at least ought to have the viewpoint of a Congressman.

The House knows my humility. Yesterday I listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and he stirred me quite a little. I tried to interrupt him. While I usually yield to anybody who wants to interrupt me, he hesitated to yield to me when I wanted to ask him a question. He is so overpowering; I admire him, really. He is a man of great stature; he is powerful in argument; he is a good lawyer, and one could not possibly take exception to him in his absolute correctness in quoting the law. But I did try to interrupt; and I may say in very good nature: "Great vessels may venture more, but little vessels must hug the shore." I am a little vessel keeping safely near the shore.

Certainly, he quoted the law correctly, and I thank him and I appreciate what he was trying to do. I am glad he freshened our minds on the law. I ought to know the law; I have been on the committee a long time, but I cannot always call these laws to mind perhaps because of brain fag; I cannot quote exact dates and the exact law, but I know that we passed an act in 1933 providing for \$3,000,000,000 of printed money, supposedly national bank notes. We feared we would have to print money because the people might not be able to buy even 4-percent bonds. For some time we have

provided that Federal Reserve notes should be issued for snakes from Burma if a bill of exchange was presented or on many kinds of property similarly acquired. Lately we use the Federal Reserve notes, protected by United States bonds. The Government should, and probably would, pay 4 percent on long-term bonds. They do not pay much interest on short-term securities, sometimes not more than one-half of 1 percent. As the gentleman said yesterday, it was cheaper to use the printed money already available than to print new money. But bear in mind that we have outstanding a tremendous amount of demand debt that is so highly dangerous that I want to hug the shore; I am frightened to venture much farther.

The Constitution states—and I shall repeat this over and over again until it gets in your mind—Congress may coin money, and fix the value thereof—yes; for the benefit of its own citizens, but not for the benefit of a Government to pay its own bills. Do not try to interpret it otherwise. Secondly, Congress can fix the standards of weights and measures. That is provided in the very same section. This does not mean that the Government can have a small peck measure as against the private citizen having the standard peck measure.

The gentleman from Wisconsin pleaded yesterday that we not lose faith in our currency. I agree with him. But he left the impression that he would venture more along the line he defended. I agree that it would hurt our currency but little at the moment even if we used the full \$3,000,000,000. The method is highly dangerous and should be limited to a very small amount. Every country that has ever tried printed money based only on national credit has had disastrous results. Examples are plentiful. We should profit by others' experiences. It should not be done and it is entirely unnecessary at the present time. If the Government needs money, let it borrow from its citizens the same as you and I have to borrow, and pay at least competitive interest on it. I suggest we should pay 4 percent to the people when we take away their money, not 1½ percent. Many rather poor people are buying bonds from a patriotic impulse and we want them to hold them for a long period after the war, but they cannot do that unless a fair return is received.

Certainly they should be entitled to more than 1½ percent. The Government should pay this tribute exactly as you and I pay it. There is, of course, plenty of gold back of Federal Reserve notes. But that gold does not belong to the Government; that gold belongs to the people; that gold came into the various banks as deposits. We forced them to send it to the Federal Reserve banks and the Government would not let even them keep it. The Government took it but gave a mortgage in the shape of a gold certificate for that gold which belongs to the people. But let the people try to get it back. This administration fears to give it back. If you were privileged to take a \$20 note to the bank and receive a \$20 gold piece, they would hand you a gold piece that would be about

one-half as large as formerly. Our people would then learn what we have been doing toward "watering the currency." The authority lies here in Washington to redistribute this gold, returning it to the people who really own it, but they seem to fear this practical demonstration of "coin clipping."

The question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday was that they were within the law technically, although there was a reverse process. The Government did not furnish a bond to the Federal Reserve and get credit on its books; no, the Federal Reserve was expected to furnish only security to the Treasury with no interest or penalty attached.

It was the beginning of a process that we do not want continued—the step in procuring money without payment of interest.

We passed that \$3,000,000,000 act in the belief that the public could not, or would not, buy bonds at that time. That act should have been repealed long, long ago. When you hint at silver worth 30 or 70 cents according to whether it is domestic or foreign, and issued at \$1.29, I earnestly urge the immediate repeal of that act also.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the course of the debate this afternoon has been on a high plane and to my way of thinking has been most constructive. Frankly, I have been very much encouraged by the indication on the part of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee that they are determined to take the bull by the horns and cut here and there in a courageous manner so that economy may be practiced, so far as nondefense expenditures in our Government are concerned.

May I also express my admiration for the membership of this committee by saying that I feel from their remarks made on the floor here at least that they are equally determined to assert the authority of the Congress against a growing demand of an ever-increasing bureaucracy which is asserting its power and authority more and more over the people we wish to represent back home.

I was particularly encouraged when I heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] earlier this afternoon say that he was through giving any blanket checks or giving the executive department of this Government further permission to write blank checks to increase this bureaucracy as it has been increased during the past years.

In the time allotted me today I shall elaborate upon the remarks I made a short time ago on the floor of the House when I protested some of the various steps that have been taken to regiment and to regulate the daily lives of people of every district in this country. May I say here and now that if the prestige of this Congress is to be maintained, further encroachments upon its power and upon the powers of the judicial branch of our Government must cease. It is our duty today and from now on to regulate the Budget of this Government so that

the bureaucrats will be cut in such a way that they will not exercise any further arbitrary influence and authority over the people of the United States.

I wish to point out at this time that I consider it my duty to rise in the House on every occasion that I can to defend the American principles and privileges of the individuals back home and to fight in every way that I can for their welfare and against the encroachments of bureaucrats upon the peoples' rights.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does not the gentleman believe that the plan proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on yesterday, to limit use of the penalty mail on the part of the bureaucrats or the bureaus, or at least cut it down 50 percent, will be a good step in the direction to which the gentleman wishes this Congress to go?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It was my privilege and pleasure to listen to the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday when he put forth his proposal. I heartily concur in what the gentleman from Iowa has just stated. When I heard the statement that \$300,000,000 was used last year to pay the communications bill of the administrative departments of the Government I was amazed. I was shocked that such a condition existed. Yet I could only conclude the correct figure must be somewhere in that neighborhood because it was so staggering. It is evident that the authority they are using has gone beyond all reason and is superseding the right and prerogatives of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to protest the deliberate encroachment upon the authority of the Congress and to condemn the authority that has been given the administrative agencies of this Government. In my opinion, they are proceeding illegally on a good many fronts. They are assuming that Congress has given them authority in many cases, whereas the Congress has not done so, and it behooves every Member of the House, whether he is on the majority side or the minority side, to take cognizance of the way they are flaunting their powers in the face of the elected representatives of the people. I maintain that from now on it is either Congress or the bureaucrats. There can be no halfway course. Either you are going to surrender your powers to these administrative agencies of the Government or you are going to reassert your authority in this session of Congress before it is too late.

I maintain further that these people are proceeding with about 10 percent authority and 90 percent bluff. They are deliberately proceeding illegally in a good many cases that they are called upon to settle. They are made bold by the apparent hesitancy of Congress to question their prerogatives. They are made confident by the green light they have been given by those high in authority in this Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, everyone agrees with the gentleman's statement, if correct. I was wondering if the gentleman would give us a bill of particulars as to who was committing these illegal acts and what particular illegal acts they are committing. Of course, in court you would have to give a bill of particulars. You realize that?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; and I am prepared at this time to give a big bill of particulars which the people of my district have passed on to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not make the statement unless he had some information particularly on the 10-percent law and 90-percent bluff proposition. That will be a pretty big bill of particulars, I know, but I am sure the gentleman can give it in his extension of remarks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will give it right now. I say that the Office of Price Administration is assuming powers that were never meant to be assumed by that agency, so far as the Congress is concerned. When it tells a pleasure driver that he cannot have his coupons for gasoline or that he must have his license taken away from him if he violates a petty regulation that they have made, I say that is illegal. I say that the Congress of the United States is the authority which should first write into the law regulations of that kind, and I contend that the Congress has never given such a prerogative to the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to enter into any dispute with the gentleman because personally I want to get all the gas I can; but then I owe a responsibility to my country in war. Does the gentleman think the Congress could legislate from time to time 2, 3, or 4 gallons of gas, depending upon the exigencies abroad?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have never disputed the right of the rationing agency to limit me to 3 gallons per coupon or 2 gallons per coupon, but I do dispute the right of any agency of government to make their own rules which supersede the courts and also the powers of the Congress. I also protest their snooping upon this or that individual citizen. They are superseding the rights that have been given them by Congress, and I protest it as a Member of this body.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, in addressing the House at this time, I desire to tell our colleagues something about a special canteen service, sponsored and maintained by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California, whose headquarters are in San Francisco.

This organization is making an outstanding contribution to the war program, and I am pleased that my fellow San Franciscans foresaw the need, and as a Member of Congress, I am glad to assist in furthering its splendid objectives.

This canteen service is entirely directed by veterans of previous wars, and has been in existence about 1 year. Through past experience these veterans are well equipped to understand and handle existing conditions in our present world crisis. The purpose is to furnish absolutely free, comforting necessities of life to the men in uniform. All branches of the Nation's war forces are served, whether hospitalized, en route, or overseas. This, of course, does not mean that the canteen service expects to give necessities to all the men in our services. That would be impossible, and would require a fund running into millions and millions of dollars, but as an instance, they serve men who are stationed in areas far from post exchanges. The supplies given out are sometimes only obtainable when the chaplain visits these distant posts. The men at these places, of course, are paid but cannot buy the articles. Many such places are scattered throughout the areas where our troops are operating. Then again, when men arrive at American ports without funds and awaiting orders to report to some other station.

Quantities of articles, far too numerous to list in full, have been delivered to our boys. To give an idea of a few, I have picked at random the following:

Over 11,000,000 cigarettes.

Over 200,000 bars of candy.

Over 20,000 bars of soap.

Nearly 40,000 packages of chewing gum.

More than 100,000 packages of razor blades.

Thousands and thousands of tins and sacks of tobacco.

About 2,500,000 pieces of writing paper and envelopes.

These items make an imposing list and this special canteen service may justly take pride in its accomplishments. Although it is organized and operated entirely by Californians, the service goes impartially to uniformed boys from all 48 States of the Union, as well as the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

Working entirely out of sight of the general public, and with all direct publicity prohibited because of wartime regulations, this canteen service works closely with the chaplains and morale officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. These officers are in best position to know where the needs are greatest, and are cooperating wholeheartedly in distributing the merchandise. Letters of acknowledgment and appreciation have been received from American boys in uniform throughout the world.

I would like to read two of these letters, one from the Army and one from the Navy. The Army letter, dated Fort Mason, Calif., September 19, 1942, and signed by Maj. William E. Millikin, special service officer, reads as follows:

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of and to extend my thanks for the two cases containing 20,000 Chesterfield cigarettes delivered to me September 17, upon my request to satisfy an urgent demand. These cigarettes were placed on a bomber early the following morning and flown to a task force in the southwest Pacific, where, I am sure, they will be thankfully received by men fighting the battle of the United Nations in that area.

I desire to express not only my personal thanks but the thanks of the special service officer and the men of this task force for this generous contribution from the canteen service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Navy communication, on the letterhead of the twelfth naval district, Treasure Island, Calif., dated September 21, 1942, is addressed to J. R. Klawans, State administrator of Canteen Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and is signed by Enoch Jones, chaplain. The text is given in full herewith:

This is to express my thanks to you and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the splendid way in which you have responded to meet some of our needs here on "Treasure Island," by providing us with cigarettes, razor blades, soap, and other things for the health and comfort of many of our men here.

Those who made possible this aid to our men would be interested to know that most of the men who receive these articles are survivors of ships sunk by the enemy, some of them having survived two or three sinkings; therefore, they arrive here without these articles and with little more than the clothing they wear, which might be a discarded Australian soldier's uniform or a pair of discarded dungarees. Our friends therefore realize what a boost it is to the morale of these men to know that they have friends who welcome them back home with provisions for their health and personal comfort.

On behalf of these men, as well as myself, I wish to express our deep gratitude for the fine way in which our friends have responded to their needs.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Canteen Service is a nonprofit organization, maintained through voluntary contributions. In addition to some 70,000 display cards throughout California, many Veterans of Foreign Wars posts throughout the Nation contribute regularly each month, as well as do many private enterprises and individuals.

This special canteen service deserves every American's support, and I deem it a privilege to go on record offering my services in this worthy cause.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including page 3, line 7.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1648, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the

Whole two brief tables from a Civil Service Commission report.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to advise my distinguished friend and the House of the program for next week.

On Monday the bill providing for a merger of the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph companies will come up for consideration. There will be 1 hour of debate on the rule, and I believe the rule provides for 2 hours of general debate. If there is a roll call on the passage of this bill, or any other roll call on Monday, it is my intention, if it is agreeable to the House, that they be postponed until Tuesday.

On Tuesday the resolution providing for the extension of the life of the Dies committee will be considered.

On Wednesday and Thursday there will be general debate on the Independent Offices appropriation bill. That bill will not be considered under the 5-minute rule, which I may say for the information of the new Members is the amendment phase, until the following Monday.

Mr. TABER. There will be no votes on that bill until a week from next Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Friday is the anniversary of Lincoln's birth, and, of course, many Members have speaking engagements for that day. I make this statement so that any Members having such engagements may know that there will be only general debate on Wednesday and Thursday, with no roll calls on those days, and they can make their plans accordingly.

I may say in connection with the appropriation bill now pending that we are meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow in the hope that the bill may be passed tomorrow.

May I also say that in talking with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] earlier in the afternoon in connection with arrangements for general debate on the independent offices appropriation bill he told me he is very eager that when that bill is considered under the 5-minute rule a week from next Monday that the bill be passed on that day. I know the members of the committee on the Republican side will cooperate in every way possible to have that appropriation bill passed on that day.

That is the program for next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 5, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

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."

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet at 10:30 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will meet at 10:30 a. m. Friday, February 5, 1943, in room 224, Senate Office Building in a joint meeting with the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys for the purpose of hearing testimony on the George Washington Carver National Monument.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

153. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report on alien registration submitted by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under date of February 1, 1943; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

154. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

155. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the cost of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowance to certain officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

157. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the second report of the Attorney General covering the period from October 1, 1942, through January 31, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 91. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 92. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 93. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1408. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Union Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 579. A bill for the relief of Barbara Healy; with amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Alvertine Nast and Wayne Nast, minor son; with amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1584. A bill for the relief of Howard M. Sandus; without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1667. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1685. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Redley, and the estate of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 1686. A bill authorizing the payment of necessary expenses incurred by certain Indians allotted on the Quinaielt Reservation, State of Washington, in securing their allotment; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1687. A bill to regulate the practice of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1688. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 1689. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the control of rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 1690. A 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.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1691. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 1692. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1693. A bill to place enlisted men in the Marine Corps on an equality as to pay with enlisted men of the Army of corresponding grades and ratings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 1694. A bill to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1695. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1696. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and education organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 1697. A bill to exempt persons in the military and naval forces of the United States from Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 1698. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," Public Law No. 729, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1699. A bill to amend section 12B and section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act during the continuance of the war and for 6 months after the cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1700. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1701. A bill to protect and enhance the social-security benefits to all persons inducted into the military service, and to provide a cushion for post-war conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1702. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1703. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in the honor of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary on June 1, 1946, of the statehood of the State of Tennessee, admitted to the Union on June 1, 1796; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of owners of certain properties rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1705. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1706 (by request). A bill to authorize and direct the Veterans' Administration to provide vocational rehabilitation and assistance in securing suitable employment for service-connected disabled veterans in need thereof and feasible therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1720. A bill to extend air-mail services to all persons equally and to provide for the transportation of mail by air without surcharge; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. Res. 100. Resolution granting a gratuity to Mrs. Alyce W. Sinnott; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Antholula S. Maskas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 1708. A bill for the relief of Perley M. Silver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 1709. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Alvin C. York as a colonel in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1710. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of A. T. Steele and J. C. Corbitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1712. A bill for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Habersfeld; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1713. A bill for the relief of Charley R. Bayless; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Patrick Henry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mala Virtudes Torres Steere; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 1716. A bill granting a pension to Clyde C. Delaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 1717. A bill for the relief of the General Exchange Insurance Corporation, Richmond, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Miss STANLEY:

H. R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 1719. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eliza V. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

77. By Mr. HERTER: Petition of the Brookline Taxpayers' Association, Brookline, Mass., urging strict economy in Government expenditures and the adoption of a pay-as-you-go taxation plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

78. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, petitioner, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to impeachment of the Honorable Wiley Blount Rutledge, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Senate Joint Memorial No. 2, adopted by the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging Congress to broaden and liberalize the administration of the duties of the Federal joint dehydration committee of the Agricultural Marketing Administration so as to permit the orderly establishment and development of dehydration plants and facilities to increase production of dehydrated potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

80. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, adopted by the twenty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging Congress to take necessary action to authorize hospitalization of veterans of this war; that a veteran of the present conflict discharged on or after December 7, 1941, be considered a veteran of a war and be entitled to hospitalization for treatment as indicated or care of any disease or injury, regardless of the nature or origin, when such treatment is required; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

We pray Thee, our Father in Heaven, to send us forth to meet the challenge of this day, whatsoever it may be. Let us become kings of truth and justice until grief and sorrow have fled and mankind no longer moans beneath the iron yoke of political and religious tyranny. Open all hearts, our Father, to accept the light of a good God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, humanity's King and Saviour.

We ask Thy richest blessings upon those who seek to help their fellows, who guard our homes, teach our youth, and minister to the sick. Grant that all hatred and resentment may be banished afar and melted into the peaceful fruits of love and contentment. Oh, lead us to take the things of the spirit and make them very real to our hearts, with the deep certainty that no earthly affluence can atone for poverty of soul. Wilt Thou glorify Thyself, O God, and let the royalty of Thy grace build up thy people in humility and sacrifice. Keep us all in the sincerest sympathy with those great souls who fanned the feeble embers of democracy into a glowing flame of freedom which is destined to sweep the heart of the world. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Historical Records Survey carried by the W. P. A. made a report on that work.

It is of great interest to everyone interested in the history of the country, I think. The report will cost \$22.50 more than is allowed in the regular congressional allotment. I ask unanimous consent that this may be published notwithstanding.

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

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

Mr. MASON. 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. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving telegrams from furniture manufacturing companies and other civilian industries in my district protesting the latest order of Chairman McNutt. This is my answer:

This will acknowledge your wire of February 4 concerning the status of your employees.

This order "Work in necessary defense plant or be drafted" is one of the craziest of many crazy orders issued by McNutt. It would mean chaos in all nondefense industry. It is the same as removing the foundation from under a house and expect the house to stand up and continue to serve minus its foundation. Peacetime occupations that provide for the needs of the civilian population is the foundation under the entire war effort. Remove the peacetime occupations and the entire war program must fall. I cannot see how this crazy order can be carried out. Our civilian structure supports the war structure. Anything that tends to destroy the civilian structure must of necessity destroy the war structure. For that reason I call this order of McNutt's a crazy order. It should be revoked and I shall do what I can to have it rescinded.

N. M. MASON.

[Here the gavel fell.]

HON. RALPH R. ROBERTS

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

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

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the employees of this great legislative body from the lowest to the highest are today feeling a thrill of pride over the election of one of their own number, Ralph R. Roberts, to the office of Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. This reward has come to Mr. Roberts after 20 years of faithful service to the House. It is strictly a reward of merit and it will be stimulating and inspiring to all who have chosen, or will hereafter choose, a career of service to this, the greatest of all legislative bodies in the world. Mr. Roberts is a Hoosier by birth and comes from a fine old family at Rockport, Ind. The State of Indiana will deem itself honored by the honor which the House has fittingly conferred upon this worthy son of Indiana. [Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a news article appearing in the New York Sun.

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