

possible moment the irrigation project known as Palisade Dam in Bonneville County, Idaho, which development will supply supplemental irrigation water to about 1,000,000 acres of land along the Snake River Valley, which is now inadequately irrigated, and also may irrigate approximately 150,000 acres of farming land in Cassia and Twin Falls Counties, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

115. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America to use their best efforts to have passed House bill 801 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, passed by the general assembly on the 4th day of February A. D. 1943; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

116. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of E. E. Schoenlein, Leland L. Miller, T. R. Buckles, V. L. Todd, Robert Langdon, and many others, urging adoption of the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan and expressing opposition to Treasury proposals for double taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. Also, petition of Gerald E. Bosserman and 400 members of the First Church of the Brethren, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of that section of the Selective Service Act which recognizes the right of conscientious objectors to refuse combatant service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1943

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

Our Father God, in all the agony of this seared and sundered earth we bless Thee that through the blackness breaks the dawn, for our eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. We thank Thee for prophetic glimpses of a new world, a radiant world in which, under all skies, reverential altars of worship shall be freely reared, none daring to molest nor make afraid—a world where no fetters shall coerce minds or silence speech; a world where the earth's abundance anywhere shall be channeled to human need everywhere. May our glad hearts rejoice that the day of salvation draweth near as against the vilest tyranny of the ages Thou hast loosed the fateful lightning of Thy terrible, swift sword.

In humility and penitence that our own democracy has fallen short of the glory, we are grateful that America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this; not flaunting her strength as a great giant, but as a Good Samaritan bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world. Help us to seize the whole of life and build Thy glory there. In the name of the Master of all good workmen, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday,

February 11, 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.

NOTICE OF HEARING—NOMINATION OF THURMAN W. ARNOLD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold, of Connecticut, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Wiley Blount Rutledge, resigned.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, February 23, 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 appear and give such testimony concerning the fitness and qualifications of this nominee as may be properly received.

INFORMATION CONCERNING NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from Rear Admiral Jacobs which is very brief and which I should like to read for the information of all Senators. The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1943.
HON. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be advised that this Bureau has established as of this date, a Congressional Information Service for the purpose of answering requests by telephone from members of Congress concerning factual information relating to naval personnel.

The telephone number of this service is Republic 7400, Extension 7600. Lt. Paul Whitehead, U. S. N. R., is the officer in charge.

It is suggested that Members of Congress continue to address to the Bureau of Naval Personnel by written correspondence inquiries concerning the policies of the Bureau and requests for information which are not of an urgent nature and, therefore, do not require immediate reply by telephone.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
The Chief of Naval Personnel.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege to make about a 1-minute statement concerning remarks made over the radio by a commentator last night.

Mr. Drew Pearson, in his statement "A prediction of things to come," said that the powerful Truman committee—he was, no doubt, referring to the special committee authorized by the Senate of which I am chairman—would very

shortly recommend to the President of the United States that the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, should be dismissed from their offices. The committee of which I am chairman has no such thing under consideration, has never had any such thing under consideration, and does not expect to go into the conduct of the war. We very carefully followed the lines laid down by the resolution as authorized by the Senate to investigate contracts and the production program, and we have, under no circumstances, considered appointments in strategic places. That was one of the things that caused difficulty in the Civil War on the part of the Committee on the Conduct of the War. They suggested to the President of the United States that he appoint certain generals, and that committee was responsible for the appointment of General Burnside, General Hooker, and General Meade. They then investigated the conduct of those generals in the field. If we, as a committee, should attempt to tell the President of the United States who ought to be Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy or who should occupy any of the other executive offices, we would be acting entirely outside the purposes for which the Senate authorized the special committee.

I merely wanted to make it plain that there was absolutely no foundation, in fact, for what Mr. Pearson said last night over the radio.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Sixth Annual Report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1941, and ending June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 15, 1943.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—TRAVEL BY GOVERNMENT-OWNED AUTOMOBILES (S. DOC. NO. 5)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, relating to the elimination of nonessential

traveling by Government-owned automobile, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I request that the report relating to Government-owned automobiles be printed in the body of the RECORD and also printed as a Senate document. I will discuss the report later on in the day.

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

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The investigation of the cost of passenger automobiles, both owned and rented by the United States Government, convinced the committee a year ago that very substantial economies could be effected by eliminating all nonessential traveling by automobile.

The committee decided last year, and so reported to Congress, that the traveling expenses of the different agencies of government were exorbitant and should be carefully supervised by the Appropriations Committees, and a substantial reduction required.

The committee now presents to Congress a report on the number of automobiles owned and operated by the various Government agencies, exclusive of those used by the Army and Navy.

Despite the growing automobile crisis, both in tires and gasoline, the investigation of the committee indicates that for the first 4 months of the present fiscal year (July 1 to November 1, 1942) the various agencies of the Government, exclusive of the Army and Navy, continued for the most part to use as many passenger cars, to drive as many miles, and to consume about as much gasoline as did these agencies in a comparable period of the previous year, and this, notwithstanding the efforts of the Government to reduce the consumption of gasoline and to conserve rubber.

The committee believes that the same standard of strictly essential driving should be applicable to Government employees as it now applies to individual citizens. This, the committee is convinced, is not being done, assuming that the latest figures available for the first 4 months of this fiscal year are a criterion for the current fiscal year.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government owned 17,305 passenger automobiles, exclusive of the Army and Navy, and exclusive of trucks and motorcycles. It now owns and operates 18,953 passenger automobiles, which represents an increase of more than 1,600 cars over the number owned and operated during fiscal year 1942.

In the last fiscal year the cost of operating these passenger automobiles, exclusive of interest and depreciation on the cars, was \$4,243,602. The cost of operating these cars for the first 4 months of this fiscal year was \$1,308,023, or, on a yearly basis, the cost would be \$3,924,069, which is substantially the same.

In the last fiscal year these Government-owned cars traveled 203,550,280 miles. In the first 4 months of this fiscal year they traveled 66,610,310, or 199,830,930 miles on a yearly basis.

The amount of gasoline used by Government-owned cars in the past fiscal year was 13,793,594 gallons. For the first 4 months of this fiscal year the amount was 4,284,511 gallons, or, on a yearly basis, 12,853,533 gallons.

Considering, therefore, the cost, the mileage traveled, and the amount of gasoline consumed for the first 4 months of this fiscal year (according to the latest information available), there has been no appreciable decline in the use of these Government automobiles by peacetime agencies, although the Government itself is compelling the private citizen to reduce the use of automobile travel and ban all nonessential driving.

But these figures by no means tell the entire story of travel by employees on Government business. The various departments allow their employees to use privately owned cars for official business on a reimbursable mileage basis. The figures from all the agencies are not available to the committee, but 5 agencies out of 47 have reported the mileage of these cars for the fiscal year 1942. The extent of the use of privately owned cars as reported by these 5 agencies shows that they traveled 145,606,241 miles at a total cost of \$7,261,856.32. Adding this mileage of 145,606,241 to the 203,550,280 miles traveled by the Government-owned cars, and making reasonable allowance for those agencies not reporting, it would appear to be conservative to estimate that in the fiscal year 1942 the various agencies of the Government operated passenger cars to the extent of from 400,000,000 to 500,000,000 miles and used from 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 gallons of gasoline.

The committee desires again to call attention to the great extravagance of the traveling costs of the various agencies of Government, and in more detailed statement which will be made to the Congress later, but at this time the committee regards, as most important, the complete elimination of nonessential operation of motorcars by the Government. In a crisis such as this the Government itself must set an example to the people. It should not ask sacrifices of the people which the employees of the Government do not themselves make. The committee has had presented to it many instances of duplicated travel of these thousands of Government employees who travel in separate cars instead of using the same car. The committee finds this practice especially reprehensible in the Department of Agriculture, which in the fiscal year 1942 traveled 143,206,000 miles in rented cars and 49,856,594 in Government-owned cars. The committee is of the opinion that a large proportion of this travel is unnecessary and should be dispensed with, and for much of the balance the same car can be used by different employees of the Agriculture Department.

It is, of course, true that in certain agencies of the Government, such as the Department of Justice, there is justification for a reasonable increase in the cars operated, due to the enlarged activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In fact, the increase of 551 cars in the past year in the Department of Justice for the most part may be attributed to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On the other hand, in the judgment of the committee, there is no justification for an increase of nearly 100 cars in the Agriculture Department, which already had 4,359 passenger cars, or an increase of 120 in the Federal Works Agency, as in this latter Agency the activities have been greatly reduced. An increase of 34 in the National Housing Agency, as well as other increases, are noted in the itemized statement which is a part of this report.

The committee further believes that substantial economies can be made in the employment of full-time and part-time chauffeurs. In the last fiscal year there were 403 full-time chauffeurs; now there are 439, an increase of 36. In the last fiscal year there were 695 part-time chauffeurs; now there are 693, a reduction of 2.

In the last fiscal year the salaries of full-time chauffeurs was \$555,295 while it is estimated their salaries this year will be \$590,000, in addition to these the Government employs many chauffeurs on a part-time basis.

The committee believes the plan which the Office for Emergency Management has adopted to regulate use of the cars assigned to it, is a step in the right direction. They require every person using a car to sign a statement for permanent record that the person is traveling on official business, and to give the destination and reason for the use of the car. Such a plan adopted by the other agencies, combined with a decentralized automobile-pooling arrangement, would do much to reduce the use of Government-owned automobiles and greatly reduce the cost to the Government.

The information gathered by the committee has been very useful to several departments of the Government concerned with this problem. Last year the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Defense Transportation availed themselves of the information to be used as a basis for their regulations and to effect economies in the use of Government owned and operated cars and trucks.

In a statement to the press on February 7, 1943, Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, pointed out that—

"Preliminary surveys conducted by the Bureau and data provided by the Byrd committee indicated approximately 100,000 tires will be pooled as a result of the order, which means that until now Government cars have had an average of 6½ tires each. This is an 'unwarranted situation.'"

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends:

1. That the Appropriations Committees carefully survey the need for the existing passenger cars of each of the agencies of Government and adjust accordingly the operation for the necessary cars.
 2. That all Government officials and employees give complete endorsement to the Office of Price Administration's mileage-conservation program as it relates to automobiles used in the public service.
 3. That there should be established immediately in Washington for the duration of the war a passenger-automobile pooling arrangement to transport Government employees engaged in official business when no other transportation is available within the metropolitan area of Washington. Each agency shall certify the names of those persons entitled to use official cars on official business, and at no other time, by no other person, and in no other way shall they be used.
 4. That any Government official or employee who uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned or leased vehicle other than for official purposes shall be summarily removed from office, and may, also, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.
 5. That every Government automobile have displayed in a conspicuous place a sign such as the following: "Owned and operated by the United States Government — agency."
- The following is a list of passenger automobiles as reported by the various agencies. This list does not include the cars that are rented by the various agencies, neither does it include trucks, pick-up trucks, or motorcycles, and is exclusive, also, of all passenger automobiles and trucks owned and operated by the Army and Navy.

Automobile (passenger)

[Re questionnaire dated Oct. 31, 1942]

Agency or department	Number owned		Cost of operating		Number miles traveled, fiscal year 1942	Number miles traveled this fiscal year to Oct. 31, 1942	Number of chauffeurs				Chauffeurs' salaries, full time		Number gallons gasoline used	
	Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year ending June 30, 1942	This fiscal year to Oct. 31, 1942			Full time		Part time		Fiscal year 1942	Estimated for fiscal year	Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year to date
							Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year to date	Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year to date				
Agriculture Department	14,359	14,454	\$1,004,001.59	\$275,722.81	49,856,594	13,722,621	7	6	5	7	\$9,780	\$8,280.00	3,153,706	858,028
Alley Dwelling Authority	None													
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Council	None													
Board of Economic Warfare	5	5	782.05	655.20	55,435	18,300	3	3	3	3	4,140	4,140.00	2,972	1,719
Budget Bureau	3	3	706.90	186.31	23,467	9,573			5	5			2,063	662
Civil Aeronautics Board	17	20	3,414.49	1,765.01	265,369	95,172	1	1			1,380	1,380.00	11,823	5,571
Civil Service Commission	None													
Commerce Department	414	489	98,281.87	36,940.32	5,488,266	2,089,667	9	9			13,140	13,140.00	322,864	117,764
Federal Communications Commission	148	175	30,321.98	15,159.16	1,851,428	728,780							85,511	36,439
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	16	16	4,779.80	1,582.00	197,530	48,231	1	1			1,500	1,500.00	11,742	2,902
Federal Power Commission	1,983	1,940	417,279.26	194,034.20	18,296,945	8,003,590	197	103	37	30	132,123	132,984.00	1,220,091	509,052
Federal Security Agency	None													
Federal Trade Commission	565	685	83,213.68	32,822.74	5,344,323	2,274,961	15	15	2	3	20,880	21,180.00	344,299	126,412
Federal Works Agency	2	2	76.44	35.76	9,204	3,118	1	1			1,620	1,620.00	924	278
General Accounting Office	None													
Gorge Memorial Institute	4	4	1,418.68	348.01	30,306	8,777	4	4			7,502	2,757.84	2,940	719
Government Printing Office	3,011	3,768	\$87,881.50	204,939.13	33,299,049	8,864,983	9	10	2	2	12,840	4,680.00	2,345,839	631,521
Interior Department	130	130	29,630.16	10,782.95	1,262,140	447,825							80,189	22,025
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,367	2,018	636,615.65	192,283.74	33,407,875	13,211,990	10	10	6	6	14,640	14,640.00	2,337,852	904,511
Justice Department	6	6	2,046.15	615.81	73,000	10,078	3	3			5,290	4,620.00	7,118	961
Labor Department	1	1	144.13	73.51	8,425	3,269	1	1			1,320	1,320.00	671	255
Library of Congress	15	20	2,326.91	847.10	81,481	39,502	3	2	3	3	4,500	2,820.00	6,249.85	2,856.3
Maritime Commission	15	15	929.66	677.16	72,867	42,487							5,137	2,448
National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics	1	1	80.88	24.26	6,148.5	2,090.8	1	1			1,320	1,320.00	477	147
National Archives	2	2	107.70	6.91	8,576	592	1	1			1,440	1,440.00	536	37
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	108	142	10,236.51	7,567.51	472,549	411,027	15	15	2	2	20,700	20,700.00	32,900	26,696
National Housing Agency	None													
National Labor Relations Board	None													
National Mediation Board	10	10	350.77	662.30	23,377	31,935	11	11	8	8	15,120	15,120.00	1,280	3,580
Office of Censorship	206	150	15,336.07	14,062.79	888,478	406,853	60	89			73,560	118,200.00	69,259	34,555
Office for Emergency Management	20	18	4,117.04	(10)	135,854	77,918	14	14			16,920	18,840.00	12,405	5,054
Office of Price Administration	1	2	174.63	43.78	6,888	897	2	2	2	2			521	236
Panama Canal	51	52	14,284.24	4,709.24	278,805	90,191	2	2			3,000	3,180.00	27,271	8,080
Post Office Department	5	5	758.70	212.62	39,973	8,301	11	11	3	3	11,708	14,140.00	3,211	852
Railroad Retirement Board	16	21	756.33	417.12	36,165	25,648	4	4			5,340	5,760.00	3,660	2,127
Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries	1	1	257.84	43.12	4,860	651							441	51
Securities and Exchange Commission	25	143	4,818.03	8,767.57	696,043	633,514	5	10	2	2	6,240	13,560.00	23,618	41,147
Selective Service System	1	1	198.84	26.50	6,030	1,810	1	1			1,380	1,320.00	670	201
Smithsonian Institution	None													
Supreme Court of United States	51	53	18,919.71	6,515.15	870,515	284,455	4	4			5,700	5,700.00	55,055	13,713
State Department	11,760	11,835	502,454.84	111,142.89	12,467,862	2,514,545	7	6			8,100	6,840.00	808,742	154,662
Tennessee Valley Authority	2,505	2,491	476,219.00	164,662.00	34,420,943	11,540,738	5	5			7,460	7,460.00	2,463,099	684,476
Treasury Department	None													
U. S. Tariff Commission	385	385	70,021.12	19,700.42	3,498,807	976,212	104	104	620	620	151,410	151,410.00	348,509	83,874
Veterans' Administration	17,305	18,953	4,243,602.55	1,308,023.10	203,550,280.5	66,610,310.8	403	439	695	693	555,295	590,051.84	13,793,594.85	4,284,511.3
Civilian Conservation Corps (not included in total)	1,179		405,896.00		16,655,261		23				28,560		1,665,526	

¹ This report excludes Civilian Conservation Corps cars.
² 65 Public Health chauffeurs used for driving trucks and tractors also.
³ Does not include Work Projects Administration cars.
⁴ Actual salary paid.
⁵ Cars from the Division of Territories and Island Possessions not included. Civilian Conservation Corps cars not included.
⁶ Cost of operating not complete for all divisions.
⁷ Includes War Shipping Administration.
⁸ 34 of these cars acquired in September 1942 from the Federal Works Agency from cost-plus-a-fixed-fee projects on a recapture basis. No records on them available.
⁹ Does not include all War Relocation Authority cars. No operating cost available on War Relocation cars.
¹⁰ Not available.
¹¹ Average for period.
¹² 42 Foreign Service cars and station wagons not included.

¹³ 52 Foreign Service cars not included.
¹⁴ This report on Civilian Conservation Corps cars not included in Federal Security Agency. Report does not include cars put in storage, due to contraction of operations, by Civilian Conservation Corps units within War Department, Agriculture Department, and Department of the Interior. No report on Civilian Conservation Corps this fiscal year to Oct. 31, 1942, because it is in process of liquidation; 883 cars transferred to Army, Navy, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and other agencies, as of Jan. 29, 1943.
¹⁵ Does not include 28 Civilian Conservation Corps cars transferred to the Alaskan Highway.
 Source: Replies to questionnaire sent out by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Does not include the legislative branch, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanical Gardens, the White House, or the Army and Navy Departments. Rental and mileage payments for use of private cars not included.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

ACTIVITIES OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS DIVISION AND CORPORATION, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

A letter dated February 11, 1943, from the Chairman of the War Production Board, submitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Smaller War Plants Division and Smaller War Plants Corporation during the last 60 days, and making certain comment on the Smaller War Plants Corpora-

tion, the Smaller War Plants Division and related activities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OCTOBER 1942 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of October 1942, containing statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and to refuse to reenact such tax; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUSHFIELD on the 11th instant, p. 819, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

"Whereas title I, section 2 (a), clause (7), reads as follows: 'Effective July 1, 1941, provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance'; and

"Whereas title IV, section 402 (a), clause (7), reads as follows: 'Provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child claiming aid to dependent children'; and

"Whereas title X, section 1002 (a), clause (8), reads as follows: 'Provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the blind'; and

"Whereas these provisions restrict the States from allowing recipients of relief in these categories from accepting intermittent employment without impairment of their grant; and

"Whereas deduction of all such earnings from grants reduces the willingness of recipients to accept such employment; and

"Whereas, due to the shortage of manpower in all lines of industry during the war emergency, it is necessary that all manpower be made available to the United States Government to successfully prosecute the war effort; and

"Whereas it is imperative that all people be employed wherever they can make a contribution to the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend titles I, IV, and X, section 2 (a), clause (7), section 402 (a), clause (7), and section 1002 (a), clause (8), to allow for intermittent employment without impairment to the grants of recipients; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Edward V. Robertson, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, and to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"To the President; the Secretary of State; Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and its associated agencies engaged in selecting labor in foreign countries for importation into the United States of America; War Manpower Commission; to the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; United States Employment Service; Board of Economic Warfare; and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: "The strongest pillar of the moral structure upon which stands the determination of free peoples to carry the present World War to a victorious conclusion is faith that out of the smoke and grime of battle will emerge a formula for the outlawing of war for many generations to come.

"There is unanimous agreement among students that this faith may be justified only through a closer bond of unity between nations, and that such unity may be secured only through a more accurate and more sympathetic mutual understanding of the problems, customs, ways of thought, aspirations, and ideals of the peoples of the world.

"A highly important if not an essential step toward the creation of such an under-

standing is a thorough knowledge on the part of official national diplomatic representatives of the language and customs of the country and the people to which they are accredited.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

"1. That all diplomatic representatives and members of diplomatic or consular staffs, in the service of the United States, accredited to or employed in any foreign nation or country, be required to have a speaking knowledge of the language of the country to which sent, and in all possible cases, familiarity with its national customs and habits."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"To the President and Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialists respectfully represent: "Upon the shoulders of American boys, 18 years of age or over, has been placed the responsibility of forming a part of the armed forces engaged in the present titanic struggle for world liberty. They are proud to accept this responsibility, and their parents and loved ones are proud to share it with them.

"Apart from the physical aspects of the sacrifice our younger men are thus called upon to make, is the matter of their education. It is a serious and a momentous thing, to them and to their country, to interrupt, perhaps to prevent, their academic and professional training. This, of course, was well understood when the policy was considered of including teen-age men in the draft, and was waived only from necessity.

"However, it now appears that it is the purpose of The War Relocation Authority of the United States to accord eligibility to some 2,500 young Japanese-American students, located in war relocation centers, to leave such centers and enter any of a large number of colleges and universities—in other words, to accord the privileges of higher education to a group of young people, citizens by virtue of their birth in this country, whose loyalty and patriotism are rendered doubtful because of their racial extraction, thereby unfitting them to be soldiers, while denying a similar opportunity to our own young men of unquestioned loyalty.

"That these Japanese-American young men will pay their own way is no justification for such discrimination. Our young men also pay their way, and it is to the credit of American courage and determination that many of them pay their way under the most difficult circumstances.

"It is admitted that practically all of the Japanese-Americans to whom higher education is to be afforded are physically fit and capable of performing services which would be useful to the war effort, where their patriotism might be demonstrated without placing them in a position where possible disloyalty might be perilous.

"Wherefore your memorialists, the Sixteenth State Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently request:

"1. That steps be taken, through executive intervention or order, or by means of legislation if necessary, to prevent according to Japanese-American youths the privilege of leaving concentration centers and securing an education in American colleges and universities while the same privilege is denied to loyal American young men called to military service.

"2. That no discrimination be shown in the matter of educational advantages, between America's young citizens, of whatever race or nationality—in short, while young men of undoubted loyalty and Caucasian extraction are required to serve in the armed forces, that these young men of Japanese ancestry and less certain loyalty be given opportunity to serve the war effort in ways in which their racial extraction will prove no impediment.

"3. That if any Japanese-American youths have already been given the privilege of attending colleges and universities, they be returned to their relocation camps."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of members of the First Methodist Church, of Clay Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY—RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GEORGE. I present and ask to have referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Georgia Legislature urging the passage of the Pace parity bill, to include all costs in the computation of parity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and referred as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas there has come to the attention of the House of Representatives of Georgia that there is now pending in the National Congress certain legislation intended to include the cost of farm labor in figuring parity on agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the certain legislation is known as the Pace parity bill; and

Whereas the cost of farm labor has increased 100 percent within the past 12 months; and

Whereas with the cost of farm labor increasing as it has, unless adequate legislation is passed immediately, it will be utterly impossible for the farmers of the Nation to compete with industry in the payment of labor, and the food program will thereby be hindered immensely; and

Whereas as a part of the war effort it is necessary that the food program be carried out: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Georgia House of Representatives, That the National Congress be memorialized, and that the Georgia delegation in Congress and in the Senate in particular be memorialized, that the passage of the Pace parity bill is urgent, is imperative, and is necessary; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Clerk of the National Congress and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, there to be read and presented to the Congress in session, and that a copy of this resolution be sent by the clerk of this house to each Member of Congress from Georgia and to the Senators from Georgia, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

AUTHORITY OF BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association regarding the division of the authority of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

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

Whereas the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association has always cooperated with the officials of the State in the protection of livestock against infectious and contagious diseases; and

Whereas we are mindful of the correlation of the Meat Inspection Division with the field inspection of the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry in giving to this country a most effective system of livestock disease control; and

Whereas we believe that taking the Meat Inspection Division from the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry and placing it within the Food Distribution Division will greatly reduce the efficiency of animal-disease control of this State and Nation, thereby making it more difficult to raise livestock and subsequently greatly reducing food supply, which is so vitally needed during this emergency. Moreover, we believe that with the Division of Meat Inspection within the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, the effective control of infectious and contagious diseases of animals has been an important public-health factor through the suppression of those animal diseases which are transmissible to man: Therefore be it

Resolved, That for the best interest of the entire country the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry be restored to its original authority and remain as an intact working organization with all its forces under the unified direction of a veterinarian as chief.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 180. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise, and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes; with an amendment in the nature of a substitute (Rept. No. 53); and

S. Res. 98. Resolution continuing the authority for the investigation of the violation of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 707. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; without amendment (Rept. No. 54).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 709. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint Lawrence L. Myatt as a commissioned officer in the United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 710 (by request). A bill to amend Public Law No. 607, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 711. A bill for the relief of the indigent and dependent heirs of Ted Vaughan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 712. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BALL introduced Senate bill 713, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 714. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 715. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1937, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. VAN NUYS):

S. 716. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 717. A bill for the relief of Cinda J. Short; and

S. 718. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Lee Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 719. A bill for the relief of Angelina Chartier; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 720. A bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 721. A bill authorizing the printing, with illustrations, of the proceedings of the national encampments of various veterans' organizations in the United States as separate documents; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 722. A bill providing for cancellation of certain loans to farmers in case of crop failure; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 723. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 724. A bill to extend the time within which certain employees in the legislative branch of the Government may come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 725. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bills 726, 727, and 728, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution suspending certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF PRICE CONTROL ACT—WAGE RATES

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the price and wage stabilization law enacted by Congress last October, by writ-

ing into the law the letter "(a)" after "Sec. 4"; and by adding at the end of section 4 thereof the following new subsection:

(b) Except as hereinafter provided, no employer shall increase the salary or the straight-time hourly wage rate of any of his employees unless such increase has been approved by the President or such agency as he may designate to administer this subsection. No increase in salaries or in straight-time hourly wage rates above those being paid by the employer for the same work on September 15, 1942, shall be so approved unless such increase (1) does not raise such salaries or straight-time hourly wage rates more than 15 percent above the average salaries or straight-time hourly wage rates for the same work prevailing in the affected industry on January 1, 1941, or (2) is found by the President or such designated agency to be necessary to correct gross inequities. This subsection shall not apply in the case of (1) any salary increase which does not increase the salary of the affected employee to an amount in excess of \$5,000 per annum, (2) wage increases which do not increase straight-time hourly wage rates of affected employees to an amount in excess of 60 cents per hour, (3) wage increases which affect fewer than 25 employees of a particular employer, or (4) any salary or wage increase which compensates the affected employee for added responsibility or added work resulting from a promotion. The President or such designated agency shall define the conditions under which such approval shall be required in the case of salaries or wages paid to new employees by an employer.

The bill (S. 713) restricting certain increases in wage rates to aid in carrying out the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL WAR SERVICE—AMENDMENT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I intend to propose to Senate bill 666, to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, and printed for the use of the committee to which the bill was referred, and of the Senate.

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

On page 8, line 24, to insert the following: "Provided further, That every person assigned to service under this act, including every accepted volunteer, shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization if he or she should not freely choose to do so."

POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that the clerk read the first section, and that thereafter the resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolution to create a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning

Resolved, That there is hereby established—SECTION 1. (a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War

Economic Policy and Planning (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

(b) The special committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the Senate, 6 from the majority and 4 from the minority, appointed by the President of the Senate.

(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable economy and a just peace. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established—

(a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

(b) The special committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the Senate, 6 from the majority and 4 from the minority, appointed by the President of the Senate.

(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable economy and a just peace. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

HEARINGS; SUBPENAS; DISBURSEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. The special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed by the chairman.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION

SEC. 3. The special committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation fixed under sections 661-663, 664-673, and 674 of title 5 of the United States Code for comparable duties. Officers and employees of the Government shall be detailed to the service of the special committee on its request, without additional compensation, and such officers and employees shall be paid from the appropriations regularly available for their salaries.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I present a brief statement, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The purpose of this resolution is to provide for systematic study of economic policy in the period of post-war readjustments by the Senate as a branch of the Congress. The committee system, excellent as it is, makes it difficult to deal systematically and comprehensively with the economic problems of the post-war readjustment period. It is hoped that a special committee, though lacking in legislative power, will be of service to the standing committees and to the Senate in the shaping and solution of post-war economic policy and plans.

Post-war economic policies and plans may be elsewhere developed. Finally the responsibility rests with the Congress. This resolution recognizes the responsibility of the Congress to the people of the United States for our post-war economic policy. In order that the Senate as a coordinating branch of the Congress may be able to function with the whole economic picture before it, the resolution is offered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McNARY. I do not believe I have any objection to the request, but I wish to inquire whether this completes the allotment based upon our understanding?

Mr. BARKLEY. It does. The steering committee authorized me to fill these two places on this committee.

Mr. McNARY. There has been no enlargement of the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been no enlargement, except that to which we agreed.

Mr. McNARY. That is, based on the ratio of 3 to 2, or 1½ to 1?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Education and Labor.

PAYMENT OF FARM-SECURITY LOAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article headed "Kreller Pays Up Farm

Security Administration Loan—A Success Story," published in the Washburn (N. Dak.) Leader of February 11, 1943.

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

KRELLER PAYS UP FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION LOAN—A SUCCESS STORY

It was about 2 years ago now that Joseph Kreller, of Underwood, quit his job on Work Projects Administration there and secured a standard rehabilitation loan from the Farm Security Administration. This past fall Mr. Kreller retired his indebtedness to the Farm Security Administration in full.

When the Farm Security Administration made their initial advance to Mr. and Mrs. Kreller they had \$1 in cash, 62 chickens, \$72 worth of feed, an old automobile, and household goods. Today they have 15 head of cattle; of this number they are at present milking 6, the cream checks amounting to about \$50 per month. In another month they will be milking 8 cows. They have 4 horses and 70 chickens.

They have five sows which are to farrow this spring. Incidentally Joe has a self-feeder made out of a barrel, a wheel, on a platform in his hog lot. Joe feels that it is little things like this that count and "the big things often take care of themselves." Right along the same line he rather boastfully states that he has only lost two calves since the secured his Farm Security Administration loan, and he states frankly that these losses were his fault. He feels that death losses in the case of calves is brought about by poor feeding, irregular feeding, and cold milk.

The Krellers started operating on a one-half-section farm three and a half miles north of Underwood. They secured a 5-year lease with an option to purchase this farm from the Federal Land Bank. It is their plan to execute this option just as soon as they feel they are financially able to, as they consider the farm their permanent home. In the spring of 1941 they set out 2,000 trees, and in the spring of 1942 another 500.

Each year they have attempted to have a good garden and can and store a lot of food-stuffs in line with the Farm Security Administration's policy in this respect. This past year the canning suffered from too much shocking activity, according to Mrs. Kreller. She was, however, able to can 80 quarts of rhubarb, 100 quarts of fruit, 30 quarts of corn, 13 quarts of beans, 2 bushels of carrots, 17 quarts of peas. Incidentally they also had some frost and hail in their garden during the season.

When queried about his plans for the future, Joe stated that he did not know of any in particular with the exception of purchasing the farm and making the farm turn out all the food and fiber possible to facilitate the prosecution of the war. He said that his cows were doing right well by the war effort at this time; that he felt his five sows would come through in good shape and that he was adding 25 acres of flax to his crop program this year.

According to Henry P. Sullivan, rural-rehabilitation supervisor, this story is not unusual, but is typical of how some of the borrowers of the Farm Security Administration have responded under their rehabilitation program. While the Farm Security Administration was set up as a rehabilitation agency, since Pearl Harbor food production has been its main goal with rehabilitation a byproduct of the process.

There have been 97 standard loans paid in full in McLean County since the inception of the program, states Mr. Sullivan.

JEFFERSON'S CREED

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of Sunday last, I

find a very interesting dissertation upon Jefferson's creed. America's two immortal emancipators, Lincoln and Jefferson, are associated, along with their other great outstanding events, by the proximity of their birthdays. We have just paid tribute to the great Lincoln. His statement "that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth" is universally recognized as one of the greatest utterances of man.

On April 13 we shall celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, who wrote and expounded the unperishable principles of democracy. Lincoln, in unlocking the shackles of slavery, carried out the thoughts enunciated in Jefferson's creed of democracy.

The principles upon which we base our participation in this global war are the Jeffersonian principles of freedom of man. I ask, Mr. President, that the quotations from Jefferson's writings be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times magazine of February 14, 1943]

JEFFERSON'S CREED: A CREED FOR TODAY
FREEDOM AND SACRIFICE

We have counted the cost of this contest and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery. Honor, justice, and humanity forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We cannot endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them if we basely entail hereditary bondage upon them.

Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable. * * * We most solemnly, before God and the world, declare that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers which our beneficent Creator hath graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die freemen rather than to live slaves. (Declaration of the Causes of Taking Up Arms, July 6, 1775.)

RIGHT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body, no matter whether of the autocrats of Russia or France, or of the aristocrats of a Venetian senate. And I do believe that, if the Almighty has not decreed that man shall never be free—and it is a blasphemy to believe it—the secret will be found in the making himself the depository of the powers respecting himself, so far as he is competent to them, and delegating only what is beyond his competence by a synthetical process, to higher and higher orders of functionaries, so as to trust fewer and fewer powers in proportion as the trustees become more oligarchical. * * * Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward-republic, or of some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs, not merely at an election one day in the year, but every day, when there shall be not a man in the state who will not be a

member of some one of its councils, great or small, he will let his heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Caesar or a Bonaparte. (To Joseph C. Cabell, February 2, 1816.)

FIRST PRINCIPLES

The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. (The First Inaugural Address.)

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Well aware that the opinions and belief of men depend not on their own will, but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds; that Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested His supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion.

We the General Assembly of Virginia do enact that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, or shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities. (Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom.)

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Reason and free inquiry are the only effectual agents against error. Give a loose to them, they will support the true religion by bringing every false one to their tribunal, to the test of their investigation. They are the natural enemies of error, and of error only. * * * The Newtonian principle of gravitation is now more firmly established, on the basis of reason, than it would be were the Government to step in, and to make it an article of necessary faith. Reason and experiment have been indulged and error has fled before them. It is error alone which needs the support of Government. Truth can stand by itself. Subject opinion to coercion: whom will you make your inquisitors? Fallible men; men governed by bad passions, by private as well as public reasons. And why subject it to coercion? To produce uniformity. But is uniformity of opinion desirable? No more than of face and stature. (Notes on Virginia.)

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

I am for * * * freedom of the press and against all violations of the Constitution to silence by force, and not by reason, the complaints or criticisms, just or unjust, of our citizens against the conduct of their agents. And I am for encouraging the progress of science in all its branches and not for raising a hue and cry against the sacred name of philosophy. (To Elbridge Gerry, January 26, 1799.)

THE JUDICIARY

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society, depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislature and executive, that so it may be a check upon both, as both should be checks upon that.

The judges, therefore, should always be men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness, and attention; their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests; they should not be dependent upon any man or body of men. (To George Wythe, July, 1776.)

EDUCATION

I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised, for the preservation of freedom and happiness. * * * Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils, and that the tax which will be paid for the purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests, and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance. (To George Wythe, August 13, 1786.)

PILLARS OF PROSPERITY

Agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left free to individual enterprise. Protection from casual embarrassments, however, may sometimes be seasonably interposed. (First annual message to Congress, December 8, 1801.)

ESSENCE OF A REPUBLIC

I believe with you that morality, compassion, generosity are innate elements of the human constitution, that there exists a right independent of force, that a right to property is founded on our natural wants, in the means with which we are endowed to satisfy these wants, and the right to do what we acquire by those means without violating the similar rights of other sensible beings, that no one has a right to obstruct another, exercising his faculties innocently for the relief of sensibilities made a part of his nature; that justice is the fundamental law of society, that the majority oppressing an individual is guilty of a crime, abuses its strength, and by acting on the law of the strongest breaks up the foundations of society, that action by the citizens in person, in affairs within their reach and competence, and in all others by representatives, chosen immediately and removable by themselves, constitutes the essence of a republic. (To P. S. du Pont de Nemours, April 24, 1816.)

BLESSINGS OF AMERICA

I sincerely wish you may find it convenient to come here; the pleasure of the trip will be less than you expect, but the utility greater. It will make you adore your country, its soil, its climate, its equality, liberty, laws, people, and manners. My God! how little my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy. * * * Come, then, and see the proof of this, and on your return, add your testimony to that of every thinking American, in order to satisfy our countrymen how much it is their interest to preserve, unaffected by contagion, those peculiarities of their governments and manner to which they are indebted for those blessings. (To James Monroe, from Paris, January 17, 1785.)

SOURCE OF THE DECLARATION

Neither aiming at originality of principle or sentiment, nor yet copied from any particular and previous writing, it was intended to be an expression of the American mind and to give to that expression the proper tone and spirit called for by the occasion. All its authority rests, then, on the harmonizing sentiments of the day, whether expressed in conversation, in letters, printed essays or in the elementary books of public

right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc. (To Henry Lee, May 1825.)

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

I have a right to nothing which another has a right to take away. And Congress will have a right to take away trial by jury in all civil cases. Let me add that a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference. (To James Madison, December 20, 1787.)

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

May it [the Declaration of Independence] be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all): The signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition have persuaded them to bind themselves and assume the blessings and security of self-government. That form which we have substituted, restores the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion. All eyes are opened or opening to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God. These are grounds of hope for others. (To Roger C. Weightman, June 24, 1826, 10 days before Jefferson's death, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration.)

TRUST IN THE PEOPLE

Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositories. And to render them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree. This indeed is not all that is necessary, though it be essentially necessary. An amendment of our Constitution must here come in aid of public education. The influence over government must be shared by all the people. If every individual which composes their mass participates of the ultimate authority, the Government will be safe; because the corrupting the whole mass will exceed any private resources of wealth; and public ones cannot be provided but by levies of the people. (To the Abbé Arnoud, July 19, 1789.)

MAN'S VAST FUTURE

I am 81 years of age, born where I now live, in the first range of mountains in the interior of our country. And I have observed this march of civilization advancing from the seacoast, passing over us like a cloud of light, increasing our knowledge and improving our condition, in so much that we are at this time more advanced in civilization here than the seaports were when I was a boy. And where this progress will stop no one can say. Barbarism has, in the meantime, been receding before the steady step of amelioration, and will in time, I trust, disappear from the earth. (To William Ludlow, September 6, 1824.)

THE MANPOWER SHORTAGE ON THE FARM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me by L. W. Hamm, on the subject of the manpower shortage on the farm.

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

THE PIERCE Co.,
 Fargo, N. Dak., February 10, 1943.
 Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Possibly you have heard that there is a manpower shortage. It is not

only affecting farmers but some of the rest of us as well.

It so happens that within the past week two letters have come to my attention which have some bearing on this shortage and I thought that you might be interested.

The first letter came from a young man who is a graduate chemist. He is working for a large eastern corporation and took a position with them to help out with the war work. He states that the job would be O. K. if it were not for the fact that they have 100 men in a laboratory that could be operated by 6 men. As a result he has nothing to do.

The second letter was written by a man in California. He is a man of some means and not compelled to work for a living. He took a job in an airplane factory in southern California because he thought his help was needed. After hanging around for weeks he grew tired of asking for something to do and quit the job.

I am sure that these are not isolated cases but why doesn't somebody build a fire under some of these corporations and make them let our men alone until they are really needed?

We are losing men right along and cannot replace them. We are willing to lose them and do the best we can without them if they are to go into the armed services or into necessary war work. We are not willing, however, to let them go when they go to a large corporation which uses them to swell the pay roll in order to get more of our tax money on a cost-plus basis contract.

Yours very truly,

L. W. HAMM.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENTS' ASSOCIATION DINNER

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States on Friday evening, February 12, 1943, at the annual dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHITE ON FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF JAMES G. BLAINE

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on James G. Blaine, delivered by Senator WHITE on January 27 before the Pan American Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP MAINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GILLETTE on February 15, 1943, the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF SENATOR HOLMAN AT PONTIAC, MICH.

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by him in Pontiac, Mich., on February 10, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE SURVIVAL OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. AIKEN asked to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Survival of Representative Democracy," delivered by Senator HAWKES, at the fifty-seventh annual dinner of the National Republican Club, New York City, February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER FOR WAR—POWER FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES

[Mr. WALLGREN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Power for War—Power for Peace," delivered by the Secretary of the Interior before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo., on January 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL BY THE PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Control by the People," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Republican Lincoln Day banquet at Omaha, Nebr., on February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY PROF. LOUIS J. A. MERCIER

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a digest of an address by Prof. Louis J. A. Mercier, of Harvard University, before the Hampden County Teachers Association of Massachusetts, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNIONS AND THE ORDER—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND OREGONIAN

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Unions and the Order," published in the Portland Oregonian of February 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETTIFOGGERS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pettifoggers," published in the Philadelphia Record of February 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTECTION AGAINST LYNCHING—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Section 52 Is News," by Helen Fuller, appearing in the February 15, 1943, issue of the New Republic, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON—EDITORIAL FROM LYNCHBURG (VA.) ADVANCE AND PARAGRAPH FROM WILL P. KENNEDY'S COLUMN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thomas Jefferson," published in the Lynchburg (Va.) Daily Advance, and a paragraph on Jefferson from the column of Will P. Kennedy in the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

ABSENTEEISM—EDITORIAL FROM OREGON JOURNAL

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Absenteeism," published in the Oregon Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME FURNISHINGS FOR WAR WORKERS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a furniture dealer of Oregon regarding home furnishings for war workers, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION—COMMENTS BY ROBERT A. HUDSON

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments and suggestions by Robert A. Hudson, president of the Hudson-Duncan Co., regarding food production and distribution, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR PRESIDENT—NEWSPRINT—EDITORIAL FROM THE DELAWARE NEWS

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our President—Newspaper," published in the Delaware News, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN AND THE FIFTH FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Lincoln and the Fifth Freedom, delivered by Senator WILLIS at the Thirteenth Annual Lincoln Banquet of the Alexander Hamilton Club of Maryland, at Baltimore, Md., February 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND BAKERY PRODUCTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) submitted by Mr. REED on the 8th instant is as follows:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," approved October 2, 1942, expressly provide (1) that "no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor" equal to the parity price for such agricultural commodity, (2) that no maximum price shall be maintained for any such processed or manufactured commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of the agricultural commodity the highest price received by them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, with certain qualifications: *Provided*, That the President may correct gross inequities in this respect, but that in no event shall a maximum price be established for such a processed or manufactured commodity which will not reflect parity to the producers of the agricultural commodity, and (3) that "in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing"; and

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, as amended October 2, 1942, expressly provides that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumstances or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act"; and

Whereas the foregoing provisions have not been suspended or modified by any law or lawful action; and

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No. 148, Revised, now in effect as amended November 2, 1942, fixing maximum prices for pork products and using as a live-hog base approximately \$13.60 per 100 pounds at Chicago, although the price of live hogs at Chicago since the promulgation of said revised regulation for a substantial period of time has been in excess of \$15 per 100 pounds, causing a loss to the processors in violation of the provision of the act approved October 2, 1942, that processors shall be allowed a general fair and equitable margin; and

Whereas said Maximum Price Regulation No. 148, Revised, as amended, is in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because the base of live animal prices used was lower than the highest price received by producers between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, and because there has been no action by the President to permit such a lower base on the ground of any gross inequity; and

Whereas on December 10, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No. 169, now in effect as amended December 19, 1942, and January 2, 1943, fixing maximum prices for beef products on a basis which fails to yield to the processors generally fair and equitable margins; and

Whereas on April 28, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued the general maximum price regulation establishing as maximum prices for bread and other bakery products, together with other commodities, the highest price charged by each seller during March 1942 for each such commodity, and said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products have since been maintained at the same levels; and

Whereas said maximum prices for bread and other bakery products were and are in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, because said products are processed and manufactured in whole from wheat and other agricultural commodities and because said maximum prices did not and do not reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodities either parity or the highest prices received by producers for them between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942; and

Whereas, contrary to the statement of the Office of Price Administration at the time of issuing the general maximum price regulation that "every producer whose prices are stabilized is assured that his costs, which are based upon the stabilized prices of others, will not rise," the Office of Price Administration did not at that time place any maximum price or control, with minor exceptions, upon any of the costs of manufacturers of bread and other bakery products, and it was not until October 1942 that ceilings were placed upon flour, eggs, dry, evaporated, and condensed milk, certain other ingredients used in such products, and wages, by which time such costs had undergone a substantial increase, amounting to an average increase of one-half cent per pound in the case of bread; and

Whereas the costs of producing bread and other bakery products have continued to increase substantially since October 1942, as a result in part of increases in maximum prices for flour allowed by Maximum Price Regulation No. 296 issued by the Office of Price Administration on January 2, 1943, although no increase in the maximum prices for bread and other bakery products has been allowed; and

Whereas producers of bread and other bakery products, particularly smaller producers, are therefore being denied a generally fair and equitable margin in violation of the act approved October 2, 1942, and large numbers of such producers, in fact, are operating at a loss; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, in violation of the provision in the act approved January 30, 1942, that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry," has used such powers to compel such changes in the bread and other bakery products industry (as evidenced by its announcement upon the issuance of Maximum Price Regulation No. 296 that "this increase in flour

prices should not necessitate an increase in the present retail bread prices because the higher flour costs, it is estimated, will be completely offset by simultaneously introduced savings in the manufacture, packaging, and distribution costs of bakers"), affected by food distribution order No. 1, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under direction of the Director of Economic Stabilization after recommendation by the Office of Price Administration, limiting varieties of bread and rolls, prohibiting slicing of bread, limiting the amounts of milk, shortening, and sugar in white bread, prohibiting certain methods of distribution and otherwise changing the practices of the industry for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread; and

Whereas said Food Distribution Order No. 1, even could it be lawfully resorted to by the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of maintaining present maximum prices for bread, has not resulted in savings which allow producers of bread a generally fair and equitable margin as required by law; and

Whereas the meat processing and bread and other bakery products industries are essential war industries and their continued operation and the foods they supply are essential to the national welfare and the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration are threatening extinction of these industries or their concentration in the hands of a few large operators able to withstand the price squeeze imposed, by reason of large financial resources; and

Whereas the action of the Office of Price Administration in maintaining maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products at present levels in violation of the foregoing provisions of law is defeating the intent of the Congress that producers of agricultural commodities shall receive fair and reasonable prices, due to the inability of processors to pay such prices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or through a subcommittee to be appointed by the chairman, is hereby authorized and directed—

(1) to investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and any other governmental agency, their officials, employees, agents, and representatives, in respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for pork and beef products and for bread and other bakery products; and

(2) to report its findings and to recommend further legislation or action by the Congress or the Senate, if any, needed to insure compliance by any or all such agencies, officials, employees, agents, and representatives with the provisions of the aforementioned act approved January 30, 1942, as amended, and the act approved October 2, 1942.

For the purpose of this resolution, 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, as it deems advisable.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

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

I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas, and also the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY],

to allow the resolution to go over without prejudice. I should very much like to have it go over until a later session of the Senate, which would deprive no one of any right, since it is not very convenient for me to discuss it today because of other matters which are to come up, especially the call of the calendar. If we get into a discussion of the resolution, it will probably take some time, and I should very much appreciate if it could go over.

Mr. REED. I always like to accommodate my colleagues, especially the Senator from Kentucky. I am reluctant, however, to agree to his suggestion for a further delay of the resolution. Last Thursday, when it was in order for it to be brought up, I was very glad to yield to the requests of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and other Senators, who desired to present specific matters.

One of the reasons for my reluctance to agree to further delay is that I should like to read a telegram which is typical of the attitude of the smaller packers and the smaller bakers in this country under the order of the O. P. A. I have before me a telegram from Kansas City, dated February 11, addressed to me, in which it is stated:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., February 11, 1943.
Senator REED, of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading with considerable interest Senate Resolution 94 that you have presented to the Seventy-eighth Congress for consideration.

You may be sure that we appreciate your interest in the situation and from the thorough manner in which you are investigating the unfair margins under which the packer is now forced to operate I am sure you have a thorough knowledge of our problem.

We have just received under date of February 9 a mandatory order from the field headquarters office of quartermaster general in Chicago, Ill., for 250,000 pounds of fresh chilled carcass beef to be delivered at Office of Price Administration ceilings in carload lots between February 15 and February 20. To fill this order would cost this firm in excess of \$7,500 for the 5 days' operation.

We are already operating on a weekly loss from \$2,000 to \$3,000, but the additional loss that would be imposed by the acceptance of this order would be unbearable.

Government business as price order No. 169 now defines it, is less profitable in the commodity of carcass beef than domestic business because we are forced to sell carload lots to the Government at 75 cents per hundredweight less than we are permitted to sell the domestic trade in less-than-carload lots.

In addition, Government regulations require that carcass beef delivered them must be sold on delivered weights. This involves an additional 1- to 2-percent shrink, which on the price of livestock today is a considerable item. Regulations further require that carcass beef must be quartered and then each quarter individually weighed and wrapped. This expense amounts to approximately 25 cents per hundredweight, for which there is no provision in regulation No. 169. A further insult has been added to injury. Government purchases in carload lots call for shipment on Government bills of lading.

The initial icing and salting charge, which is included in domestic business on shipments from the West to the East by virtue of the \$1.50 spread between Kansas City and the eastern seaboard, is not permitted to be charged to the Government on such Govern-

ment bills of lading. All in all, our position has become intolerable.

We trust that you cannot question our patriotism, for we have within the past 6 months delivered from 40 to 50 percent of our entire production to the armed forces directly. If we were financially able to subsidize the armies of our United States, we would be happy to do so. Unfortunately, we are not in this financial position, and, furthermore, do not feel that the Congress of the United States has any such desire. Your prompt reply will be appreciated.

A. B. MAURER,
MAURER PACKING CO.

Mr. President, this telegram is typical of dozens of telegrams and letters I have received from the smaller packers and the smaller bakers in every State of the Union. They are being forced out of business, contrary to what I believe is the plain intent of the Congress. Day by day and week by week more and more of them are going out of business.

The whole question of an adequate food supply, whether through production by the farmers or by processing, is in such chaotic condition that there is no more important question before the people of the United States at this time.

Senate Resolution 94 does not seek to change the law. All it proposes to do is to direct the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate to make an investigation. The whole question between the distinguished majority leader and myself is whether the resolution shall go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It will not take me more than about 10 minutes to tell why I think it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think we can dispose of the whole matter in 30 minutes. I do not see any necessity for a prolonged discussion. Therefore, though I have great reluctance in refusing to accede to any request of the Senator from Kentucky, which I seldom do, I prefer to proceed at this time.

Mr. President, there is nothing new, nothing novel, in the directions contained in Senate Resolution 94 and the request for its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Last year I, myself, submitted Senate Resolution 308, which was referred to that committee. On October 26 the committee held a hearing on this subject, and this very question of meat ceilings and meat prices was discussed before the committee at length.

On the same day the committee had before it Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Wickard, and Mr. Henderson. The hearings have been printed, and on pages 51 to 62 is contained a discussion of this very question with Leon Henderson, Mr. Wickard, and Mr. Byrnes. Nothing was done about the matter at that time.

Later the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and I submitted Senate Resolution 312, which, again, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Again, on November 19 and 20, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on this subject.

The same subject, and nothing else, is covered in Senate Resolution 94. This is not a new question; it is not a question of

jurisdiction as between some other committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there is no question that is new and fresh and novel. It merely involves a continuation of the consideration of matters which were brought up last fall. Senate Resolution 312 was then approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It went to the calendar, and remained on the calendar to the close of the last session of Congress, when it died. Now the question comes up again.

Mr. President, there is no question about the serious, in fact, the desperate situation of the small bakers and the small meat packers. If these small businessmen cannot continue to operate on a competitive, free enterprise basis, then they must go out of business. I am not going to sit in this Chamber and bear my share of responsibility and fail to raise my voice when businessmen in the United States are put out of business by arbitrary orders from bureaucrats downtown—orders which have no foundation in the mandates or instructions given those officials by the Congress of the United States. That is what is happening now. That is what we ought to stop.

The only question involved in the resolution is that of investigation. Investigation of these very same subjects was begun after we passed the price-control measure, which was signed on October 2 of last year. These subjects have been under continuous consideration. Hundreds of businessmen have been forced out of business by the arbitrary orders which have been issued. All that Senate Resolution 94 contemplates is an investigation by a standing committee of this body, and that standing committee should be the committee which already has dealt with this subject, is dealing with it now, and which has made public announcement within the last few days of its intention to make a thorough investigation of all the facts and circumstances surrounding the production, the processing, and the distribution of food products. Why there should be any question about the proper committee to consider the subject matter of the resolution is not clear to me.

Mr. President, a question of psychology is involved. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that five times I refused the requests made by the bakers, through their organization, before I finally consented to frame and submit the resolution. I have shown a reluctance, I think about an equal number of times, to take up the question at the behest of the small packers. They finally convinced me, however, of the seriousness of their situation, and I prepared the resolution, submitted it, and hope to obtain its prompt consideration.

The resolution has been framed in such a way as to be very thorough. It contains 12 whereases, which set out for the information of Senators the various infringements of the law on the part of the Office of Price Administration. That information is given by date and verse and chapter; that is, the number of the regulation and the date upon which it was issued.

One of the whereases, standing by itself, would cause the resolution to be sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] mentioned to me last week that one or more of the whereases touched a subject matter which should be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I agree, so far as one whereas is concerned, that, standing alone, it should be the subject of investigation by that committee. With that one whereas, standing by itself, the resolution should go to that committee.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I hesitate to interrupt the very distinguished Senator from Kansas. I have just read the resolution itself—not the whereases—and am strongly of the opinion that the resolution does not confer any additional authority to that now possessed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make the proposed investigation. The Senator from Kansas well recalls that 2 weeks ago today the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, in connection with the resolutions favorably reported from that committee, said that a reserve of \$5,000 was provided for all the major committees save three—the three being the Committees on Finance, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations, which were provided with \$10,000 for the purpose of making investigations.

I presume the situation now to be that if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or a majority of its members, should ask for this investigation, the committee would be able to conduct it without the adoption of the Senator's resolution, to the point of expending \$5,000. Expenditures beyond that amount would require additional legislation and additional appropriation. The right to subpoena witnesses is inherent in the committee. The committee does not claim the right to employ counsel. Probably a word or two should be omitted from the resolution, that is as to places and times, of holding hearings. The hearings would be held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, it appears very plainly to me that the resolution does not confer any rights which are not inherent in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the committee could just as well make the investigation without the adoption of the resolution.

For that reason—while the inquiry is a long one, and is awkwardly propounded—I wonder why the resolution is proposed, concerning a matter over which the committee now has jurisdiction, unless there is a reluctance on the part of the chairman of the committee to function under the terms and philosophy of the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am always happy to be interrupted by my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can investigate

all these matters at any time it feels like doing so. Any standing committee of the Senate can investigate anything which comes within its jurisdiction, and the things which are within its jurisdiction are generally the things which it feels like investigating.

It is customary, however, when especially important questions involving definite interests are raised, to prepare a resolution, and name therein the proper committee to make the investigation. I submitted this resolution before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had announced its purpose of making a general investigation. I did so because I thought these particular questions ought to be investigated at the earliest possible time. There is no dispute with respect to the seriousness of the matters involved. Not even the distinguished majority leader questions the seriousness of the situation. Therefore I think we ought to proceed.

Let me say again, and then I shall conclude, that it is true that the Price Control Act came out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is also true that the way the measure was handled last year left some unpleasant memories. I have no desire to revive those memories—I want them to lie quiet—but there is a question of psychology involved. Those who came to me requesting that I submit a resolution with respect to the matter, and who, after five refusals on my part, induced me to take up their case, asked only one thing, and that was an investigation to be conducted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They said they would be satisfied with that. If they can have that kind of an investigation, then whatever the result of it may be, whatever the finding of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may or may not be, they will be content, and, at least so far as I am concerned, they will have to be content. But if we send the resolution to a committee which they believe lacks friendliness, if it is not actively hostile, then we shall fail in the purpose both of the resolution and of satisfying those who have a just complaint.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. If the only conflict of jurisdiction rests in the whereases, why not drop the whereases from the resolution, and simply refer the resolution itself to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and thus avoid all possible friction?

Mr. REED. The distinguished Senator from Michigan has before him a copy of Senate Resolution 94. The whereases have no binding or probative force of any kind, and are merely explanatory. The whereas on page 2, the beginning of the first paragraph on that page, is as follows:

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, as amended October 2, 1942, expressly provides that the price-fixing powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices,

cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumstances or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

That language is taken from the act itself. I agree with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that if the resolution contained only that one whereas it might properly go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am deeply in sympathy with the purpose of the resolution, and so far as that is concerned, I am deeply in sympathy with the whereases. But after all is said and done, the whereases are simply an indication of the reasons for submitting the resolution, and do not actually add anything to it. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has suggested, the whereases tend to cause a dispute with respect to jurisdiction. Much as I am in sympathy with the whereases, I am in favor of deleting them.

If the Senator from Kansas will permit me, I wish to say that I think the situation in question is a very desperate one. If the O. P. A. continues the present policy of putting a ceiling on prices of processed meat and processed flour, while at the same time leaving the production costs without any ceiling, I think they are going to put out of business every independent baker and every independent miller in the United States. There is no question on earth about that. When they do that they will very seriously interfere with the food supply of the Army and the Navy, of all the armed forces of the United States and her allies, as well as the civilian population.

I think the resolution should be adopted, but if it will lend any facility in the reference of the resolution, I think the Senator from Kansas, having already had the resolution published in the RECORD with the whereases in it, could well afford to let the whereases be stricken out.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Missouri has said precisely what I rose to say in further reference to my suggestion to the Senator from Kansas. I wish to see his resolution acted on today. I think he removes all reasonable chance for an argument when he strikes the whereases out of it. Why not strike the whereases, inasmuch as they have no probative force anyway, and thus circumscribe the argument to a point where there cannot be any question?

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senators from Michigan and Missouri that I do not understand the objection of the Senator from Kentucky to be lodged against the whereases. I understand that the objection of the Senator from Kentucky goes to the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. So far as I am concerned, I do not care anything about the whereases. We put them in the resolution only for the purposes I have stated. If Senators

will read the whereases they will find that they give Senators the chapter and verse—that is, date and regulation number. They give all the information any Senator needs, if a Senator wishes to examine the RECORD with respect to the facts and the documents behind the resolution. That is all they do.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Would it not serve a useful purpose to have the resolution printed in the RECORD as a part of the remarks of the able Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. The resolution, including the "whereases," has already been printed in the RECORD in full. I am perfectly agreeable to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], to drop the "whereases" if that will meet the objection of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks in my own time with reference to the subject now under discussion, if the Senator from Kansas is through.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. With reference to the possible assignment of the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, am I to understand that my friend from Kansas implies that the friends of agriculture feel that it should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because the Committee on Banking and Currency is thought to be hostile to agriculture?

Mr. REED. I have not said that the Committee on Banking and Currency is hostile to agriculture.

Mr. TOBEY. Is there any implication that the Committee on Banking and Currency is hostile to the agricultural interests?

Mr. REED. No; I did not mean to leave that inference. What I stated was that the small packers and small bakers, who have consulted me individually and through their organizations, have stated to me that they would be satisfied if they could get an investigation of this question by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have said, as is well known, that price-control measures were handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency and reported to the Senate by that committee. There are some unpleasant memories in that connection which I should dislike to revive.

If the resolution goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, those who are now complaining will be satisfied. I cannot give that assurance should the resolution be referred to any other committee.

Mr. TOBEY. The only reason I ask the question is that I thought I distinctly understood the distinguished Senator from Kansas to state that the Committee on Banking and Currency is hostile to agriculture. I desire to correct the RECORD in that regard, because among the stalwart supporters of agriculture in the Senate there is a large

group on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

As a member of that committee, and as one who believes in agriculture, I can assure the Senator that on that committee there are those who recognize the needs of agriculture, and that should the resolution be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency it would receive a square deal from that committee in connection with any matters pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. REED. My friend the Senator from New Hampshire is the ranking minority member of that committee. My equally good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is also a member of that committee. There are other members of that committee who are just as good friends of agriculture as is any other Member of the Senate. I am talking about the psychology of meeting the complaints by letting the committee which would be satisfactory to those making the complaints conduct the investigation. I have said at no time that I hold any belief that the Committee on Banking and Currency is unfriendly to agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me discuss for a moment my request that the resolution go over without prejudice. The other day, when it went over until today, I did not know that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], could not be present today. The distinguished Senator from Kansas is not responsible for the absence of the chairman of the committee, and neither am I. I believe that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I believe that no harm could result from another postponement of the resolution. Out of courtesy to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is unavoidably absent, I believe that the resolution should go over for the present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to make a personal statement?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I have no warmer personal friend among the Members of the Senate than the distinguished and able Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kentucky will recall that a couple of years ago, on a close vote, it was proposed to call the Senator from New York back from Florida, where he was recuperating. I asked the secretary of the minority not to require the Senator from New York to return. I told him that I was willing to be paired with him, to take care of his vote on that important question. The Senator from New York and I have carried a general pair during all these years. No one likes him better than I do, and no one is less desirous than I of doing him any discourtesy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the able Senator from Kansas has said, and I am sure the Senator from New York will appreciate it as well.

These requests frequently involve mutual concessions and courtesies. The Senator from Kansas was the sponsor

of a measure which was placed on the calendar on January 11, 1942. The purpose of the bill was to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. On the surface, the Senator apparently thought that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which it would naturally be referred, should be bypassed. Because the Senator from Kansas was absent for 2 or 3 weeks, consideration of the bill was postponed until he could return.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the attitude of the Senator from Kansas was not "on the surface," but was the result of mature consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not doubt the accuracy of the Senator's statement. However, if a bill of that nature could be placed on the calendar without any consideration having been given to it by any committee, I could introduce a tax bill and, by the same method, have it put on the calendar and considered by the Senate without being referred to the Committee on Finance. At the proper time we shall have to discuss the question of the reference of that bill. I regret to say that I fear that a chaotic situation is developing in the Senate with respect to the reference of bills and resolutions.

I have discussed that situation on several occasions. I hope I shall not become monotonous or boresome to the Senate in my effort to bring some order out of chaos in the matter of proper reference of proposed legislation. I hope the Vice President—and I say this with the greatest affection and respect for him—will not persist in his inclination, which seems to have developed in the past week or so, to leave it to the Senate to vote on the question when there seems to be any doubt as to where a bill should go. It is conceivable that in the midst of the war we may be debating for hours the question of where a bill should be referred, when in my judgment the reference should be made by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

I realize that the rules of the Senate are somewhat vague and chaotic; but in national or county conventions, without any precedents under general parliamentary law, the right is inherent in the presiding officer to refer resolutions to the appropriate committee. The rules of the Senate do not specifically require the Vice President to do so, but ever since there has been a Senate the Vice President has been following that procedure.

I desire to say frankly that, rather than remain in this chaotic situation, in which, every time a bill or a resolution is introduced, we must have a joint debate with reference to where it should go, I shall propose an amendment to the rules which would require the Presiding Officer to exercise that function. I have no doubt that the Vice President would be glad to exercise the function if he were assured that he should do so. Senators can see what a chaotic situation will develop in the future if every time a controversial bill or resolution is introduced we must have a debate on the floor of the Senate before it can be determined to what committee it should be referred, and then vote on the ques-

tion of reference according to the inclinations of Senators, depending upon what they think they will get from a given committee, rather than to follow the parliamentary and logical procedure of referring bills to the committees to which they should be referred.

Mr. President, let me return to the pending resolution. It contains five pages of "whereases," and every one of them refers to the administration of the Price Control Act by the Office of Price Administration. Even if the whereases were eliminated, the resolution would authorize the committee to investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration. I dare say that if I were to offer a resolution authorizing an investigation into the conduct of the Bureau of Internal Revenue—the agency of the Government which collects taxes—that resolution would go to the Committee on Finance without any question whatever, because the Committee on Finance sponsors, writes, and puts through the Senate all legislation with respect to the collection of taxes. I do not believe anyone would seriously question the propriety of referring to the Committee on Finance a resolution to investigate the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There is no question that if any Senator should submit a resolution providing for an investigation of the manner in which the Federal Reserve Board has conducted the financial operations of its department, pertaining to the currency of our country, Federal Reserve notes, and the entire law affecting the situation pertaining to currency and banking, such a resolution would go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction of legislation dealing with subjects of that nature. A similar situation would obtain in the other House.

I have no doubt that if a resolution were offered providing for an investigation of the way in which the Secretary of Labor has conducted her office, or the course which has been pursued by the National Labor Relations Board in its administration of the Wagner Act, such a resolution would go to the Committee on Education and Labor, which sponsored the legislation and put it through the Senate.

Here is a resolution to investigate the whole set-up, the whole policy, the whole course of action of the Office of Price Administration in regard to the matters set forth in the whereases as well as in the resolving portion of the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Kentucky would want to add that the investigation would apply only insofar as the establishment and maintenance of maximum prices for pork, beef, and bakery products are concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand that; but the Senator from Kansas could just as well have included in the resolution clothing and shoes and everything else.

The bill providing for the control of prices was sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was properly sent there because the bill provided for legislation designed to prevent inflation, which is directly associated with the question of our currency and the value of

our currency. Inflation is a term which is applicable to our currency, the amount of it, and the value of it in terms of purchasing power; and the bill was properly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill was debated in the committee and was reported from the committee; and I think I can say for the committee, and I believe that every member of the committee will agree with me—including the ranking minority member, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who was and is a very valuable, able, and sincere member of the committee, and one of the outstanding advocates of fairness to the farmers of the country—that the committee has had the interests of farmers at heart. I, myself, claim a little credit along that line. For 30 years I have been voting for legislation to help the farmers of the country. As I have said heretofore, I voted for the original McNary-Haugen bill, which was going a good distance; but I never regretted doing so. I thought it was the best measure offered, and I never apologized for voting for the bill. Of course, at that time I was not a Member of this body. If I had been a Member of the Senate at the time, and had had the benefit of my very warm, intimate and delightful association with the author of the bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], I might have been even more enthusiastic for the bill than I was. But even in the House, where I was very well acquainted with the Member of the House who was one of the sponsors of the bill, Mr. Haugen, I with some enthusiasm and conviction voted for the McNary-Haugen bill; and all my life I have been an advocate of legislation to help the farmers of the country.

In the Committee on Banking and Currency we finally went further in the provisions for the benefit of agriculture than the farm organizations themselves had already advocated. So I think there is no evidence which would convict the Committee on Banking and Currency of any dereliction or any lack of enthusiasm or any hostility whatever toward the interests of the farmers of the United States.

We all studied psychology when we were in college, I am sure. The question here is not one of psychology. It is a question of the orderly procedure of legislation and the reference of bills to the committees having jurisdiction of them, and which should have jurisdiction of them. I suppose the Senator from Kansas means that, from a psychological standpoint, if the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made the investigation and did nothing, then those who are complaining would be better satisfied with nothing coming from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry than they would be with nothing coming from the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, I do not think the question under consideration is a purely psychological one. We have to bring some form of order out of the legislative and parliamentary chaos which has grown up in regard to the reference of bills.

Let me show what the resolution would do. All of it refers to the manner in which the Office of Price Administration

has administered the law which we passed. The fact that the resolution is limited to pork and beef and bakery products does not change the situation. It might have included shoes and clothing; it might have included everything upon which the Office of Price Administration has fixed a ceiling.

It begins:

Whereas the provisions of the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living," approved October 2, 1942—

That is the second price control act which came out of the Committee on Banking and Currency—

And so forth. Then over on the next page:

Whereas the act known as the Emergency Price Control Act—

And so forth. Then further down:

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Office of Price Administration issued Maximum Price Regulation No.—

So-and-so; and—

Whereas said Maximum Price Regulation No. 148—

And so-and-so; and—

Whereas on December 10, 1942, the Office of Price Administration—

Did so-and-so; and—

Whereas on April 28, 1942, the Price Administrator—

Did so-and-so; and—

Whereas—

All the way through it—

The Price Administrator—

Or—

The Price Administration—

Has done something under the act that is a subject of protest from a large number of people in the country—and with whom I sympathize let me say to the Senator from Kansas and other Senators. The whole resolution is based upon the situation set out in the whereases; and then finally:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry * * * is hereby authorized and directed—

To investigate and study the policies and actions of the Office of Price Administration * * *

So the whereases are forerunners of the resolution itself which orders the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate the way in which the Office of Price Administration, created by a law which was enacted on report from the Committee on Banking and Currency, has conducted its affairs in the certain respects enumerated. If that is to be done, there certainly would be created such a situation that the Senate would never know how its future conduct would be charted.

I sympathize with the meat packers. Some of them have been in my office. In my State of Kentucky, as well as in other States, there are packers. Kentucky is not the location of large packers, but we have many small packers in Louisville, Covington, Newport, and various other localities in the State. I realize the hardship which is being done to them. They are being squeezed. I read the telegram which the Senator from Kansas had

placed in the RECORD. It is only a repetition of what certain of my constituents have told me in my office. So there is no dispute about the fact that the small packers have been squeezed. That condition has grown out of a situation for which the Office of Price Administration may not have been responsible originally. It may have been that the War Department and Navy Department, in the making of contracts with the large packers who are supplying the Army and Navy, have had some part in bringing about the situation which contributed to the condition complained of—not altogether responsible for it, but making some contribution to it.

However, regardless of that, and be that as it may, undoubtedly the small packers are in a bad way and are losing money. I have taken up the matter with the Office of Price Administration, first under Mr. Henderson and, since he has been out of office, under Mr. Brown; and I think that if they can find any formula under which they can remedy the situation they are anxious to do so. They have not as yet been able to find one.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate by discussing the matter further at this time, because I hope that the calendar may be called in a few minutes; but, in view of the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who I think desires to have a little something to say about the situation, I do not think any harm can come if the resolution goes over again. I hope the Senator from Kansas will agree that that may be done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as I tried to say, I have none but the warmest feelings for the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator from Kentucky has emphasized what I said: This matter has been running for months. The small processors of meat products which are essential to the welfare of the country have been going out of business and are going out of business every day and every week. I think this is a matter which should be disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. Undoubtedly the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction of legislation amending the Price Control Act. I do not suppose that will be disputed. Does not the Senator think that if the investigation is made by the committee which sponsored the legislation, if it should find that the policies inaugurated under the legislation are not being carried out according to the intention of Congress, it would be more likely to report proposed legislation dealing with and correcting the situation than would another committee which has not had jurisdiction of the legislation?

Mr. REED. I do not. In the first place, the heart of the question is going to be the price of hogs and the relation of the price of hogs to the wholesale price of meat—not the retail price, but the wholesale price. I think that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry knows more about the price of hogs, and ought to know more about the price of hogs

and its relationship to the price of meat, than does the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The investigation would be confined to subjects having to deal with price ceilings, with going market prices, with parity prices—all of which have always been considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the final judgment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had weight with the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that the individual members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry know more about the price of hogs than do the individual members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, although I doubt it. But in spite of any such superior knowledge on the part of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it has never reported any measure dealing with the price of hogs. It has suggested legislation dealing with corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice. I do not criticize it for not bringing in legislation dealing with hogs; because we all agree that the basic products should not have included cattle or hogs at the time when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed. However, I am not prepared to agree that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has any greater knowledge in regard to hogs than does the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are a lot of hogs in the banking business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to "hog" the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am through. I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request, if it is necessary, that the resolution go over without prejudice until Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. What was the request, Mr. President?

Mr. BARKLEY. I asked that the resolution go over without prejudice until Thursday.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me inquire whether it is in order to move to postpone consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No motion relative to reference of the resolution is before the Senate at the present time; and a motion such as that to which the Senator from Kentucky has referred is in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if I have not done so, I was about to make a formal motion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We have now, acting under a resolution which covers this very subject, appointed a subcommittee, and have subpoenaed certain witnesses to come be-

fore us; and the identical matter is included in the resolution which the Senate adopted and under which we are acting. I am of opinion that meat is a part of the food of the Nation, and we are investigating the food situation—f-o-o-d, not f-o-o-l. We hope to have a hearing. If the resolution should go to any other committee, it would merely be cumulative of the work being done by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, unless the Senator from South Carolina wishes to proceed further, I desire to say that I agree with the position taken by the Senator from Oregon. Any standing committee of the Senate has a right under its own authority, to investigate any subject upon which it might bring in legislation. We do not have to authorize the Finance Committee to investigate taxes; we do not have to authorize, by resolution, the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the banking and currency laws. The standing committees, practically all, if not all, of them, have been given an appropriation of \$5,000 each to conduct investigations, and if any committee can show reason why it should have more, it, of course, will be given more. But the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and every other committee has the right, without any specific resolution or authority, to investigate any subject over which it may have legislative jurisdiction.

Nobody can ever tell, when an investigation is inaugurated, whether it will result in legislation. We have investigations that do not result in legislation and we sometimes have legislation that results in investigations; but still the committee would have the right to go forward, according to what I understand was its action last Friday, and investigate the food situation and any collateral matter that might pertain to the food situation.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said and what the Senator from South Carolina has said, but this thought came to me: In the first place, if the Committee on Forestry is already doing the work, why have a resolution at all? If the resolution is adopted by the Senate, and another investigation is authorized, perhaps by the Committee on Banking and Currency, we would have two committees investigating identically the same thing. That is the reason I asked why the necessity for the resolution at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt the wisdom or necessity of it, but the point is this, if I may emphasize it: In our legislative course here and in the reference of bills and resolutions to committees we must try to preserve some order of sequence in the reference of bills and resolutions of various kinds. I think it would be a bad precedent to take this resolution or any other resolution proposing to investigate the administration of the price-administration laws from the committee that fathered the original legislation and

refer it to another committee. I should infinitely prefer that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry go ahead with its own investigation in its own way than to have a resolution investigating the O. P. A., which was promoted by the Banking and Currency Committee, taken away from that committee and by action of the Senate referred to another committee.

Mr. SMITH. The only thing which urged me to make a statement was the fact that the resolution is pending. The committee of which I am chairman is operating and has charge of the food situation. I am under the impression that meat comes in that category. Meat is becoming pretty scarce; the committee is investigating that very thing. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, it looks as if it is proposed rather to multiply investigations from different angles. I do not know but that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is in duty bound to find out what is the matter with all the miserable mess, for that is what it is. Almost every branch of the Government seems to want to deal something; they want to deal things out, and now they have gotten down to the heels of women's shoes, which must not be more than so long, and all that kind of thing. Such actions have caused the American people to reach a point where they are just about ready to say, "All of you quit."

I cannot, for the life of me, see why a question of food should not be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I do not know that food is produced by chambers of commerce or in banking houses. I really think that the resolution of the Senator from Kansas would result in a duplication of what we are already doing.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Under what resolution is the Senator's committee now investigating?

Mr. SMITH. Under a resolution—I have forgotten its number—under which the committee is to go into all food products.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the able Senator, a subcommittee has been appointed by him as chairman to do, in connection with a number of other things, the very thing proposed by the resolution of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SMITH. To do the identical thing. We deal with transportation and its effect upon the price of food products; with processing; with the price paid the original producer and then the difference in price of the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer. We want to get some line on what is being done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may do so, I move that the consideration of this resolution be postponed until next Thursday without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, am I to understand that the motion of the Senator from Kentucky takes precedence over the motion made by me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky takes precedence.

Mr. REED. Let me discuss the question for a moment.

I am somewhat surprised at the Senator from South Carolina. A constituent of his, a meat packer, sent me a telegram received by him from the Senator from South Carolina saying that the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had considered Senate Resolution 94 and desired that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who raised the question about an investigation already announced to be made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I submitted my resolution in advance of the public announcement made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

If I had had that announcement before me possibly I would not have submitted the resolution; but it was presented at the request of numerous small business organizations representing small businesses which are being squeezed out of business. Starting with the President, continuing through the Cabinet, through various agencies, and including Members of the Senate and the House, if you please, we talk about small businessmen, and here are a number of small businessmen being squeezed out of business under a process that has been going on for months without anything being done about it. That is the reason the resolution was drafted and offered in the Senate.

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the committees are agencies of this body and nothing else. No committee has any jurisdiction except such as this body gives it. If this body says that the investigation should be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I think all the argument is that way—certainly no discourtesy would be done by the Senate to any subordinate agency of the Senate. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I inquire what is the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to postpone the consideration of the pending question until Thursday. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

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

Alken	Byrd	Guffey
Andrews	Capper	Gurney
Austin	Caraway	Hatch
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Hawkes
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Bankhead	Connally	Hill
Barkley	Danaher	Holman
Bilbo	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Downey	Kilgore
Brooks	Ferguson	La Follette
Buck	George	Langer
Burton	Gerry	Lodge
Bushfield	Gillette	Lucas
Butler	Green	McClellan

McFarland	Reed	Truman
McKellar	Revercomb	Tunnell
McNary	Reynolds	Tydings
Maloney	Robertson	Vandenberg
Maybank	Russell	Van Nuys
Millikin	Scrugham	Wagner
Moore	Shipstead	Walgren
Nye	Smith	Walsh
O'Daniel	Stewart	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Idaho	White
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	Willis
Radcliffe	Tobey	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are conducting hearings in Puerto Rico on behalf of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky. The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. The vote will come on my motion to postpone the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Kansas until Thursday, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, to postpone the consideration of the resolution until Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. If my motion shall be agreed to, then the resolution will be laid before the Senate automatically Thursday, if the Senate shall adjourn until Thursday, at the end of the routine morning business, just as it has been today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be laid before the Senate just before the conclusion of the routine morning business, just as it was today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate more than a moment or two to express my views as to the reference which should be made of the resolution of the Senator from Kansas.

I think that the subject matter touched upon by the resolution involves one of the most serious questions now

confronting the American people. In my opinion, it involves a situation which in the very near future is likely very seriously to affect the food supply of the United States. Since it involves the disposition entirely of agricultural products, and since it does involve the food supply not only for the civilians of the United States, but for the armed forces of the United States, in my opinion the reference of the resolution should be to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee which has been specially charged over a long period of time with jurisdiction of the production, marketing, and distribution of agricultural products.

What has happened in this situation is that the O. P. A., through a lack of understanding of the agricultural problem, by putting a ceiling on processed agricultural products and not on the production of agricultural products, has brought about a situation which in the immediate future is likely to put out of business all the processors engaged in processing agricultural products, taken in connection with the practice of the Government in issuing mandatory orders which have to be filled, even though they are filled at a loss.

It is entirely true that the O. P. A. was the putative child—and I say "putative" because everyone knows it was not the actual child—of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Everyone knows that the child was the product of the brain of Mr. Ginsberg, whose services were too valuable to the O. P. A. to permit him to go into the Army, as a man of his age would ordinarily be expected to do. That being true, the Committee on Banking and Currency has a shadow of claim to jurisdiction of the resolution; but the purpose of the resolution is to get something done for the agricultural interests of the United States, and that includes the producers as well as the processors.

I suggest that the way to get something done to correct the present situation is to refer the resolution to a committee which is interested in agricultural production, rather than to a committee which, as I have said, is the putative parent of the O. P. A., and therefore is naturally interested in trying to show that it did not make a mistake in the law as it was originally passed.

I say that any one member of this body who is interested in having something done to correct the present situation should vote to refer the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and not to postpone consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate very long in the discussion of the resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas, which is now before the Senate for determination. I am as much interested in the packers' problems as is any other Senator on the floor at the present time. Many of the problems of the small packers have come across my desk, and I have attempted, in my limited way, to contact O. P. A. and other officials in Washington with the view toward having those packers given some relief.

Mr. President, that is not what disturbs me at this moment. We have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who says point blank, and without any equivocation, that the question covered by the resolution is now being considered and discussed by a subcommittee which has been appointed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It should be sufficient for the Members of the Senate that this very problem is now being discussed and investigated and debated by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

What disturbs me is that the Members of the Senate, at least a great number of them, are constantly complaining about the duplication of effort, the duplication of authority, and the lack of an organized program in the bureaus of the executive branch of the Government. Yet, here on the floor of the Senate, in our own body, there is a discussion consuming almost an hour and a half over a resolution covering a subject which is now being considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. What interests me about the resolution more than anything else is that it specifies two products which are to be investigated, when our committee proposes to investigate the whole field affecting food. If we take the resolution up and it shall be agreed to, we will specify and give preference to two products, which I do not think are more important than others.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his contribution. The resolution under which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is now investigating is all-inclusive. It does not cover merely two particular subjects in which some Senator may be interested because he lives in a particular section of the country, and because that problem involved commands his interest. The resolution to which the Senator from South Carolina referred covers the entire field, as he has so ably said.

So, Mr. President, here we are, wasting an hour and a half—and we did the same thing last Thursday—on a resolution which in my opinion has no place whatsoever before the Senate, because it is cumulative, it will do no good, whether it goes to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Its reference will make no difference, because the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is now in the course of an investigation of the entire subject.

I wish to elaborate upon what the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the minority leader, has said with respect to this kind of a resolution.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I have examined the general resolutions applying to committees which have come before the committee, and I believe I know what each committee's duties are with respect to investigations. I have exam-

ined the resolution which is now before the Senate. In my opinion, there is no question that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has, under the general resolution authorizing it to hold hearings, which has heretofore been adopted, full and complete authority to do the very things contemplated by the resolution now before the Senate. Similar investigations have been made many times. If the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry desires the Secretary of Agriculture to come before the committee and testify upon any question that we agree should be investigated, he will do so. Such a thing has been done many times without the adoption of a special resolution.

I am as much interested in this question as is any other Senator on the floor, but what I am complaining about is the fact that we as members of the Senate stand here constantly condemning bureaus and bureaucrats because of their duplication of authority and because of their bungling efforts, yet here we ourselves have a perfect case of bungling in the submission of this resolution and the taking up of the time we have taken here on two different occasions to debate it.

So far as I am concerned, I do not care to what committee the resolution is referred. It ought to go into the waste basket. That is where it belongs, so far as doing any good is concerned, because the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is doing more, under the general resolution adopted with respect to that committee, than can possibly be done under the specific resolution now before the Senate.

THE RECENT RUSSIAN VICTORIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, dispatches last night and today bring the news and the confirmation that the Russian city of Rostov, heretofore in the hands of the Nazis, has capitulated, and that Russian forces are now in possession of that strategic point.

Late news dispatches also reveal that Russian forces are rapidly investing Kharkov, another industrial and commercial center to the north of Rostov, now and for the recent past a center of German supplies and munitions and activities.

Mr. President, I simply wish to take a few moments of the Senate's time to express a message of admiration to the Russian people for the heroic and gallant conduct of the Russian armies. The winter season has presented many difficulties to military campaigns, but notwithstanding these natural impediments the Russian forces have moved forward and driven back the lines of the invaders to what they say are "new positions," but in doing so, the Russians have redeemed large territories of Russian soil, and have no doubt stiffened and increased the granite resistance of the Russian people until they will be encouraged and stimulated to greater and more heroic efforts to carry the war to a successful conclusion.

Russia has amazed the United Nations. There were many who believed that under the impact of the hammer blows of the Axis, Russia would collapse for

lack of organized industrial power and for lack of military training and stamina, but Russia, throughout the entire campaign, from the time of the initial attack to this moment, has revealed an astounding ability for the organization of her industry and the supplying of her vast forces. She has likewise similarly astounded the people of the United Nations by her military organization, by her strategy, and by all the elements of warfare upon a grand scale.

I am gratified to know that American supplies and munitions are now reaching the Soviets in a larger volume than they have for a considerable period in the past. The details of that situation cannot be properly discussed here, but our convoys are now reaching Arctic ports with much smaller losses than they have in the months which have preceded.

Mr. President, not alone have the Russians shown unflagging resistance to the invader but they have been able, through their gallant attacks, their heroic campaigns, not alone to arrest the invader but to drive him back toward his own boundaries.

I wish to say a further word regarding Russia. Mr. President, Russia's domestic policies and internal institutions are not the proper concern of the United States to the extent of intervention or interference with those institutions. Whether we like them or whether we do not like them, it is not a matter for the United States to undertake to determine for Russia her political institutions or her economic system. We must remember that Russia is relatively a new nation. The Soviet Republic's form of government has been in existence for only a quarter of a century, and she has behind her only 25 years of development and advancement, but I think it will be the judgment of history that during that time Russia has shown to the world a power of self-government—a power of caring for her resources and ability to organize her industry—that few of us realized in the years that are gone.

So while I do not subscribe, as I know most Senators do not subscribe, to the political concept of Russia and her people, my own hope is that God may grant her strength to develop her institutions in a manner suited to the needs of her own people and to enable her to meet her international obligations as she shall be forced to meet them in the future into which we look.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Texas has just stated, entirely accurately in my judgment, that Russia in her resistance has amazed the United Nations. I know the Senator will agree with me that she has not only amazed the United Nations, but she has amazed Germany as well, and I think Germany will be even more amazed at the wonderful progress of Russian armies than United Nations are.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the eminent Senator from Tennessee for his observation. I have no doubt that Germany and

her master, Hitler, at the moment that German armies swept across the Russian frontier in their campaign of invasion and conquest, believed that Russia within a few weeks would suffer the same fate that befell Poland in 1939 when the German infantry and panzer divisions poured over the plains of that unhappy country. I think Germany had a concept that Russia was a great inert, unorganized mass which would succumb to the organized military power, the organized military strategy of the great machine which has swept over the face of Europe and crushed under its feet practically every nation on the continent of Europe that did not subscribe to the policies and did not accept the suzerainty of the German authority and power.

Mr. President, I wish to say that Russia, great nation that she is, with 160,000,000 people, sovereign over vast areas both in Europe and in Asia, cannot be ignored in post-war arrangements and in consideration of what shall follow victory by the United Nations.

There are those who seek now to bring about an arrangement among the United Nations as to what shall immediately follow peace. Mr. President, my own view is that the most that can be accomplished along those lines at the moment is simply an agreement upon a few general policies, a few general principles, that shall actuate the United Nations when victory is achieved. It is manifestly impossible for us to peer into the uncertain dramas of the future in detail and to settle definitely now the various and multitudinous issues which shall come before the peace conference.

However, what I rose to say, as a citizen of the United States, if my voice can be heard by any Russian citizen, or any representative of the Russian Government, is that I believe that by her sword Russia has earned the right to be consulted at the peace table. She has earned her right to stand among the great powers of the earth and have her voice heard in whatever arrangements may take place when victory shall have been accomplished by the United Nations.

Mr. President, the collapse in part of the German forces in South Russia and, I hope, in the Caucasus, is one of the encouraging and stimulating things which have recently been brought to our attention. I wish to salute Russia, the great leadership of her armies, and the striking power which has enabled them to drive back the greatest military machine that modern times have known.

Mr. President, when the Soviet Union was first established it seemed that Russia then had some ambitions of propaganda among other nations, to convert them to her political concepts. However, my information is that that movement has been abandoned and that no longer will she undertake, at least in the United States, to press those concepts. I have no fear of the Russians undermining or attacking the institutions of the United States. I welcome her comradeship in arms in this titanic

struggle in which she and her armies have played so valiant and so heroic a part.

SHORTAGE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, New England, and particularly Massachusetts, is at this time suffering the dire consequences of an acute shortage of all petroleum products. I regret to say that much of this suffering is due to the public confidence in promises made by various governmental agencies which have had to do with oil. I am advised that a series of contradictory regulations, imposed one upon another, has baffled the public, prevented the fair functioning of the oil industry, and caused one of the greatest disasters which this section of the country has ever faced. There is an extreme difference between the suffering, privation, or self-discipline imposed by war conditions and the misery caused by departmental stupidity, lackadaisical action, and unplanned, unthought-out, unworkable rules and regulations. New England, and particularly Massachusetts, always has been and always will be willing to make any sacrifices necessary when fundamental principles and the winning of the war are involved. But New England will not willingly be nailed, drawn, and quartered on the rack of administrative incompetence.

Last May the present oil shortage was forecast by men of practical experience in the oil industry. One of them, Joseph F. White, president of the White Fuel Co., evolved a plan which depended upon tank car movements from the oil fields into New England. Backed by representatives of every major oil company in New England, he tried to convince officials of O. P. A., O. P. C., O. D. T., and W. P. B. that immediate action was necessary. That was in May. In June, July, August, September, and October he and other oil men together made a series of trips and visited the bureaucracies which control oil from the moment it leaves the ground until it reaches the consumer. Their visits were in vain. The White plan went into effect in November.

I became alarmed at the oil situation last August, and after considerable study I introduced a bill to have placed under one man definite control of the whole petroleum situation. That bill did not become law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the bill which I introduced, which would establish a single Petroleum Administrator. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD following the bill a statement which I made at that time explaining the proposal.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Petroleum Act of 1942."

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, unless the context otherwise indicates—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the National Petroleum Administrator.

(b) The term "petroleum" means petroleum and motor vehicle fuels, fuel oils, and other fuels produced from petroleum.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created and established an agency of the United States to be known as the National Petroleum Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration"). At the head of the Administration there shall be a National Petroleum Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 a year. The Administrator shall have no other vocation or employment and shall have no financial interest in any enterprise with which he transacts business in his official capacity.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and shall make such expenditures, as may be necessary for carrying out his functions and the functions of the Administration. The Administrator is authorized to accept gifts or loans of real and personal property and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services. With the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, any officer or employee of any department or agency of the Government may be assigned to assist in the work of the Administration. Any function of the Administrator may be exercised by such officers or employees of the Administration as he may designate for that purpose.

SEC. 5. (a) The following functions are hereby transferred to and vested in the Administrator:

(1) All functions of the Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War.

(2) All functions of the War Production Board and its Chairman, of the Price Administrator, and of the Office of Defense Transportation, relating to the production, transportation, distribution, sale, or price of petroleum.

(b) The Petroleum Conservation Division of the Department of the Interior is hereby transferred to the Administration and shall perform its functions within the Administration subject to the direction and control of the Administrator. All powers and duties of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the functions performed by such Division are hereby transferred to and vested in the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator is authorized to formulate and require the execution of such policies, programs, and measures as he deems necessary to provide for the coordination of the functions of departments and agencies of the Government relating in any manner to the production, transportation, distribution, sale, or price of petroleum and to provide for the execution of such functions in such manner as the Administrator deems best. All officers and agencies of the Government authorized to perform any such functions shall, in performing such functions, conform to such policies, programs, measures, and requirements as the Administrator may prescribe in the execution of the powers vested in him by this subsection.

(d) The Administration is authorized to direct the manner in which and the purpose for which transportation facilities available for the transportation of petroleum shall be used, and shall have authority to direct the shipment of any petroleum to any particular destination.

SEC. 6. (a) Such personnel and property (including office equipment and records) of the various departments and agencies of the Government as have been employed in the execution of the functions transferred to the Administrator or the Administration by this Act and as may be determined by the President shall be transferred to the Administration upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

(b) Such appropriations or other funds as have been available for expenditure in the execution of the functions so transferred by this Act and as may be determined by the President shall be transferred to the Administrator on such date or dates as the President may prescribe, and shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator in carrying out his functions and the functions of the Administration.

SEC. 7. The Administrator is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to delegate to any department or agency of the Government any of the functions vested in the Administrator. Any functions so delegated shall be performed by such department or agency upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator may determine. The Administrator is authorized to reimburse, out of any funds available for expenditure by him, any such department or agency for expenses incurred in the performance of such functions.

SEC. 8. All rules, regulations, orders, and requirements issued or made in the exercise of any function transferred by this act, and in effect when this section takes effect, shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Administrator, by any court of competent jurisdiction or by operation of law.

SEC. 9. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and to make and issue such orders and directives as may be necessary for carrying out his functions.

SEC. 10. Such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 11. The provisions of sections 5 and 8 of this act shall take effect on the tenth day after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 12. This act shall cease to be in effect upon the termination of 6 months after the end of the present war, or upon such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

I am today introducing a bill to establish the Office of National Petroleum Administrator. This bill seeks to remedy several defects in the present system, and in particular to meet three major criticisms of our present petroleum policy.

1. This bill sets up a Nation-wide control in place of the present sectional control which is confined to 17 Eastern States.

2. It sets up a unified authority replacing the present divided authority which has led so many people to complain that they were victims of "passing the buck." The mayors of Massachusetts and a great many of the petroleum dealers have strongly expressed themselves as favoring the unified control of this great problem.

3. It confers a grant of power sufficiently broad to enable the Government to compel petroleum shipments into critical areas.

I believe the need for Nation-wide control is already apparent to many people and will be apparent to the entire Nation within a short space of time. I understand that it is by no means certain that the Middle West will continue to enjoy an abundance of petroleum products. Moreover, the need to conserve rubber is just as great in one section of the country as it is in another, and control of petroleum is a practical way to conserve rubber. I believe that Nation-wide control not only appeals to one's sense of fairness and justice, and that it not only would meet a criticism which is being voiced within the rationed area, but that it would be definitely in the interests of the Nation as a whole.

In a telegram to me of recent date, Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Coordinator of Defense Transportation, stated that the oil shortage was "not a matter to be controlled alone through distribution of tank cars, because

neither the railroads nor I can bring buyers and sellers together nor require shippers to make consignments to a particular destination."

This message makes it clear that there is a present lack of authority to compel oil shipments. Although the granting of such authority might normally be repugnant to our notions of free enterprise, we are confronting an emergency which justifies the taking of effective steps to see to it that people in our Northern States do not grow cold during the winter, and that essential war industries in all the rationed States are enabled to continue war production. I believe this is a proper delegation of power in time of war.

I introduce this bill with the hope that it will be enacted into law, and in the belief that in any event it sets up a standard to which those of us who are so vitally interested in the petroleum situation can repair. Obviously it would be much quicker if this same object were to be achieved by action of the executive branch. I still hope that this may be the case. This bill, however, represents the thoughts of a great many people who are vitally concerned with this problem.

In the final analysis this bill centralizes control and definitely places responsibility on a very vital concern of the home front.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on September 4, 1942, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States in which I called his attention to the seriousness of the situation. I received a reply under date of October 1, 1942, in which the President agreed with my contention that the control of the entire oil problem should be unified under one agency. I ask to have a copy of my letter, together with the reply from the President, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SEPTEMBER 4, 1942.

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Only the seriousness of the problem would justify me in taking your precious time with a letter, and I would not think of doing so unless the matter about which I write carried such a grave threat to our program for the production of weapons.

I refer to the impending shortage of fuel oil in New England. This shortage will not only threaten the health of all people who must live in a cold-weather climate, but it menaces the many industries in this section which need fuel oil in order to manufacture weapons. The seriousness of these two dangers must not be minimized. In studying this question, and in conferring with the numerous agencies of the Government having to do with it, I have been led to the conclusion that, while the shortage is real, its effects could be considerably reduced if two principal things were done:

First. Unify the control of this problem under one head instead of distributing the authority, as is now the case, among a number of different Federal agencies.

Second. Institute a Nation-wide rationing or conservation plan so that amounts of fuel oil now being used for nonessential purposes in other parts of the country could be made available to this section.

In order to accomplish this purpose, I have drafted legislation which confers additional authority on the Executive. I enclose a copy of the bill and would be deeply obliged to get your reaction.

I recognize that legislative action is slow and that many of the things embodied in this bill could be done by you without legis-

lation. I hope that you will take cognizance of this important matter and act early so as to avert the dangers which threaten New England and which have such grave implications to the Nation as a whole.

With assurances of my esteem and high regard,

Faithfully and respectfully yours,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 1, 1942.

HON. H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I have read with much interest your letter of September 4, and the enclosed copy of S. 2716, a bill to establish a National Petroleum Administration, which you have introduced in the Senate.

I share your view that governmental control and direction of the problem of petroleum supply should be centralized in a single agency. An intensive study has been under way for some time to determine the type of organization best suited to accomplish this objective and so designed as to fit into the over-all pattern of organization of the war agencies. A decision on this matter may be expected within the near future.

Since statutory powers already exist to create, by Executive order, an agency with adequate power and responsibility to deal with the oil problem, I do not think that new legislation in this field is necessary at this time.

Steps have already been taken to ration fuel oil in the States on the Atlantic seaboard and in the Midwest in order to distribute the available supplies equitably among all affected. Affirmative action has also been taken to increase both the production of fuel oil and the ability of our transportation system to move such oil to the areas of shortage.

I have been assured by the agencies that are primarily concerned that there will be adequate fuel oil supplies for all military and essential industrial requirements, and that all possible measures are being effected to minimize the shortage of fuel oil for civilian consumption.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and I am glad to have had the opportunity to express to you my views on it.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. LODGE. In his reply the President stated that he thought the idea of a unified petroleum administration was good, and thanked me for my interest. However, nothing was done, until December 3 when, at long last, Mr. Ickes was given some of the authority that he needed. I say some of the authority, because he still has not enough power to do the things which he knows should be done.

I spoke of contradictory regulations. Let us look at the record. Originally, the Office of Price Administration conceived the beautiful theory—and I use the word "theory" advisedly—that in order to ration the New England public to 75 percent of the amount of oil consumed last year they would freeze the industry and allow oil companies to sell 75 percent of the amount sold last year to their respective customers. This policy resulted also in freezing the customers. If a major oil company, for example, sold to a number of oil marketers a certain amount of petroleum products in the fall of 1941 and the spring of

1942, then he could this year sell but 75 percent of that amount in the fall of 1942 and the spring of 1943.

The public, through various rationing boards, were given coupons. These coupons were supposed to represent about 75 percent of the amount of oil each consumer used in the last heating season. That rule, of course, did not work. Some companies had gone out of business. Their customers could get no oil from anybody under that ruling. Some oil companies discriminated in favor of their better customers; and so the O. P. A. changed the rule. It promulgated another rule 3 weeks ago. The new rule stated that any person with money and coupons would have to receive oil. Chaos followed the rule. A small oil company which bought its oil from a major company and which had depended upon the major company for supplies for years was told that no longer could it be sold its supplies.

So the picture changed for the worse. Small independent oil marketing were forced to drive their trucks from one major oil company to another major oil company in the hope—often a vain hope—that they could buy oil for their customers. About half the time they could not buy anything. The cupboard was bare. On February 3 that order was revoked. As if those conditions were not enough to drive oil marketers and consumers to the belief that they were the forgotten people of this country, the Petroleum Administration for War issued a decree in December setting forth a list of priorities which, said P. A. W., must be provided with oil. These priorities naturally included hospitals, transportation companies, and all departments having to do with the public safety and public health. The utilities of necessity were listed on this priority scale. So the major oil companies found themselves facing a fine of \$10,000 from W. P. B. if they did not sell their product to those on the priority list established by W. P. B. They faced another fine from O. P. A. if they refused to sell oil to anyone who proffered coupons and cash. Orders and cancellations of orders came too fast. Rules clashed, confusion resulted and still continues.

I ask, in all fairness, how any honest, intelligent human being or industry could operate under such conditions.

Those are only the most recent examples of bungling. Let us go back to the time when the O. P. A. announced that coupons would be good for 10 gallons. They are no longer worth 10 gallons; they are worth 8 gallons. Let us think back to October 13. At that time the Governors of the six New England States came to Washington and consulted with Mr. Ickes and with the President of the United States. Mr. Ickes told them that they would receive 75 percent of last year's consumption. What the President told them I do not know. All I can say is that the Governors said they were very optimistic after having talked with the President; so it is reasonable to assume that he reassured them.

It must be remembered that such technicalities as "degree days" and the relationship of "degree days" to the consumption of oil are technical matters about which the New England public has had no cause to be concerned. "Degree day" is a technical expression. It means the number of degrees on any day below 65°. If, for example, the temperature on any given day averaged 30°, that day would be a 35° day. Oil companies use the "degree day" system and know when customers' tanks are empty. The practical public knows only that the colder the weather the more oil they burn, which is enough for them to be concerned about. So when O. P. A. blithely announced that the public would receive 75 percent of its last year's consumption, a few commented that the season of 1941 and 1942 was about 10 percent warmer than average. The authorities either knew or should have known that 1941-42 was not a normal year and that by promising 75 percent they aroused false hopes on the part of the public.

Let me put it another way. The last heating season was a 90-percent heating season. Seventy-five percent of 90 meant that the public, at most, would receive only 66 percent of the oil it needed for a normal year. O. P. A. founded its rationing plan on what it thought was the rock of temperature, but it knew, or should have known, that actually it founded the rationing plan on the shifting sands of New England's varying temperatures.

So far—to make conditions worse—the winter in Massachusetts is 12 percent colder than normal. Rationing coupons for the present heating period have been cut in value from 10 gallons to 8 gallons, a reduction of 20 percent. Hence, the public who looked with confidence to our Government and who naturally expected to receive 75 percent of their normal oil requirements have found—what? They have found that they have coupons for only 50 percent of the oil they need in order to keep warm for the remainder of the winter. There is no assurance that they will receive even that much oil.

At this point let me take up the question of conversions. People were urged to convert their heating plants from oil to coal.

They made inquiry and found there were no parts available. Later the W. P. B. made available some iron with which to make grates. Gradually the public started again to take heart. But on October 14 O. P. A. got busy. On that date a ceiling price was placed on grates. Grates at the foundry were priced at 11 cents a pound. The wholesalers bought the grates from the foundry at 11 cents. But O. P. A. put a ceiling price on the wholesalers, too. That ceiling price was 13.75 cents a pound—a so-called profit of 2¼ cents a pound. For that sum the wholesaler was supposed to truck the grates from the freight yard to his warehouse, inventory them, sell them, and pay the freight on them when he sold them. The wholesalers lost money on every transaction. So they stopped handling them. People who wanted to convert could not get the necessary parts.

That ceiling price lasted from October 14 to November 26—during the very 6 weeks when conversions would have been made. So, on the one hand, people were urged to convert, and then price ceilings made it impossible for them to get the parts. Meantime, O. P. A. officials kept repeating that the public would get 75 percent of its oil. The price ceiling was lifted to 15.75 cents a pound to the wholesaler only after cold weather had set in. Planned economy!

I believe that the people have the right to look to their Government for help in time of crisis. Those who did look to their Government for help were sadly misled. But let us go on.

It is tragic but true that if the disaster now confronting Massachusetts and New England could better be seen, more help from the Federal Government would be forthcoming. I know how the American people react to a visible catastrophe. When the Mississippi overflowed its banks and people were driven from their homes, the generosity of the American public sent food and clothing and materials to the flood victims. But the tragedy in New England is not visible. It is hidden behind the four walls of each home. A temperature of 65°, as was promised by the O. P. A., might be comfortable, but temperatures running in thousands of homes as low as 50° are not comfortable or conducive to health. These low temperatures have caused sickness and hardship and suffering. But the tragedies cannot be seen.

Let me speak for a moment about the 500,000 persons in New England who depend upon kerosene for their only fuel. Kerosene is distributed by peddlers. The peddlers buy their kerosene from an oil company and peddle it up and down the streets. The families to whom they sell the kerosene usually buy 5 gallons at a time, enough to last a day or 2, depending upon the weather. But in Boston, Lowell, Lawrence, Brockton, Fall River, New Bedford, and other of our communities the peddlers were unable to get the kerosene they needed in order to take care of their customers. For weeks in October and November the peddlers were instructed by O. P. A. not to take oil coupons from their customers. They were told to accept promises that the coupons would be given to them later. The reason is simple—the coupons were not then available. The rationing boards did not have them. After between fifteen and eighteen million gallons of kerosene had been sold the coupons became available. The consumers went to the rationing boards and got their coupons. Many of the peddlers are of foreign extraction. So are many of their customers. Many of the peddlers cannot read or write and are unable to digest ever-changing rules, and say so frankly. Neither can many of their customers. So we have the picture of a situation developed by O. P. A. where a peddler, unable to read or write, or harassed by complex procedure, was supposed to get from a customer who could neither read nor write a promise that when coupons were available he would turn them over to the peddler. The result, of course, was chaos. Some

customers refused to pay the peddler for kerosene and said the Government would do it. Some refused to give their coupons to the peddler in spite of their promises. Coupons worth 15,000,000 gallons of petroleum products are still floating around. I have been told, although I do not know it of my own personal knowledge, that there is a black market on them now.

Meantime, however, someone conceived the idea of shipping oil, both kerosene and furnace oil, in steel drums which hold 53 or 54 gallons. The drums could be packed in freight cars. Each freight car—and there are still enough freight cars available, although tank cars are short—could be packed with 195 drums. So packed, each boxcar could carry about 10,000 gallons of precious oil. That is as much as even the largest tank cars can handle. The Army had thousands of those drums, and were not using them.

At first the idea was pooh-poohed. Then it was said that the cost would be too great. As though cost should be allowed to matter. Finally it was agreed that the Defense Supplies Corporation would pay the extra freight and handling charge. So some freight cars were shipped full of kerosene oil. They arrived in Boston, and 20 of them were unloaded on a specially built unloading platform. It was zero weather. Because of those 20 cars, some 40,000 families received 5 gallons of kerosene—a whole day's supply. I hope there is a thought there that the authorities here will develop and take prompt advantage of.

Now comes the other side of the picture. The Defense Supplies Corporation now refuses to pay the extra charges. Oil dealers find themselves unable to collect for the costs. Is this America?

Let me stress the importance of this matter not only in regard to the people who live in New England and whose health and the welfare of whose children depends upon an adequate supply of fuel oil, but from the standpoint of war production; because in the area where I live a very large war industry is located.

In Massachusetts and, I believe, in other sections of New England, a great many plants making goods that are needed by the armed forces have been forced to curtail operations and in some cases to stop.

It is incidental that schools have been closed in 17 different communities in Massachusetts. Only by the dint of the greatest ingenuity and effort have some essential war industries been kept operating. That picture is bad enough, but when I say to the Senate that bowling alleys, country clubs, and other non-essential plants have been furnished petroleum for heating while our war industries have been in danger of closing, and in some cases have been closed, because of lack of fuel oil, Senators can see for themselves the absence of foresight and brains on the part of the bureaucracies involved in this petroleum mess.

Even institutions such as hospitals have been in danger of closing. I cannot understand why some form of priority has not been evolved for the utilization of fuel oil just as in the case of every other material resource of war.

Vainly did I plead with W. P. B. to have petroleum placed on priority just as are steel, copper, manganese, rubber, and other war essentials. This war is being fought for and by petroleum. Yet we have the picture of the War Production Board—notice the word "War"—and the Petroleum Administrator for War—again note the word "War"—saying that the war was responsible for the shortage of oil for heating. It is said the military authorities unexpectedly seized the supply of petroleum destined for New England. I talked with the military, and they said: "If the choice is between the homes of New England and the troops of north Africa, we will give your people every consideration. But as long as it is a question as between pleasure resorts and the troops in north Africa, the troops in north Africa will come first." I agree; I cannot disagree.

Mr. President, in the name of New England, and particularly in the name of my own State, Massachusetts, I ask that 1,500 more tank cars be assigned immediately to bring heating oil into New England. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that all nonessential buildings burning oil for heat be denied oil until this crisis is over. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that more 53-gallon drums of oil be shipped in box cars from the oil fields into New England. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that inventories be published daily or weekly so the public may know what to expect. In the name of Massachusetts, I ask that the minimum essential civilian needs be met forthwith, to the end that the suffering of mothers and children may cease, and that our war work may be maintained.

MERGER OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES— AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file a conference report on Senate bill 153 during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session. The request is made solely for the personal convenience of the Senator from Arizona. I desire to be out of town on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say that it is hoped, or at least the Senate conferees hope, that a complete agreement with respect to the bill will be reached at a conference to be held this afternoon. I understood that the Senator from Arizona desires to leave town for a short while, and that his request contemplated only permission to file the report during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, if the report should be agreed upon this afternoon.

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

RESCINDING OF 3-PERCENT INCREASE IN AGRICULTURAL FREIGHT RATES— STATEMENT BY FRED BRECKMAN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a summary of a statement made before the Interstate Commerce Commission by Mr. Fred

Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange. Mr. Brenckman made the statement in support of the application by the National Grange and other farm groups to have rescinded the 3-percent increase in railroad freight rates on agricultural products, which went into effect March 18, 1942.

While I have the floor, I wish to state that I am in complete accord with the position taken and the statement made by Mr. Brenckman. The railroads today are receiving the highest revenues in their history. I call attention to Mr. Brenckman's statement that operating revenues for the first 11 months of 1942 increased 39 percent over the corresponding period in 1941, that passenger revenues increased 97 percent, and that net income increased 41 percent.

I also call attention to the fact that after the I. C. C. order allowing the 3-percent increase in agricultural rates went into effect, a transportation tax of 3 percent was levied under the 1942 Revenue Act, making the increase in effect 6 percent. I cannot see the reason for the 3-percent increase in freight rates on farm commodities when manifestly the railroads do not need the revenue.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

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

In appearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of the National Grange, in January 1942, with reference to the petition of the railroads for a 10-percent increase in freight and passenger rates, we opposed any increase in the freight rates on agricultural commodities but offered no objections to an increase in passenger rates.

We were perfectly sensible of the fact that the increase in wages for railroad workers recommended by the mediators appointed by the President would call for increased revenues on the part of the carriers. However, we expressed the opinion that the increase in traffic of all kinds occasioned by the war emergency would provide ample revenue to meet the situation. We also had in mind the fact that passenger traffic would reach new high levels, and that an increase of 10 percent in passenger fares would probably produce hundreds of millions of dollars in added revenue.

As figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission itself so conclusively demonstrate, these expectations have been fully realized. The record shows that the operating revenues of the railroads for the first 11 months of 1942 amounted to more than \$6,763,000,000, as compared with \$4,867,000,000, for the same period in 1941. This represented an increase of 39 percent. During the first 11 months of 1942 the revenues derived from passenger traffic rose to \$909,000,000, compared with \$460,818,000 in the first 11 months of 1941. This represents an increase of more than 97 percent. Comparing November 1941 with November 1942, the increase in revenues from passenger traffic amounted to more than 166 percent.

After paying all operating expenses and making allowance for tax accruals, the carriers had a net income of \$1,473,762,000 during the first 11 months of 1942. This was an increase of more than 41 percent as compared with the previous 11 months.

We hold that it is not in accord with sound public policy for the railroads to earn so much in excess of all their expenses. While freight and passenger rates should, of course,

be compensatory, the excess earnings of the roads under present conditions cannot be justified.

One of the most important battles we have to fight on the home front is the battle against inflation. The Government has set up elaborate machinery to protect the country against the evils of inflation, but in spite of all the efforts that have thus far been put forth, prices continue to rise and the inflationary spiral threatens the well-being and security of every man, woman, and child in the country.

Higher transportation rates are naturally reflected in the price of commodities transported. Higher transportation costs also reduce the net returns of agriculture. The farmer pays freight rates both ways, and he is hit both coming and going by the higher rates that are now in effect.

The farther the farmer lives from market, the more he is penalized by higher transportation rates. As an illustration of the hardships under which agricultural producers on the Pacific slope are laboring, it should be kept in mind that the intercoastal steamship service has been discontinued. To clearly illustrate what this means, let me quote just a few preemergency intercoastal steamship rates and compare them with current railroad rates in carload lots: Wool in bags, \$1.18 per hundred pounds, and \$2.40; canned fruits and vegetables, 58 cents and \$1.08; dried fruits, 69 cents and \$1.28; eggs, \$1.50 and \$1.91; apples, \$1.10 and \$1.25; rye grass seed, 60 cents and \$1.03; agricultural implements other than hand, 77 cents and \$1.98; wheat to Savannah, Ga., \$6 per net ton and \$22.20 per ton. Steamship rates quoted apply from principal Pacific ports to principal Atlantic ports of the United States, and rail rates except on wheat, apply from north Pacific terminals to New York City and related points.

In addition to this, it is pertinent to say that since the 3-percent increase in freight rates on agricultural commodities took effect, under the present revenue act a 3-percent tax on all transportation of property within the United States was levied. To all practical intents and purposes this amounts to the same thing as a 6-percent increase in rates on agricultural commodities.

The task devolving upon the American farmer in this hour of crisis is to produce the food and fiber needed to feed and clothe our armed forces and the civilian population, besides making up the deficiencies of our allies. This is a huge responsibility, and the farmer is already laboring under many severe handicaps, including the most acute shortage of labor in our agricultural history. He is short of equipment and supplies, and the returns he receives for his products are insufficient to enable him to compete with the war industries for skilled and competent labor. Rescinding the 3-percent increase in freight rates which is now in effect would materially assist agriculture in achieving the production goals that have been set by the Government itself.

In recognition of the supreme importance of maximum production of meat, dairy, and poultry products, in particular, prices of corn and wheat have been fixed to bring these grains within easier reach of the livestock producer, the feeder, the dairyman, and the poultryman.

According to an inventory made by the Department of Agriculture, nearly 2,000,000 hogs, including pigs, are on the farms of the Dakotas, and nearly two and one-half million in Nebraska. The figure for the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho is over a million. California alone has close to a million.

In normal times very little corn is produced in the mountain-Pacific area. Formerly most of the corn consumed on the Pacific coast was transported by water.

Today all feed grains are carried by the railroads.

Lower freight rates in this connection will stimulate our food-for-freedom program.

FARM PRODUCTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the American farmer is being called upon these days to make superhuman efforts to produce food for a good part of the world. And he is being asked to do this with diminished manpower—reports are that this shortage amounts to more than 3,000,000 men—and with inadequate machinery.

It is true that farm income, measured in dollars, is the highest in history. But it also is true that production costs are rising, and rising rapidly.

Several governmental agencies having to do with farm production and farm income are proposing, in fact, trying to put into effect a huge subsidy program, through which instead of receiving fair prices for his products, the farmer will receive subsidies from the Treasury.

I feel, and have felt all along, that if our American way of life is to be preserved on the home front, the farmer should receive fair prices for his products, not prices admittedly below cost of production, the difference being made up by means of subsidies.

I am not one of those who believe that the way to maintain the economic freedom of the farmer is to make him dependent upon the Federal Treasury for his income. That is the road to national socialism, the other word for which is nazi-ism. I know the farmers feel the same way about it. Farmers want to produce on their own; they want to market on their own; they want to feel that they are earning their own way in the world, not that they are being supported by a paternalistic government. They know that a paternalistic government soon becomes a despotic government.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a joint statement from the heads of three major national farm organizations of America.

As spokesmen for the great bulk of family farm production in the Nation, Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; and Ezra T. Benson, executive secretary of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, assert in this statement that only the American farm family stands between the United Nations and hunger. They are unanimous in their opinion that an immediate right-about-face by Government in many of its agricultural policies and programs is imperative if we are to avert grave food shortages.

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

Today the American farm family stands between a large part of the world and hunger.

Only through the initiative, the ingenuity, and the hard work of our farm families can our people, our armed forces, and our allies possibly be fed.

American farmers are handicapped and the food supply for the United Nations jeopardized by:

(1) The Government's manpower and labor policies;

(2) The confusion and loss of confidence created by an impractical and wasteful bureaucracy more concerned with social experimentation than the production of food;

(3) The policy of using subsidies in lieu of a fair return to the farmer in the market place.

As spokesmen for the national farm organizations, which represent the great bulk of family farm production in the Nation, it is our unanimous opinion that an immediate right-about-face by government on these policies is imperative.

We emphasize the vital necessity on the part of Government to take such steps promptly as will restore the confidence of farmers and end confusion.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of a fair return in the market place. The Department of Agriculture has announced a program of so-called incentive payments for the production of certain crops. We insist that these payments as now projected are nothing but subsidies disguised. Despite repeated protests, it continues to be the policy of the administration to restrict returns to farmers by ceilings and to attempt to compensate them by subsidies with their attendant uncertainties. For the first time in 20 years, normal adjustments in the national economy, if permitted to function, would put the farmer on an equal basis with American labor and industry.

We warn that any economy which does not pay the cost of its food bill will inevitably collapse. If this situation persists, we consider it a grave danger to the Nation.

We insist upon price-control policies which will assure maximum production as the best protection against both inflation and hunger.

We urge an immediate reduction in nondefense expenditures and in the volume of directives sent out from Washington. We also urge a decentralization and restriction of the enormously expensive bureaucracy which polices these orders.

Finally, we recommend that immediate assurance be given American farmers by the Congress and the administration of their intention to preserve agriculture as an independent and self-supporting industry.

ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.
EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American
Farm Bureau Federation.
EZRA T. BENSON,
National Council of
Farmer Cooperatives.

MAXIMUM PRICES ON PORK AND BEEF PRODUCTS AND BREAD AND BAKERY PRODUCTS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of Senate Resolution 94 be deferred until next Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, automatically the resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. REED. I am asking unanimous consent that it remain in its present position.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should have to object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the morning hour having expired, the resolution, under the precedents of the Senate, will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REED. I serve notice that at the next meeting of the Senate I shall move to take it from the calendar and make it the business of the Senate.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the calling of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. In order that Senators may be present, 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:

Alken	Green	Radeliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Balley	Hatch	Reynolds
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scragham
Billbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Wallgren
Davis	Moore	Walsh
Downey	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Daniel	White
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Clerk will report the first bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States, approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect" was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY DISBURSING OFFICERS

The bill (S. 218) to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think these bills relating to Army officers should be explained by the author. I have asked that the first bill go over for today. To the second I have no objection. The first one I believe has gone over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Senate bill 218 provides that the General Accounting Office shall relieve any disbursing officer of the Army charged with

responsibility on account of loss or deficiency, while in line of duty, of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in his charge, when such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of the officer.

The bill also provides that the Secretary of War shall have determined that the officer was in line of duty, and that the loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on his part. It further provides that the determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office. Provision is also made that all cases of relief granted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress. It is further provided that the bill shall be applicable only to actual physical loss of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Army resulting from illegal or erroneous payments which might have been made by the disbursing officers.

In 1919 Congress enacted into law the act of July 11, 1919, which provides for the relief of disbursing officers of the Navy under circumstances similar to those proposed in the pending bill. The language of the bill now before us follows that of the act relating to the Navy, the only changes being those made necessary by reason of its application to the Army instead of to the Navy.

Heretofore, when Army disbursing officers lost records by reason of fire or storm or under unusual circumstances, the facts of each case were presented to Congress and relief requested for each officer. Under present conditions accountable disbursing officers are required to make shipments of funds, vouchers, records, and papers, by every means of transportation, such as the airplane, boat, and so on. It is a hazardous undertaking, and if loss occurs in making such shipments the Department, without the proposed legislation, would have to submit each loss to Congress for relief, as heretofore they have done, or as they did prior to the enactment of a similar law applying to disbursing officers of the Navy.

Under present war conditions the physical loss of funds and of vouchers, records, and papers, resulting from enemy action or due to accidental circumstances, might occur with increasing frequency.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are there such cases? Have such cases been reported? Is there some specific case to be settled, or is this a provision for the future?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is a general provision such as has been made for the disbursing officers of the Navy. As I have just stated, prior to this date, in the case of every loss by accident or otherwise, it has been necessary to make specific reports to Congress. For instance, recently moneys were sent to South Africa, and it was the understanding of all of us, through the columns of the press, that

great sums of money were lost. That is a specific instance of a loss. From time to time there will be occurrences of this sort. This measure is merely to cover the disbursing officers of the Army as heretofore the naval disbursing officers have been covered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is one provision of the bill which does not meet my approval at all. On page 2 of the bill it is provided:

The determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office.

The General Accounting Office is set up by the Congress for the purpose of ascertaining the very things mentioned in the bill. For instance, suppose a claim is made, which the Secretary of War allows in due course, probably never looking at it, some subordinate examining it, but suppose it is approved and is sent in. Suppose the General Accounting Office, which we have set up to examine into just such claims, finds the facts to be diametrically opposed to what is sent up by the Department. It is provided in the bill—

The determination by the Secretary of War of the aforesaid questions shall be conclusive upon the General Accounting Office.

I do not think such a provision should be in the law. I doubt the wisdom of the general authority proposed, because we have the General Accounting Office to examine into such matters, and the Congress will always appropriate the necessary money in cases where the General Accounting Office reports in a way favorable to the claimant. It seems to me this would be very unwise legislation. It is too general; it is too all-inclusive; it rules out the General Accounting Office, which is a congressional set-up, not an administration set-up, an agency provided by Congress to pass on just such things as are covered by the bill.

I think I shall ask that the bill go over for today, if the Senator is not too insistent on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

EQUALIZATION OF CERTAIN DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR ARMY OFFICERS

The bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will not the Senator from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The purpose of the bill is to place all officers of the Army of the United States on the same basis, with respect to certain benefits, now authorized for disability incurred in line of duty.

Under existing law, officers of the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, and of the Officers Reserve Corps, if retired or relieved from active duty by reason of physical disability, receive retired or retirement pay, computed on the basis of their commissions in the respective components of the Army of the United States to which they belong. The fact that they may have held or are holding temporary higher rank in the Army

of the United States would have no effect, although undoubtedly a majority of such officers will be holding higher temporary rank.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who is supposed to be discriminated against and for whom is the bill presented?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My understanding is that the discrimination is between those holding temporary higher rank and those holding permanent higher rank in the same category.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. If I understand the bill, it makes the law now applicable to similar officers of the Navy applicable to officers of the Army?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite true.

Mr. LODGE. It puts the civilian officer, the National Guard officer, or Reserve officer on the same footing with the Regular officer.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is the purpose of the bill. Thus, an officer in the Officers' Reserve Corps, commissioned therein as a captain but holding temporary rank in the Army of the United States as a lieutenant colonel or a colonel, would, if relieved from active duty because of physical disability, receive the retirement pay of a captain, although his service until the time of disability may have been in a much higher temporary grade.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Army of the United States or of any component thereof, except an officer of the Regular Army, who incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade and becomes entitled to retirement pay because of such disability shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

Sec. 2. Any officer of the Regular Army who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be retired for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade shall have the rank and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

Sec. 3. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability, shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for an officer of such higher grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

Sec. 4. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs additional physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade: *Provided,* That the Secretary of War, or such person or persons as he may designate, shall find that the additional physical disability is incident to service while on active duty in the higher

grade and not less than 30 percent permanent.

Sec. 5. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same grade as that held by him on the retired list, receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

Sec. 6. The benefits of this act shall apply to officers of the Army of the United States who were retired subsequent to April 6, 1917, or who may hereafter be retired for physical disability in line of duty in time of war or any emergency declared by the President, or within 6 months thereafter, determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, including any officer given a temporary appointment in a higher grade under the act of June 16, 1936, who has been retired for physical disability in a lower grade.

Sec. 7. The provisions of this act shall not apply in any case unless proceedings to obtain the benefits provided herein are initiated within 6 months from the termination of the temporary appointment held at the time when the disability is incurred or the disabled officer's release from active duty, whichever occurs earlier: *Provided,* That such proceedings may be initiated within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act in any case where such termination of appointment, retirement, or release from active duty occurred prior to such approval. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to limit the power of the President under existing law, or to affect the right of any officer of the Regular Army to have the rank and retired pay of a higher grade than herein provided, or of any other officer of the Army of the United States to have the retirement pay of a higher grade than herein provided, if entitled thereto under other provisions of law.

Sec. 9. No back pay shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act. The provisions of this act shall not otherwise affect the method in which officers are to be retired.

"THEY PLOTTED 'BUNDLES FOR CONGRESS'"—ARTICLE FROM PIC

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, about a year ago there was enacted by the Congress of the United States and signed by the President a pension law, and subsequently that pension law was repealed. We all remember the campaign which was conducted to smear Congress and to vilify certain Members of Congress relative to their activities and their votes on that measure. I did not happen to be present at that time; I was sick in the hospital; but I followed it with a good deal of interest.

Recently, there has come to my attention an article in a magazine called Pic, which discusses the two authors of the move for "Bundles for Congress" and the campaign to vilify and smear Congress because of their action on the pension bill. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to these two men. One is a man by the name of Joe Albi. He was a representative of the Italian Government. He was an Italian consul in the western part of this country, and served as the acting consular agent for the Italian Government until July 15, 1941, when the consular office was closed by order of the President.

The second is a man named Ashley Holden. He was connected with the Spokane Spokesman-Review. He was secretary of the Seattle Japan Society. He assisted the Japanese Government in this country, and he aided in the publication of the All-Japanese Society Bulletin. He admitted that he had taken a trip to Japan, and that expenses had been paid by the All-Japanese Society.

It is an interesting thing that in a very critical era of this country, when Congress passed a pension bill, regardless of the merits of that plan, the leadership of the campaign to smear and vilify Congress was taken by two men who had official or friendly connections with two governments with which we are now at war, namely Italy and Japan, as I have indicated. I think it is well that we take note of the record. These men inspired the campaign. It was at their instigation that the move was made which swept all over the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the article from the magazine Pic entitled "They Plotted 'Bundles for Congress.'"

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

THEY PLOTTED "BUNDLES FOR CONGRESS"

Shortly after the passage of the act which authorized members of Congress to enter the retirement system applying to Government employees, one Joe Albi, of Spokane, Wash., who is the leading spirit of a play organization known as the Athletic Knights of the Round Table, conceived the idea of the bundles campaign. In order to publicize it, he sought and received the assistance of one Ashley Holden, a political and editorial writer on a newspaper called the Spokesman-Review of Spokane, Wash., which is the largest daily in eastern Washington. The campaign to smear Congress was then set in motion by these two men.

Their previous affiliations are all the more interesting by reason of their authorship of this campaign of vilification.

Joe Albi is an American-born Italian, and is a practicing attorney in Spokane. On November 11, 1929, he was appointed acting consular agent of the Italian Government. He served in this capacity until July 15, 1941, when, on the President's orders, all Italian consular offices were closed. Italy is under a dictatorship, and dominated entirely by the personality of one man—Mussolini. Serving in the capacity mentioned, Albi thus became and remained the personal representative of Benito Mussolini until July 15, 1941.

As a coauthor of the Bundles for Congress campaign, his past connection with the Fascist government is interesting—and significant.

Ashley Holden is influential in shaping the editorial policy of the Spokesman-Review. He had been frequently regarded by citizens of the State of Washington as a publicist of Japanese business interests. He had appeared in the political picture of the Pacific Northwest at times when protests were being registered against the sale of scrap iron to Japan. His expressed friendship for the Japanese and the Japanese Government made his attitude in such matters very evident to the people of that section.

A Japanese lawyer by the name of Thomas S. Masuda was recently placed on trial in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, at Seattle.

Ashley Holden had been in touch with an agent of our Government, and gave that agent certain information about Masuda. The Government then subpoenaed him as a witness, but when he appeared at trial time he surprised the Government attorneys by stating that he did not recall making the statements to the agent attributed to him, whereupon the Government dismissed him as a witness. Holden immediately was examined by Masuda's lawyer and became a favorable witness on behalf of the defendant, who was charged with being an unregistered agent of the Japanese and acquitted.

Holden testified at the Masuda trial that he has been in the newspaper business for approximately 20 years; that he had resided in Spokane for 6 years, and, prior to that time, had resided in Seattle for about 15 years. He testified that he had known Masuda for at least 15 years, and that he had had business, professional, and social contacts many times with the defendant, Masuda. He further testified that he had been a member and also secretary of the Seattle-Japan Society, which was an American organization, composed of businessmen, professional men, educators, clergymen, and outstanding Japanese businessmen. The primary purpose of the organization was to promote trade and commerce between this country and Japan.

He stated that he had been personally acquainted with all the Japanese consuls in Seattle since 1919. He stated that when Masuda graduated from law school, he (Holden) endeavored to help him get established in the legal profession. He testified that he had met Masuda at Olympia, the State capital. He stated that Masuda was much interested in the resolution before the legislature which called for an embargo on material being shipped to Japan.

In response to questions by counsel for Masuda, he testified that out of his experience and acquaintanceship with Japanese, it was quite customary for the Japanese to make gifts to friends or acquaintances, and to those who had done favors for them, and that he had been the recipient of such gifts upon numerous occasions, including gifts from the last Japanese consul in Seattle.

Holden stated that the Japan Society published a bulletin for its own members called the Japan Society Bulletin, and that he assisted.

Holden testified that the Japan Society of Seattle was organized in 1923, and that he served in a purely honorary capacity until about 1927 or 1928, at which time he was paid a monthly stipend for 2 or 3 years, until he resigned the position to leave Seattle. He testified that he had run for a post on the city council of the city of Seattle, and that at that time he had been known as "Banzai" Holden; that he had been the subject of cartoons which identified him as "Banzai" Holden. He stated that the term "banzai" is a sort of salutation in Japanese. He further testified that he had made one trip to Japan in 1939, which was financed by the Japan Society, of which he was then secretary. He stated that the Seattle Japan Society did not furnish all the money for this trip, but that he took the trip "as its secretary."

He testified that the present Mrs. Masuda (wife of the defendant) was his secretary while he was acting as secretary of the Seattle Japan Society.

The long-time official agent of Benito Mussolini and the long-time friend of Japan must chuckle to themselves as they contemplate their cleverness in enlisting a considerable part of the press of the country in their campaign. Some good may come out of it since we now know how our domestic experts in smear technique set about to discredit a parliamentary body.

PROTECTION ON NAVIGABLE WATERS ENDANGERED BY BOMBING OR FIRING PRACTICE

The bill (S. 221) to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to protection of life and property in water endangered by activities of the Army, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 892), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army of the United States: That in the interest of the national defense, and for the better protection of life and property on the navigable waters of the United States or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered to prescribe such regulations as he may deem best for the use and navigation of any portion or area of said waters endangered or likely to be endangered by the Army of the United States while engaged in bombing or firing of any kind in target practice, or otherwise, in proving operations at any proving ground or elsewhere, or any other activities, and of any portion or area of said waters occupied by any plant or facility engaged in the execution of any public project of river and harbor improvement, or by submarine mines, mine fields, submarine cables, or other material and accessories of the Army of the United States: *Provided,* That the authority hereby conferred shall be so exercised as not unreasonably to interfere with or restrict the food fishing industry, and the regulations prescribed in pursuance hereof shall provide for the use of waters included in such regulations by food fishermen operating under permits granted by the War Department: *Provided further,* That said authority shall also be exercised as not to conflict with any duly authorized and promulgated order or regulation of the President or appropriate United States naval authority governing persons or vessels within the limits of any defensive sea areas or maritime control areas heretofore or hereafter established, or with any of the powers conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 1, title II, of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191), or on the Secretary of the Navy by section 2 of the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. —; U. S. C., title 50, sec. 191a)."

Sec. 2. That section 2 of said act be, and is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That to enforce the regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, the Secretary of War may detail any public vessel, craft, facility, or agency in the service of the War Department, or, upon the request of the Secretary of War, the head of any other department may enforce, and the head of any such department is hereby authorized to enforce, such regulations by means of any public vessel, craft, facility, or agency of such department."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO PUERTO RICO

The bill (S. 222) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is the purpose of this bill to transfer to the people of Puerto Rico a strip of land con-

taining 1.26 acres, which is a part of the military reservation of San Juan, Puerto Rico, and no longer required by the Army. The property involved is a strip of land comprising a portion of the main reservation of the post of San Juan set aside by Executive order dated June 30, 1903. The strip fronts on property of the Government of Puerto Rico, and is bounded on the north by the Atlantic Ocean. This land is of no strategic value to the military post, and is desired by the people of Puerto Rico in connection with the extension and beautification of the land adjoining the Capitol building and the School of Tropical Medicine.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 222) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to convey to the people of Puerto Rico a strip of land containing 1.26 acres, more or less, located at Ward Fuerta de Tierra of the municipality of San Juan, P. R., adjoining Salvador Brau Boulevard on the north, and comprising a portion of the San Juan Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT FORT SILL, OKLA.

The bill (S. 223) to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior that portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., now occupied by the Department of the Interior under revocable permit from the Secretary of War dated January 23, 1942, and in exchange therefor the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of War that portion of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Okla., now occupied by the War Department under permit from the Secretary of the Interior dated October 2, 1941.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The bill (S. 224) to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to convey to the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard deceased, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a triangular parcel of land containing 13,715.84 square feet, more or less, situated at the northeast corner of and comprising a portion of the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Pa., and fronting on Oregon Avenue east of Twenty-first Street in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and to accept in exchange therefor the fee-simple title to a strip of land

containing 9,819.75 square feet, more or less, and being the northern portion of what was formerly Johnston Street west of Twentieth Street in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., the exchange herein authorized to be made under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 220) to provide for payment of certain travel costs of dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Army and the War Department on a mileage basis in order to promote efficiency and economy in such payments was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LOANS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES IN TIME OF WAR

The bill (S. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes, as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. RADCLIFFE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to order of business No. 11, Senate bill 12.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill would increase the discretion which may be exercised by the R. F. C. in making loans to companies engaged in the development and production of minerals. As the law now stands, before such a loan can be made it is necessary that the R. F. C. find in advance that if the loan were made the company would probably be in a position to operate at a profit.

In view of the fact that the need for the development of mineral ores is increasing steadily the present restriction is onerous. All the bill would do would be to enable the R. F. C. to make a loan without first ascertaining whether the company could operate at a profit. The bill would suspend for the duration of the war the requirement that the R. F. C. make a finding in advance that the project can probably be operated at a profit.

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

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention to order of business No. 13, Senate bill 381, which deals with the same subject. It is a bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war. What is the relationship between the two bills? If one should be passed, why should the other one be also passed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I believe that both bills should pass. The bill to which the able Senator from Michigan has made reference refers mainly to loans made to companies preparing to go into business. At present it is necessary that a company be already engaged in business.

Under the provisions of Senate bill 381, a company would not be required to be in business at the present time. Therefore that bill would permit the R. F. C. to make loans to companies which are planning to go into business. In other words, Senate bill 381 is more or less of a companion bill to the one which we are now discussing, namely, Senate bill 12. It is certainly not antagonistic to it in any way. Senate bill 12 does not make any reference to new companies. It provides that it shall not be necessary to show that a profit would result from the intended operations. It might be that that point would be covered by the bill to which the able Senator from Michigan has referred. I am by no means sure, however, and I believe it would not be wise to act on such an assumption. Consequently we have both bills.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there a difference between the bills in the basis upon which loans are to be made?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Since I have not charge of Senate bill 381, to which the Senator has referred, I hesitate to be positive in my reply as to the exact respective bases of the two bills.

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

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that under the present law a company must actually be engaged in mining operations before a loan can be made to it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; that is the situation.

Mr. HATCH. Under Senate bill 381, if a company were planning to go into business it could apply for a loan. That is the only difference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. During the morning hour today the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] had a great deal to say about confusion and chaos in the reference of Senate bills and resolutions. The two bills now under discussion were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Have they been correlated in any way?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. They have both been studied by the Committee on Banking and Currency; and it is quite possible that both bills could have been incorporated in one measure. However, they have been submitted as two separate bills and it seems to me to be advisable to allow them to continue to be considered as separate measures.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the Senator's answer to my question, as to whether they provide different bases for making loans?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is this difference: Under the terms of the first bill, Senate bill 12, a company applying for a loan must already be engaged in the mining business. Under the terms of Senate bill 381, if a company, though actually not engaged in the mining business, desires to go into the development of mines, it may make an application for a loan. As the Senator from Maryland has said, the bills might have been combined, but they were not. They were introduced by different Members of the Senate, and for that reason they were reported separately.

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

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would not the provisions of Senate bill 12 apply to the provisions of Senate bill 381, which also appears upon the calendar, if they should both be enacted?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so. I do not think the basis for the loans provided for in Senate bill 12 is the same as that in Senate bill 381.

Mr. BRIDGES. If Senate bill 12 were passed would it be necessary, under the provisions of Senate bill 381, to show that the company would be in position to earn a profit as a result of its operations?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If Senate bill 12 were passed and became a law, it would not be necessary for the R. F. C. to submit an opinion in advance that a profit could be made. I presume that would apply as well to Senate bill 381.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. To help clarify the situation, let me say that in 1934 I introduced a measure which became section 13 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, providing for loans to companies engaged in small mining operations. Senate bill 381 would amend that act and make it apply also to those who desire to engage in mining instead of only to those who are actually engaged in mining.

That is substantially the only change that would be made. Senate bill 381 has little or no connection with Senate bill 12, which is for the purpose of authorizing loans for mineral deposits based on ore development. The two bills are for different purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Nevada one question pertaining to these two bills. Would the proposed authorization apply to strategic minerals only or to all minerals?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It would apply to all minerals. However, it would apply primarily to strategic minerals. The section to which I referred applied originally to gold, silver, and tin. It was later amended to include all strategic minerals.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then it includes all minerals, and is not limited to strategic minerals.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The objection I have to the proposed legislation, as I understand it, is that the proposal is made by Senate bill 12 to allow the R. F. C. to loan money to mining companies without first finding that a profit could probably be made, and to apply the authorization to all minerals, not limiting it to strategic minerals. I could see a reason for the proposed legislation if it were to be limited to strategic materials. I cannot see a reason for it if it is to be left wide open to all minerals.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the able Senator from New Hampshire realizes

that this is permissive legislation. It would merely permit the R. F. C., whenever it seems to be necessary and desirable to make such loans, to go ahead and make them. It may be possible to define exactly what is strategic and what is not strategic, but the dividing line is not very clear and not very simple. It varies from time to time, and therefore it seems desirable that the R. F. C. should have wide discretion to make these loans without the previous finding which it now is required to make. I do not know whether it can be determined just where the dividing line should be. If the able Senator from New Hampshire can suggest some language by which that distinction can be outlined and emphasized, I shall be glad to consider it in the hope that a bill helping to provide substantially for what is required by our war program in such matters may be passed.

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

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the existing law, if a mineral were strategic and most vital the R. F. C. could not make a loan to a company producing such material unless it could show it could make a profit. Senate bill 12 is to correct that situation, is it not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is the situation, exactly. It would eliminate for the time being the necessity of showing that operations can probably be conducted at a profit. I believe it is not desirable that such restrictions as exist at the present time should continue. It also seems that there should be a wide discretion in the R. F. C. in the making of these loans. We know that the needs of our war program in regard to metals vary. New needs arise from time to time for metals already regarded as strategic. Also now and then needs develop for metals which had not heretofore come under the classification of strategic or vital materials. I think it may be assumed that the R. F. C. will not launch upon a general campaign of making loans to companies where there is not any real need for strategic materials.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator have any objection to inserting in the bill the words "or strategic minerals," or "minerals to be used for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of the war effort," or something of that kind?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should have no objection to such an idea being incorporated in general terms in the language of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it would be most unfortunate to circumscribe the permission with a great many rules and regulations. Some ores are complex. Some of the minerals in the complex ores may not be strategic, while others are very strategic; and restrictions placed in the bill by the kind of definition suggested by the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] might entirely defeat the objectives of the bill. As a matter of fact, almost no minerals are now being produced which are not critical or strategic. "Strategic"

is a very technical term, and I believe it would be most unfortunate if the bill should be encumbered with any language of that kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over until further study can be made of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. RADCLIFFE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 11, Senate bill No. 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 12) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "war" to insert "or on December 31, 1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 14 of the Act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), as reads as follows: "when, in the opinion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there is sufficient reason to believe that, through the use of such loan in the development of a lode, ledge, or vein, or mineral deposit, or placer gravel deposit, there will be developed a sufficient quantity of ore, or placer deposits of a sufficient value to pay a profit upon mining operations," shall be suspended during the period commencing upon the date of enactment of this Act and ending 6 months after the termination of the present war or on December 31, 1944, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 40) to provide that the term of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

R. F. C. LOANS TO PERSONS PRODUCING MINERALS OF VALUE TO UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 381) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SCRUGHAM subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 13, Senate bill 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 381) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I would have the same general objection to that bill that I had to Calendar No. 11, Senate bill No. 12. I believe the bill should be confined to strategic materials.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the bill passed without objection during the closing hours of the last session. In view of the lack of time it was not considered by the other House. It applies to minerals needed in the war. There is a difference between strategic minerals and critical minerals. Strategic minerals, generally speaking, are those which are not produced in sufficient quantity in the United States. A critical mineral is any mineral which is needed critically in the war program.

The bill is intended to apply to both strategic and critical minerals, but only to minerals needed in the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the bill so state?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator read the part of the bill which so states?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I ask that the bill be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 (authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for mineral development purposes) of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is hereby amended by inserting in the second sentence of such section, after the words "engaged in" the words "or desiring to engage in."

Sec. 2. Section 14 of the act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and adding the following: "Provided further, That nothing contained in this section, as amended and supplemented, shall be construed to limit or modify the authority to make mining or other loans vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by subparagraph 2 of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, or by any other act of Congress or Executive order."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not see anything in the bill of the character indicated by me. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCRUGHAM subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 13, Senate bill 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 381) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I offer a clarifying amendment: On page 2, line 2, after the words "engage in", I move to insert the words "producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to one further point. Calendar No. 11, Senate bill 12, dealing with the same subject or a related subject, is definite in its terms in respect to being restricted to the war period. Apparently the bill now under consideration very definitely should be restricted to the war period.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I have no objection to having such a provision added to the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that language similar to that contained in Senate bill No. 12 be added to the bill now under consideration, and in that connection, on page 2, after line 13, I suggest that the following language be added: "Provided further, That the authority herein contained shall end 6 months after the termination of the present war or on December 31, 1944, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That amendment is acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 (authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for mineral-development purposes) of the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is hereby amended by inserting in the second sentence of such section, after the words "engaged in," the words "or desiring to engage in" producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war.

Sec. 2. Section 14 of the act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (54 Stat. 897; U. S. C., title 15, sec. 606 (d)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and adding the following: "Provided further, That nothing contained in this section, as amended and supplemented, shall be construed to limit or modify the authority to make mining or other loans vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by subparagraph 2 of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, or by any other act of Congress or Executive order.

Provided further, That the authority herein contained shall end 6 months after the termination of the present war or on December 31, 1944, or at such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police and the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this bill and the bill immediately following should be passed over in the absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 17, Calendar No. 15, and Senate bill 18, Calendar No. 16, will be passed over.

The bill (S. 414) for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] favor us with an explanation of Senate bill 414?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like permission to return to that bill in a moment. I do not have a copy of the report of the committee before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

PREVENTION OF SPECULATION IN LANDS OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The bill (S. 408) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I see the Senator who reported the bill from the committee is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has considered this measure fully at this session, and considered a similar bill at the previous session of the Congress. The bill now before the Senate, except in comparatively minor aspects, is in exactly the same form as the bill which was passed at the last session. Its purpose is to permit an agreement between the State of Washington and the Bureau of Reclamation to organize and develop the Grand Coulee Dam project. Its purpose is to safeguard the investment of the Federal Government in the Columbia Basin and to safeguard, also, the investments of the settlers upon that project. It is in harmony with the program which has been followed for the last 20 or 25 years by the Interior Department and the Congress with respect to projects of this kind.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], one of the authors of the bill, is in the Chamber, and perhaps he might add a word or two

about the measure. I should say, first, however, that the bill was most thoroughly examined by the committee in a full session. It was not referred to a subcommittee, but represents the unanimous judgment of the entire Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and I would both like to see this bill passed at the present time, because whatever we do here must be ratified by the State legislature of the State of Washington, which is now in session. We are anxious that the proposed improvement be made in the act of 1937.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill does not change the ownership of the projects? It is merely to prevent speculation in lands there?

Mr. WALLGREN. It does permit the ownership of more land than the act of 1937 permits. It provides for the establishment of farm units up to 160 acres, instead of 40 acres, as under the last bill.

Mr. HATCH. Does the bill fix a limitation on the price of the lands?

Mr. WALLGREN. No; it does not.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with amendments.

The first committee amendment was, on page 13, line 4, after the word "lands", to insert "to improve such lands, or other lands within the project under contract with the owners or organizations thereof as herein provided, by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for handling of irrigation water."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 1, after the word "thereon", to insert "Contracts for repayment of costs incurred by the United States in clearing, leveling, and preparing lands for the handling of irrigation water may, in the Secretary's discretion, be made with individual water users or any form of water users' organization satisfactory to him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 14, after the word "therein" to insert "after it is"; and in line 15, after the word "act", to insert "and before execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering it."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 22, to strike out down to and including line 7 on page 15, as follows:

(b) Any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under the provisions of this act shall be subject to all provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts and shall be subject to liens for charges legally assessed by any such district, to the same extent and in the same manner as public lands subject to entry are or may be subject to said laws and charges by the provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of August 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 506), as amended by the act of May 15, 1922 (42 Stat. 541).

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Any public lands within the project and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under this act, beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations made under section 8, shall be (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character. The United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed; and any proceedings to enforce them shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any lien for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, under and by virtue of such contracts or any contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located. Regulations to carry out this subsection shall be effective when filed for record in the manner provided in subsection 2 (f).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 5, to strike out the word "upon" and to insert "(c) In addition to taxation or assessment under subsection 5 (c) upon"; in line 12, after the word "enforced", to strike out "by the sale of the lands"; and in line 14, after the word "lands", to strike out the colon and the following: "Provided, That the title or interest which the State or political subdivision thereof may convey in any tax proceeding shall be subject to whatever title remains in the United States and to any prior lien reserved to the United States for all unpaid installments upon the contract of sale, whether accrued or otherwise, and any other charges upon said land which have accrued or may accrue under and by virtue of said contract of sale or the contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located."

And to insert in lieu thereof "subject to the limitations in favor of the United States that govern the enforcement of district assessments or taxes as provided in subsection 5 (b). If lands under any such contract shall at any time revert to the United States before transfer of title under the contract by reason of default thereunder, all liens or tax titles resulting from taxes levied pursuant to the authority of this subsection upon such lands shall be thereupon extinguished; and the levying of any such tax by such State or political subdivision shall be deemed to be an agreement on its part in the event of such reversion, to execute and record a formal release of such lien or tax title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In addition to the primary purposes for which the Grand Coulee Dam

project (hereafter to be known as the Columbia Basin project and herein called the 'project') was authorized under the provisions of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), the project is hereby authorized and reauthorized as a project subject to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and the provisions of each of those two acts together with the provisions of this act shall govern the repayment of expenditures and the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works constructed as a part of the project.

"Sec. 2. (a) No part of the funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allotted for project construction or for the reclamation of land within the project shall be expended in the construction of any irrigation features of the project, exclusive of Grand Coulee Dam and appurtenant works now under construction and of the pumping plant and equalizing reservoir and dams, until the requirements of the following subdivisions (i) and (ii) of this subsection (a) have been met:

"(i) All lands within the project shall have been impartially appraised by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the 'Secretary') and evaluated at the date of appraisal without reference to or increment on account of the construction of the project. Reappraisals may be made at any time by the Secretary, and will be made upon the request of the landowner concerned accompanied by an advance to the United States of \$15 for each quarter section or fraction thereof involved, on account of expense thereof. In such reappraisals the Secretary shall take into account, in addition to the value found in the first appraisal, improvements made after said appraisal, such irrigation construction charges on the land as have been paid, and other items of value that are proper, other than increments on account of the construction of the project. The term 'appraised value' as used in this act shall mean appraised values determined as provided in this subsection.

"(ii) Contracts shall have been made with irrigation, reclamation, or conservancy districts organized under State law embracing the lands within the project providing for payment thereby of that part of the cost of construction of the project determined by the Secretary to be the part thereof to be repaid by irrigation. Each such contract shall conform to the requirements of this act, shall require repayment within the maximum period permitted under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto (hereinafter called the Federal reclamation laws), and provide that payments shall be enforceable by all means and remedies provided in said laws.

"(b) (1) The lands within the project shall be developed in irrigation blocks, as that term is defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The Secretary shall segregate the lands in each irrigation block into farm units of sufficient acreage for the support of an average-sized family at a suitable living level, having in mind the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other relevant factors as, in his judgment, enter into the determination of the area and boundaries thereof; and shall establish the units as hereafter provided. No farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land, except that any nominal quarter section comprising more than 160 acres of irrigable land may be included in one farm unit, and except that lands owned by the United States may be established into units of lesser size for part-time farming purposes.

"(1) Prior to the initial delivery of water to an irrigation block, the Secretary shall prepare a plat of all the farm units in the irrigation block and shall publish a notice of the intention to establish such farm unit plat in 6 weekly issues of a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which any part of the irrigation block is located.

From the date of first publication, a copy of the plat shall be available in the county auditor's office of each of said counties for public inspection during the business hours of the office. Any interested landowner shall have the right to file written objections to the plat with the county auditor of the county in which his lands are situated before the close of the period of publication. After expiration of the period of publication the Secretary shall consider and determine all such objections, draw the plat in final form, and file it for record in said county auditor's offices. With the consent of the owners of all farm units affected, the Secretary may revise the plat or any part thereof from time to time, and place the revisions of record with the original plat.

"(iii) Water shall not be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for lands not conforming in area and boundaries to the farm units covering the lands involved, nor to or for more than one farm unit held by any one landowner, except that as to lands held by the one having equitable or legal title on May 27, 1937, or the heir or devisee of such owner, delivery may be made to or for a total irrigable area not exceeding the maximum provided in this section. The limitations of this subdivision shall not apply to lands owned by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, corporate or otherwise.

"(iv) Lands within the project in excess of one farm unit held by any one landowner shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, be deemed excess land: *Provided*, That if excess land is acquired by foreclosure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance or by devise, water therefor may be furnished temporarily for a period not exceeding 5 years from the effective date of such acquisition, delivery of water thereafter ceasing until the transfer thereof to a landowner duly qualified to secure water therefor.

"(v) As used in this act, the terms 'owner,' 'landowner,' and 'any one landowner' denote any person, corporation, joint-stock association, or family; the term 'family' denotes a group consisting of either or both husband and wife, together with their children under 18 years of age, or all of such children if both parents are dead; the term 'their children' includes the issue and lawfully adopted children of either or both husband and wife; and the term 'lands within the project' denotes those lands within the boundaries of the existing Columbia Basin irrigation districts, or revisions thereof approved by the Secretary, which the Secretary determines may be supplied water from through, or by means of the project works and are required to be included to provide for sound development and operation of the project. Lands shall be deemed to be held by a family, if held as separate property of husband or wife, or constitute a part or all of their community property, or if they are the property of any or all of their children under 18 years of age.

"(c) As a condition precedent to receiving water from the project and in consideration thereof, each landowner shall be required to execute, within 6 months from the date of the execution of the contract between the United States and the district within which the land is located, a recordable contract covering all his lands within that district, agreeing as to such lands for and on behalf of himself, his heirs, successors, and assigns to the provisions set forth in this subsection (c): *Provided*, That any landowner, having failed to execute such a contract within this period, may be permitted to execute such contract within 1 year after the date of judicial confirmation of the validity of the contract between the United States and the district but only in accordance with such rules and

regulations as may be prescribed under section 8 concerning this privilege.

"Each such recordable contract shall provide—

"(1) That the landowner will conform his lands by purchase, sale, or exchange at the appraised values to the area and boundaries of the pertinent farm unit or units shown on the plats filed under subsection 2 (b) and will dispose of excess land then or thereafter owned by him at its appraised value; that the Secretary is thereby given an irrevocable power of attorney to sell in behalf of the landowner any such excess land at said appraised value; and that the United States is thereby given, without further consideration, an option to buy any such excess land at said appraised value: *Provided*, That sales under such power or such option, unless otherwise provided in writing by said owner, shall be only for cash and only such that surrender of possession by the owner of any area of excess lands then operated as a single unit for dry farming or grazing may be effected substantially at one time.

"(ii) That in the period from the date of execution thereof and to a date 5 years from the time water becomes available for the lands covered thereby, no conveyance of or contract to convey a freehold estate in such lands, whether excess or nonexcess lands, shall be made for a consideration exceeding its appraised value, and in connection with any conveyance of, or contract to convey, such an estate within such period the grantor or vendor or the grantee or vendee or any lien holder thereof shall, within 30 days from the date of such conveyance or contract, file in the office of the county auditor in the county or counties in which the land is located an affidavit describing the conveyance or contract and the consideration therefor.

"(iii) That in the event that within such period such a conveyance of, or contract to convey, is made without filing within said 30 days the affidavit required in (ii) of this subsection, or is made for a consideration in excess of the appraised value, the Secretary, at any time within 2 years of the day on which there is filed for recording in the official county records the contract or deed involved, whichever is filed earliest in the event both the contract and deed are filed in a given transaction, may cancel the right of such estate to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works by a written notice of cancellation: *Provided*, That said power to cancel as to any given parcel of land may be waived by the Secretary at any time within said 2-year period by a written notice of waiver: *And provided further*, That after any such cancellation a project water right for the estate involved may be acquired only on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary.

"(iv) That should any freehold estate in land covered thereby be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed within the period defined in (ii) of this subsection, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be subject to all the provisions of subsection 3 (b) hereof.

"Any or all of the provisions of this subsection (c) required to be included in the recordable contracts may be made covenants running with the land when said recordable contracts expressly so provide.

"(d) Each contract made pursuant to subdivision 2 (a) (ii) shall provide that no water will be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works except in accordance with the provisions and limitations of section 2 hereof.

"(e) Each district contract may include provisions—

"(i) Requiring that all lands within the district not covered by recordable contracts

provided for under subsection (c) or otherwise not eligible to receive water shall be subject to assessment in the same manner and to the same extent as like lands eligible to receive water, subject to such provisions as the Secretary may prescribe for postponement in payment of all or part of such assessments but not beyond the expiration of the period during which the price limit under subsection 2 (c) applies.

"(ii) That, without compliance with other provisions of State law for the exclusion of lands, lands may be withdrawn from the district by filing a written notice of withdrawal with the district board on or before such date fixed by such board between a date 10 days after the official notice of the election on the contract between the United States and the district and the date of such election. The date limiting the time of such filing shall be announced in the official notice of the proposed election, and lands for which such notice is filed shall be deemed excluded from the district for all purposes as of the time of such filing. Thereafter lands so withdrawn and excluded so long as they remain in private ownership shall not be entitled to receive water from, through, or by means of the project works.

"(f) Any instrument, action, determination, rule, or regulation of the Secretary or his duly authorized representatives under the authority of this section 2 which is or may be determinative of the title to lands or interest in lands in private ownership within the project shall be effective as to any given parcel of land, as against purchasers for value without actual notice, only from the time of the filing for record in the office of the county auditor of the county or counties in which the lands affected are located of a copy thereof authenticated in the manner authorized by law. Such filing shall impart legal notice to the public of the matters and things set out therein.

"Sec. 3. (a) Fraudulent misrepresentation as to the true consideration involved in the conveyance of, or contract to convey, any freehold estate in land covered by a recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof, in the affidavit required by that subsection shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) Should any freehold estate in lands subject to the recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed, after the date of execution of such recordable contract and within 5 years from the time water becomes available for such lands, at a consideration in excess of the appraised value of said estate, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be invalid and unenforceable by the vendor or grantor, his successors or assigns as to that part of the consideration in excess of the appraised value of the estate involved. In the case of any such transaction involving deferred payments, said invalid portion of the consideration shall be deducted first from the deferred payments in the inverse order of their due dates.

"The vendee or grantee in any such transaction, at any time within 2 years from the date of any such conveyance or contract and on filing a correct affidavit as required in subdivision 2 (c) (ii), may recover from the vendor or grantor, or the successors or assigns thereof, an amount equal to the payments made in excess of the appraised value.

"In connection with any judgment or decree hereunder in favor of a vendee or grantee, said vendee or grantee shall have the right to recover court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

"Sec. 4. (a) For the purposes of assisting in the permanent settlement of farm families, protecting project land, facilitating project

development, preventing speculation in project lands, and providing for the general welfare, the Secretary is authorized to administer public lands of the United States in the project area and lands acquired under this section; to sell, exchange, or lease such lands; to improve such lands, or other lands within the project under contract with the owners or organizations thereof as herein provided, by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for handling of irrigation water; to establish town sites on such lands; to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes in keeping with sound project development; to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands or interest in lands, within or adjacent to the project area, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the project; to accept donations of real and personal property for the purposes of this act; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods. Any moneys realized on account of donations for purposes of this act shall be covered into the Treasury as trust funds.

"(b) Contracts, exchanges, and leases made under this section, shall be on terms that, in the Secretary's judgment, are in keeping with sound project development. In addition, land-sale contracts shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, provides for the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and improvements thereon. Contracts for repayment of costs incurred by the United States in clearing, leveling, and preparing lands for the handling of irrigation water may, in the Secretary's discretion, be made with individual water users or any form of water users' organization satisfactory to him.

"Qualifications of applicants for the purchase of land for irrigation farming shall be prescribed as provided in subsection C of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

"Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or political subdivision thereof with respect to any real property situated therein after it is acquired pursuant to the authority of this act and before execution by the United States of a contract of sale covering it, out of funds derived from the leasing of such lands. The amount so paid for any year upon any such property shall not exceed the taxes that would be paid to the State or subdivision as the case may be upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

"(b) Any public lands within the project and any lands or interests in lands acquired by the United States under this act, beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations made under section 8, shall be (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, reclamation, and conservancy districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of like character. The United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed; and any proceedings to enforce them shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any lien for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, under and by virtue of such contracts or any contract between the United States and the district in which the land is located. Regulations to

carry out this subsection shall be effective when filed for record in the manner provided in subsection 2 (f).

"(c) In addition to taxation or assessment under subsection 5 (b) upon execution by the United States of a contract of sale of any lands within the project, the lands under contract may be taxed by the State or political subdivision thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands of a like character. All taxes legally so assessed may be enforced in the same manner and under the same proceeding whereby said taxes are enforced against privately owned lands subject to the limitations in favor of the United States that govern the enforcement of district assessments or taxes as provided in subsection 5 (b). If lands under any such contract shall at any time revert to the United States before transfer of title under the contract by reason of default thereunder, all liens or tax titles resulting from taxes levied pursuant to the authority of this subsection upon such lands shall be thereupon extinguished; and the levying of any such tax by such State or political subdivision shall be deemed to be an agreement on its part, in the event of such reversion, to execute and record a formal release of such lien or tax title.

"Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, to be reimbursable to the extent required by this act. All revenues received in carrying out the provisions of section 4 hereof shall be covered into the General Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Amounts equal to appropriated funds requisitioned by the Secretary and made available for disbursement on the books of the Treasurer of the United States shall be debited in a special account in the Treasury, to be known as the Columbia Basin Land Development Account. Amounts equal to revenues covered into the General Treasury as miscellaneous receipts shall be credited in said special account. After such credits equal the amount of the debits with interest thereon at the rate of 3 percent per annum from the respective dates of the debits, additional credits in said special account shall be made by the Secretary, in the manner determined by him, the basis of corresponding credits to the construction cost obligations of the district or districts entering into contracts under section 2 hereof.

"Sec. 7. No water shall be delivered for irrigation within the project until the State of Washington, by appropriate legislation, shall have adopted, authorized, ratified, and consented to all the provisions of this act insofar as such provisions or any of them, in whole or in part, may come within the scope of State jurisdiction or authority or be applicable to State lands.

"Legislation otherwise conforming to the standards above stated in this section will meet the requirements of the section even though, by reason of limitations in the State constitution, the contracts required under subsection 2 (c) cannot be executed pursuant to such legislation as to the State's school and other public lands. As to such lands, the provisions and requirements of subsection 2 (c) shall remain effective, but if these constitutional limitations have not been removed at least 6 months prior to the expiration of the time provided for the execution of the contracts, the time is hereby extended for a period ending 6 months after the removal of the limitations.

"Sec. 8. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in the contracts hereinafter provided for such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under the act, he is authorized to

effect conveyances without regard to the law governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

"Sec. 9. The consent of the United States is hereby given to the sale of school lands and any other public lands of the State of Washington comprising a part of the lands within the project at prices not to exceed their appraised values, determined as provided in subsection 2 (a) hereof.

"Sec. 10. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 11. This act may be cited as 'The Columbia Basin Project Act.'"

EASEMENTS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER NAVAL RESERVATIONS

The bill (S. 301) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, Calendar No. 19, Senate bill 301; Calendar No. 20, Senate bill 176; Calendar No. 21, Senate bill 184; Calendar No. 22, Senate bill 303; Calendar No. 23, Senate bill 304; Calendar No. 24, Senate bill 305; Calendar No. 25, Senate bill 306; and Calendar No. 26, Senate bill 393, were introduced at the request of the Navy, all were favorably reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and all were passed by the Senate during the last session, but failed of approval by the House of Representatives for want of time. They have all been before the Senate before, and most of them have been explained. I hope that favorable action will be taken on them so that they may go to the other House for consideration.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me inquire whether Calendar No. 22, Senate bill 303, is the bill concerning which I previously interrogated the Senator?

Mr. WALSH. It is the same bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And is the bill now in the same shape as it was when it had the Senate's approval during the last session?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly. I think the Senator approved of the committee changes which had been made in the original bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. I wanted to be sure it was the same bill.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 301?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 301) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "telephone" and the comma to insert "telegraph" and a comma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 301) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations and other lands under his control for gas, water, electric, telephone, telegraph, power, and sewer pipe lines, and roads and highways, to any citizen, association, or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any State of the United States or political subdivisions of a State of the United States: *Provided,* That such rights-of-way shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of the Navy that the same will be in the public interest and will not substantially injure the interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further,* That all or any part of such rights-of-way may be annulled or forfeited by the Secretary of the Navy for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under the authority hereof: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of the Navy shall include in his annual report to the President a full and complete statement of each and all easements granted, which statement shall also include the name and address of the grantee, the purpose of the grant, and the benefits accruing to the United States or to the public therefrom.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The bill (S. 176) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Private Law No. 99, Seventy-fourth Congress, an act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, is amended as follows: "*Provided,* That compensation, retirement pay, back pay, or other benefits shall be held to have accrued and that this man will be entitled to the benefits, privileges, and rights conferred upon an honorably discharged sailor by reason of the passage of this act."

PRESENTATION OF SILVER MEDAL TO MEMBERS OF THE PEARY POLAR EXPEDITION

The bill (S. 184) to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908-9 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be made, at a United States mint, silver medals of an appropriate design to be presented, in the name of Congress, to Matthew A. Henson, Capt. Robert A. Bartlett, Ross G. Marvin, Dr. John W. Goodsell, George Borup, and Donald B. MacMillan, in recognition of their efforts and services, as members of the Peary polar expedition of 1908-9, in the field of science and for the cause of polar exploration, by aiding in the discovery of the North Pole by Admiral Peary.

SEC. 2. If any of such persons has died, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make the award posthumously by presenting such a medal to the widow or other member of the family of such deceased person.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for carrying out the provisions of this act.

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL

The bill (S. 303) to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the persons now subject to the Articles for the government of the Navy, all persons, other than persons in the military service of the United States, outside the continental limits of the United States accompanying or serving with the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard when serving as a part of the Navy, including but not limited to persons employed by the Government directly, or by contractors or subcontractors engaged in naval projects, and all persons, other than persons in the military service of the United States, within an area leased by the United States which is without the territorial jurisdiction thereof and which is under the control of the Secretary of the Navy, shall, in time of war or national emergency, be subject to the Articles for the government of the Navy except insofar as these articles define offenses of such a nature that they can be committed only by naval personnel: *Provided,* That the jurisdiction herein conferred shall not extend to Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, except the islands of Palmyra, Midway, Johnston, and that part of the Aleutian Islands west of longitude 172 degrees west.

CAPT. RICHARD ROTHWELL, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 304) for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$53 to reimburse Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as a result of the flooding of public quarters No. 425, Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., during the absence of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

MASTER GUNNERY SGT. EUGENE M. MARTIN

The bill (S. 305) for the relief of Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a

third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Master Gunnery Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps, the sum of \$1,796.60, which sum represents the value of personal property lost as a result of a fire which occurred in public quarters No. 143, United States Marine Barracks, Parris Island, S. C., on September 21, 1941: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST AT ANTARCTICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 306) to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of \$1,203.84 to pay claims of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expeditions' Antarctic base on Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica.

The facts and circumstances of this case are substantially as follows: Navy personnel manned the above-mentioned base from March 1940 until an emergency evacuation on March 21, 1941. The two ships attached to the expedition, the U. S. S. *Bear* and the U. S. motorship *North Star*, proceeding on their assigned mission of evacuating the expedition's two bases, reached the vicinity of Marguerite Bay, Palmer Land, and encountered impenetrable ice pack which prevented their reaching East Base.

After approximately a month of fruitless effort to negotiate the ice pack, it was decided to evacuate the personnel of the base by airplane, and to abandon all equipment, supplies, and materials at the camp. On March 21, 1941, the personnel of the camp, 26 in number, were evacuated by airplane in 2 flights to Mikkelsen Island, 112 miles to the north, at which point they were picked up by the U. S. S. *Bear*. The extremely hazardous nature of the evacuation operations and the limited capacity of the single Condor airplane available for the purpose, necessitated the abandonment of practically all the personal belongings of the camp personnel.

The Navy Department Claims Board has considered the claims of loss sustained by the Navy personnel and has found the value of the property lost to be \$1,203.84.

There is no other authority of law pursuant to which these claims may be adjusted by the Navy Department and therefore the matter is submitted to Congress for its approval. The additional cost to the Government would be not to exceed \$1,203.84. The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and is approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Assuming, for example, that there was a naval base in the Aleutian Islands, and that certain naval personnel stationed at the base were renting homes, not on Government property, and had their own personal furniture in the homes, and that it became necessary to evacuate the base, with resultant loss of the furniture and other personal belongings, what is the background of the policy of the Government relative to such personal losses? Let me say that I desire to ascertain whether the bill under consideration is consistent with our past policy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, where naval personnel meet with losses at sea by reason of fire, explosion, or other disaster, the Navy Department has authority to adjust the losses without coming to Congress; but where losses occur on shore, as the loss covered by the pending bill occurred on shore, at the Aleutian Islands, or at Quantico, or at any other naval base, the practice is for the Navy to set up a claims board to determine whether the Navy Department is responsible for the loss or whether the personnel who claim the losses are in any way responsible. The claims board makes its finding, and then the Navy Department prepares for introduction a bill or bills for the payment of the claims.

The pending bill is one of the bills introduced at the request of the claims board of the Navy, who heard the claims in the particular case.

Do I make the matter clear to the Senator?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I ask the Senator to follow me one step further. In a case such as the one I cited, what has been the usual practice? Does the Navy Department or the Claims Board pass upon and adjust the claim, and ask for action by Congress?

Mr. WALSH. They find the cause of the disaster or the evacuation, as in the case of the pending bill, and the circumstances attached to it, so as to eliminate the element of negligence on the part of those who filed the claim. When the claims board is convinced that the loss of personal property occurred while the property was in the custody of the Government, the board finds that fact, and the bill is introduced for congressional approval.

Mr. BRIDGES. In such case there must be no question of negligence on the part of the personnel involved; is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. La FOLLETTE in the chair). If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question

is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$1,203.84, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expeditions' Antarctic base on Nyen Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM BY PIPE LINE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHEERRY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be read at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received out of order, and, without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 103), as follows:

Whereas the production of ships, the making of high-octane gasoline, and the construction of synthetic-rubber plants have been and are being delayed because of the shortage of necessary materials; and

Whereas it is now proposed to construct a steel pipe line from points in Texas northeast to a point in Indiana for the transportation principally of petroleum products; and

Whereas the construction of such pipe line will consume materials and labor in competition with the above-mentioned projects and will cost a vast sum of money; and

Whereas the diversion and use of vast quantities of critical materials and labor would be justified only if alternative means of transportation for petroleum products, such as barges and railroad tank cars, are not and cannot be made available, and then only if the projected pipe line is so located and of such character as to provide the maximum increase in the required transportation capacity for petroleum and petroleum products; and

Whereas it has been contended that recently announced plans of the War Production Board and the Petroleum Administrator for War for projected additional pipe-line construction do not meet these requirements, and that consideration should be given to constructing other pipe lines in other locations and to alternative means of transporting petroleum products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a full and complete study and investigation be made for the purpose of determining (1) the necessity and desirability of constructing any additional pipe line; (2) the extent to which any projected pipe line would unduly compete for scarce materials and labor with other programs necessary to the war effort; (3) the type, location, and use of any projected pipe line and the functions to be performed by it; (4) the availability of any alternative means of transportation for petroleum products, such as barges or railroad tank cars; and (5) the possibility of increasing the efficiency of present facilities for the transportation of petroleum by rerouting or otherwise.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is my purpose to ask that the resolution which I have just submitted on behalf of myself and other Senators may be referred to the special committee headed by my colleague and which is known as the Truman committee, the official title of which is the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I understand that some preliminary investigation has already been made by the committee headed by my colleague.

It seems to me that the resolution involves an extremely important matter. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator is about immediately to proceed with the construction of the pipe line referred to in the resolution. The net effect of the construction of the pipe line, as it seems to Senators from the midcontinent area immediately concerned, would be, at the conclusion of the war, to turn over the control of the whole petroleum industry of the United States to some big companies and put the independents out of business.

It is also our opinion, based on the most expert advice the Senators who have submitted the resolution can obtain, that, so far as relieving the shortage of gasoline and petroleum products on the eastern seaboard is concerned, it would be far more preferable to reverse the contemplated process and build a pipe line from Indiana to the eastern seaboard rather than from Texas into the great petroleum field of Illinois, and to use the tank-car service, which is available and which everybody agrees must be used to the very utmost, on the western end of the oil shipment program rather than on the eastern end, which would enable the Government and the public at the present time to utilize the great midcontinent oil fields as well as the Texas fields and the Illinois oil field. It is with that purpose in view, Mr. President, that the resolution has been submitted. I should like to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish to interfere with the wishes of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, but he must remember that the Truman committee, than which none is more effective, industrious, and capable, is an investigating and exploratory committee. If the resolution contemplates legislation, it must go to the committee having juris-

diction of the subject matter. So the question naturally arises, in my mind, What is the main purpose? Is it for the committee to report to the Senate legislation, or is it merely to investigate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can say very frankly to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the purpose of offering the resolution is in some manner to develop facts in the quickest possible manner that might prevent Secretary Ickes, the Petroleum Coordinator, from going ahead with this scheme of his. It was discussed among the Senators who offer the resolution as to whether it should go to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or the Truman committee, and it was believed, in view of the fact that the Truman committee, as we understood, had conducted some preliminary investigations and had an investigatory staff already set up, that it would be better to send it to the Truman committee in order that the facts might be developed before Secretary Ickes had time to build the pipe line.

Mr. McNARY. I am not contentious about the matter, but I wish the rule observed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Oregon said a moment ago, that, ordinarily, it is better to refer resolutions to a standing committee than to a special committee. We are not asking to have any special committee set up; we are not asking for any appropriation. We simply submit the resolution as a means of calling this matter to the attention of the committee which has already set up an investigatory staff which might develop facts, as we believe, at a very early day, and, possibly, prevent the construction of this pipe line which we are apprehensive might be a national disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Missouri to ask unanimous consent to refer the resolution?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not as yet done so. I was proposing to ask my colleague, who has just come into the Chamber from a meeting of his committee, as I understand, what the situation is as to the preliminary investigation which has already been made.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. We have made some preliminary investigation of this whole situation; in fact, we held a hearing at Kansas City on the program and the situation as it now is. There are pipe lines already in existence from the proposed terminus at the southwestern end of the line which are not now being used to full capacity; in fact, they are full of gasoline and they have no outlet for it either at the Chicago end or the East St. Louis end of the pipe line.

It seems to me to be good common sense to make use of the pipe lines already in existence in the southwestern section of the country, and, if it is necessary to build a new pipe line, such pipe line should be built from the terminus

of the present fuel-oil line in Illinois or from East St. Louis or Chicago to the east coast.

I am not hunting for any more jobs so far as the work of the committee of which I happen to be chairman is concerned, because we have already a tremendous amount of work to do. We have made some preliminary investigations of this very situation, and had expected, in a very short time, to make a report on it; in fact, I have asked for a hearing with Mr. Ickes and some others on Wednesday of this week on this very subject. If the Senate deems it proper that the resolution should be referred to the special committee, of course, I shall be glad to do whatever the Senate asks me to do in the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wish to make a very brief observation. If this pipe line is to be built, I think no one would object to its construction; but investigation before several committees, to my certain knowledge, discloses that we have a bottleneck in shipping, the reason for which is the shortage of steel for building ships; likewise we have a bottleneck in the production of octane gasoline, the reason for which is the lack of steel with which to construct the refineries; and likewise we have a bottleneck in the construction of plants for the production of synthetic rubber, the reason for which is a lack of steel necessary to build the plants; and so the synthetic rubber program has been limited to 55 percent.

Further investigation shows that we have a new pipe line which has just been constructed from the Southwest to Illinois. Further investigation shows that we have now constructed and in operation a pipe line from Texas to Chicago. That pipe line is not in use; it is full of gasoline, but there is no place to store it in Chicago. However, the pipe line is there, and could be used, but it is not in use. Some of us were not satisfied under the conditions to sit idly by and let this new pipe line be constructed until we were sure that it was necessary.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My inquiry goes to the possible duplication of investigations. The Senator, of course, will recall that in the closing days of the last session we created a special committee under resolution offered by him and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], as I recall—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And several other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and several other Senators—to investigate the oil situation or the gas situation in the section contiguous to Kansas City and that general area.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is the chairman of another special committee investigating the gen-

eral oil situation. At the time the Senator's resolution was adopted, in the last Congress, question arose as to whether the Truman committee had full jurisdiction to go into a matter of that sort or whether the Maloney committee had the same jurisdiction. Notwithstanding those inquiries, which apparently were not very satisfactorily answered, the other special committee was set up. What is the particular reason why either the Maloney committee or the committee sponsored by the Senator from Missouri in the last Congress would not be qualified to hold this hearing, and will the Senator inform me whether there is duplication, or whether all these oil committees should function?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should be very glad to explain the matter to the Senator from Kentucky. The committee to which he refers, which was appointed under the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and myself and several other Senators, was a committee whose jurisdiction was confined to the fuel situation in a particular area, namely, the area between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains. The jurisdiction of that committee was specifically limited and purposely limited to that great fuel-producing area, in which a great shortage of fuel had been brought about by conflicting Government orders.

The committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], while it is to look into the general fuel situation, is particularly intended to consider the supply of oil and gasoline on the eastern seaboard.

Mr. MALONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is my understanding. If the Senator from Connecticut wishes to correct me, I should be glad to yield to him for that purpose. That at least is the real purpose of the committee.

It has not been felt by the members of the committee of which I am chairman, since we are confined to the area between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains, and with primary regard to fuel, that we had a right to go into the question of the pipe line for petroleum products designed for the shipment of oil to the East; but we do feel it concerns our area very strongly, and we feel that it concerns the whole United States very strongly, whether the control of petroleum products in the United States at the conclusion of the war shall be turned over to a few large oil companies which happen to be very heavily represented in the Office of the Petroleum Administrator.

Therefore we have believed that the Truman committee, with their investigatory staff already set up, is better qualified to make the investigation than we are. I say very frankly that I do not believe it is necessary to adopt the resolution to give the Truman committee jurisdiction, because I believe they have jurisdiction under their general authority, already provided; but my colleague informed me that the Truman committee had not proceeded with the matter, although they had made a preliminary investigation, by reason of the fact that they thought that either the

committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut, or the other committee, headed by me, had taken that matter into consideration, and they did not wish to duplicate the work.

It seems to me that the Truman committee, having made a preliminary investigation and being ready to proceed, is the proper committee to make the investigation. As I have said, I do not think it is necessary to confer jurisdiction on the Truman committee. I do think it is very desirable to impose specifically that jurisdiction on the committee, or call the attention of the committee to it. It is for that reason that we have submitted this resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator whether this pipe line is in process of construction?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been informed by the Office of the Petroleum Administrator that the construction of the pipe line has not actually been started, but that it is imminent.

Mr. BARKLEY. This has no relationship, then, to the pipe line that was started from somewhere in Texas or Oklahoma up to Salem, Ill.?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The pipe line to which the Senator refers starts at Longview, Tex., and ends, at the present time, I believe, at Norris City, Ill. It is proposed to start this products line from a point somewhere in the vicinity of Beaumont, Tex., join up with the other pipe line some place in Arkansas, and use the same right-of-way. It is our contention, based on all the information we can obtain, that the construction of the pipe line, if it is to be constructed at all, should be started at the other end, should start from Illinois, rather than duplicate the facilities in the Southwest.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. We are considering the calendar, and many Senators are in their places for that purpose. Unanimous consent was given to read the resolution. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the continuance of the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, the resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, under the parliamentary situation am I entitled to 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is entitled to 5 minutes on any bill which may be under consideration. The clerk will report the next bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 393) for the relief of William Kovatis.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the so-called oil shortage committee of the Senate, I am very much concerned, and I expect that committee will be greatly concerned, with the resolution just submitted by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. Obviously any one of several Senate committees might very properly, with or without the resolution, proceed to make such investigation of this situation as the

members of those committees desire. The Committee on Interstate Commerce might do it, the Commerce Committee might do it, the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri himself might do it, the Truman committee might do it, the Oil Shortage Committee, of which I am chairman, might do it. I do not think a resolution is necessary. But I believe it would be probably extremely dangerous if we should undertake at this particular moment to do anything which would delay the construction of a pipe line.

Because of the reference made during the brief statement of the Senator from Missouri, I think I should point out that the committee of which I am chairman has Nation-wide jurisdiction, and that it is not, as the Senator supposed, a committee created to deal only with the petroleum situation on the Atlantic seaboard. The committee has authority to deal with the petroleum problem throughout the land.

Mr. President, I am told that the temperature was 35° below zero in some sections of New England this morning. Because of the petroleum shortage there has been great mental anguish all through the Northeast for many months past. I do not know that there has been much actual physical suffering, but I am told that today, and for the past few days, the oil situation in New England—and probably over a broader area—has been seriously acute. I should not be surprised if there was actual suffering, and I think the Senate will make a grave mistake if it now undertakes to consider a resolution that might result in delaying the construction of the proposed pipe line.

I am assuming from what I heard the able Senator from Missouri say that the resolution is submitted, in part, because of a fear of what may happen after the war, in the post-war period, a fear that certain major oil companies may take control of the situation at the expense of the so-called independents.

I have no desire to set aside or delay any proper investigation, and I cannot be absolutely sure that one is not now necessary. But I should like to point out to the Senate that the Army, the Navy, the War Production Board, and various petroleum committees, and every interested agency of the executive branch of the Government, have made a study of this pipe-line situation.

In effect, the pipe line is under way. Much of the preliminary work has been done. I do not think a shovel has been put into the ground as yet, but—

Mr. WALSH. To what pipe line does the Senator refer?

Mr. MALONEY. The so-called products line, the 20-inch line. Engineers are engaged, surveys are under way, and I should like to point out that a large part of the suffering of the last year has been due to the fact that the construction of the original 24-inch pipe line was too long delayed. I am able to say, on my authority as chairman of the Special Petroleum Committee, that the situation is exceedingly dangerous, and there is reason to believe that next winter, in the northern area of the country, the North-

west as well as the Northeast, we may have great trouble. We may not be so fortunate as we have been this winter, when, by living on a hand-to-mouth basis, it appears we may just about get by without breakdown or epidemic. The people of New England have lived for months in the shadow of pneumonia and influenza. There is some indication that such a situation might yet exist in the Northwest, because the situation might get tight there, too.

There has already been great trouble in the northern part of the country, aside from the Northeast—in Michigan, Wisconsin, and other areas—and I hope the Senate will not now do a thing that would delay the construction of this so-called 20-inch line.

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

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has spoken of various sections which have been affected. I should like to say to the Senator that when I was in Kansas City about 2 weeks ago, holding hearings on this very situation, the temperature was about 15 below zero. As a matter of fact, it was very much below that in Chicago as I came through. That is, in a section which produces between 75 and 80 percent of the fuel oil of the United States under an irrational system of rationing, there has been very great suffering, right at the door of the wells and the refineries.

Mr. MALONEY. The able Senator from Missouri leaves the subject under discussion. I quite agree with him that there have been rationing mistakes, and that as a result thereof there has been some suffering, at least mental suffering, and we may have more of that. But I am concerned with providing fuel oil for the homes of the North, not particularly the northern section whence I come, but it so happens that that section of the country has been most seriously hit.

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

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator from Connecticut will yield, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether his committee has made a survey of all the proposed pipe lines, or if he knows whether any other committee has done so.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I do not know just what the Senator from Massachusetts means by a survey. We have made a study of the pipe-line situation over the country.

Mr. WALSH. I have in mind to ask the Senator whether he knows what progress has been made and to what extent the proposed pipe line to the East has been undertaken.

Mr. MALONEY. I assume the Senator has reference to the so-called big-inch line, the 24-inch line from Texas to Illinois?

Mr. WALSH. No; from Illinois to the eastern seaboard.

Mr. MALONEY. It is the hope of the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War that that large pipe line can be completed to the East by next December. I should like to point out that even with the so-called 24-inch pipe line completed by that time we are faced with very great danger, taking into account the constant need for the withdrawal of petroleum products to satisfy the needs of our forces in Africa and probably in other places before another winter comes.

Mr. WALSH. I am informed that the money has been appropriated for the building of this pipe line to the eastern coast, that the plans have been prepared, and that the only reason it has not been built is that it has been impossible to obtain priorities for its building. Is that information correct?

Mr. MALONEY. Scarcity of materials has contributed to the delay.

Mr. WALSH. I refer to the pipe line from Illinois to the East. The Navy is very much interested in the pipe line, as is also the civilian population. The Army is also interested, but the Navy is particularly interested in it. My information from the Navy is that the bottleneck situation referred to by reason of inability to obtain priorities has been removed and that the pipe line is going to be built. I am wondering if the Senator's committee has that information.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; we have.

Mr. WALSH. So that, so far as we know, that is a program which is going forward, and the construction will proceed during the next year, and the pipe line will be ready for operation in the fall?

Mr. MALONEY. Late this year.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to ask the Senator one other question, and I thank him for yielding to me. I hope some Senate committee will give us a detailed and complete account of all proposed pipe lines. I sat in an unofficial committee recently, a committee of Senators from the Northeast, and there was presented to us a plan for a pipe line through to the Carolinas from Texas. Apparently there are a great many plans for pipe lines. I think some committee—and I believe the committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut is in the best position to do so—ought to inform us what pipe lines have been built, what can be built, what is the reason they are not being built, and how soon they will be put in operation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to point out that some of the matters the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has dealt with are quite delicate. There is a great need, as every Senator knows, for the early and rapid construction of escort vessels. There are great shortages of materials. Some have thought that valves and pumping equipment which would be

needed in connection with the construction of this or any other large pipe line might rob materials needed in the construction of escort vessels. But this entire pipe-line matter has been studied by the Army and Navy, and if the Navy were to suggest that we would rob the armed forces of so much as one escort vessel, I should be reluctant to disagree with the Senator from Missouri. I am assuming, however, that they, the Army and Navy, have taken all those things into account. We do not want to jeopardize our ship-construction program, particularly so far as escort vessels are concerned. But let me point out, Senators, that a great bulk of the war production of this country is centered in New England, and we need oil to run the plants there, as well as to keep the homes of the war workers reasonably comfortable. If we should be so unfortunate as to encounter a shortage of oil for a very long period of time next winter, in this distressed section of the country, the entire war program might suffer a very damaging blow.

I shall not trespass longer on the time of the Senate, because I am now almost out of order, having taken up so much of its time, but I do want to admonish the Senate that this is a very serious subject and situation, and I hope it will be dealt with very carefully.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is tremendously interested in the problem which is now being debated before the Senate. I have great respect for the opinions of the chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages and the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. I also have equal respect for the opinions and the conclusions of the chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. My position in this matter at this moment is based solely and wholly upon what the junior Senator from Missouri has said. His committee has found a bottleneck with respect to the transportation facilities to speed the oil to the eastern seaboard after it is received in my section of the country. He states positively, and he is present now, that his committee is able to show that refineries in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Illinois are now filled to overflowing, and that a products pipe line running from Texas into Chicago at this moment cannot be used because there is no transportation facility out of Chicago to the East to deliver the oil.

Mr. President, no one is more interested than the Senator from Illinois in alleviating the suffering in the East or in supplying oil for ships to transport supplies to our soldiers across the sea. Frankly, I do not know who is right and who is wrong. We have to assume in the first instance that those who are dealing with a great project of this kind know what they are doing. No one in the Senate Chamber has been more faithful in supporting the Army and the Navy in their war efforts and endeavors than has the Senator from Illinois, and I

will sink or swim with them on nearly all propositions, because if we do not do that then we are all lost.

But, Mr. President, here is a domestic problem, which individuals can at least analyze and to which they can give some thought of their own, just as we are doing here constantly to other domestic problems. After listening to what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] had to say about this matter, I had no hesitancy in joining with this small group of Senators in directing the attention of the Secretary of the Interior, who is the coordinator of the petroleum industry, to the question of the necessity of building an additional products pipe line.

Mr. President, it does not affect the fuel pipe line at all. That is almost completed. The only thing it does is to call attention for the moment at least to the facts that are being developed by the Truman committee relating to what seems to me an important question, and the question solely is as to whether or not the pipe line should be built from Texas to Illinois, or whether the pipe line should be started in Illinois and built on to the East. It is not a question of trying to deny the East anything. It is a question of who is right and who is wrong. I think we all agree that sometimes the officials downtown make mistakes, and I am not so certain that the Secretary of the Interior is completely familiar with all the facts involved in this proposition, although I may be wrong on this point. We all realize his tremendous responsibilities.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to call the Senator's attention further to the fact, as was discussed in the meeting the other day at which the Senators presented this resolution, that the best information we could obtain and the best authority is that the bottleneck in railroad transportation is east of the Mississippi River rather than west of it. In other words, the available tank-car facilities might be better used at the western end of the oil-shipment program rather than at the eastern end. The bottleneck is east of the Mississippi rather than west.

Mr. LUCAS. Where the bottleneck is I am not sure, but the evidence will develop it, and perhaps the evidence with respect to the bottleneck has been developed by the committee headed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] who is now on his feet, and to whom I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that neither do I know the answer to that question. I now have no objection to the matter going to the Truman committee. I have nothing but applause for the Truman committee. My concern is that there be no unnecessary delay on the pipe line. I am told that in connection with these plans the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War went into careful detail with the railroad people, as they did with all other agencies concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Be that as it may, I know that the Truman committee has done more than all the other committees put together in discovering many serious mistakes which have been made by the various agencies of the Government. The job is so big that honest mistakes are bound to be made. No one will deny that fact. Even the Truman committee has made mistakes, and I have not always agreed with them. At times I have defended certain individuals who have been condemned by that committee, but no one will deny the fact that the committee has been worth its weight in gold and has saved many million dollars to the taxpayers of the country. It has certainly aided the war effort. As a result of the standing which the Truman committee has with the American people, whenever the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] makes a statement we are bound to give it weight.

I do not wish to delay the construction of any pipe line, Mr. President. I do not desire to cause any delay whatever in connection with the transportation of vital oil to the East. However, there is a problem involved; and when I am told that the pipe lines are filled to overflowing, when I am told that the refineries in my section of the country, in Kansas, and in Oklahoma, are filled to overflowing, and that oil cannot be taken from them because of lack of transportation facilities, I say that it is only a fair proposal that we at least make a preliminary investigation through the proper committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague needs no assistance from me, either by way of argument or factual data, to support and sustain the point which he previously made before the Senate. Even while the discussion was in progress I received over the telephone a telegram from the mayor of Bridgeport, which reads as follows:

Range oil and petroleum situation desperate in Bridgeport. Terrible suffering among peoples in this war-production city. With subzero temperatures, less than one day's supply of kerosene and range oil on hand. It is being doled out to sick and to families with infants and in ridiculously small amounts. Action is imperative and must be taken at once.

JASPER McLEAVY,
Mayor of Bridgeport.

Mr. President, last week in the city of Hartford distributor tank trucks came to central distributing points where authorities had sought to collect such range oil and kerosene supplies as were available so that the trucks might pick it up and deliver it in small quantities to people who were on the preferred list—preferred by virtue of the dire circumstances in which they found themselves. Day after day went by and no oil came in. Women came with gallon containers, from homes where there had been no heat for 2 or the 3 days. They wept bitterly. That is the situation in Connecticut.

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

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How would the proposed pipeline affect the situation to which the able Senator from Connecticut has made reference?

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the able Senator from Illinois that I know nothing about any quarrel which may exist on the part of independent producers in the Missouri and Kansas oil fields or whether they do or do not receive access through a pipe line to tie into one running from the Texas Panhandle to Norris City, Ill. That is not the point at all. The point my colleague was making was that he wanted to see no action of any kind taken which might interfere with expediting consideration of the problem as it affects the Northeast. That is all I understood my colleague to say.

Mr. MALONEY. The answer to the inquiry of the able Senator from Illinois is something like a difference of 200,000 barrels of petroleum a day.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is it not also true that in offering the resolution today the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] stated that he hoped prompt action would be taken on it so as to postpone construction of the pipe line?

Several Senators rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I prefer not to yield at this time. I make the point that for many months—as long ago as last March or April—those of us in the affected areas, where the plight is so serious, urgently sought to call attention of this body to the precarious situation. Later, in May, the Senate joined with us in an amendment to a bill then before this body which would provide not less than \$20,000,000 to supply oil barges to carry oil and build up reserve stocks in the summer.

We had testimony then—and the Senate acted upon it—to the effect that those barge lines could have assisted, by their conversion to fuel oil carrying potentialities, within 150 days at the very most. However, it was not until December 20 that the affected agencies agreed on how they would get together.

I am not quarreling, by way of recrimination, over what has happened. That gets us no more oil or gasoline. My point is that the situation which many of us thought would become acute this winter has materialized into a very dire and desperate plight. Mr. President, I submit that we can brook no action which would involve further delay.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in support of the position of the Senator from Connecticut.

The oil situation has been badly mismanaged. It has been bungled in such a way that havoc has been raised in my section of the country. Last summer I stood upon the floor of the Senate and predicted the situation that might occur in New England and in the Northeast. The conditions I predicted might occur have occurred. Today it is 32 degrees below zero in my State of New Hampshire. People are suffering; sickness is prevalent; conditions are desperate and some people are still talking of investigating.

We want action, not investigation. I cannot understand statements to the effect that people have suffered only mental anguish. When I went home before Christmas, for the Christmas holidays, the morning I arrived in Boston I picked up a copy of the Boston Post and read in scareline headlines that 10 people had died because they could not obtain sufficient oil to keep them warm. People have died and we still want to investigate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to correct the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire. I said it was no less than mental anguish.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was not referring to what the Senator said. I know he realizes the situation and is doing all he can. However, it has been stated that there was some mental anguish. It is much more than mental anguish that is taking place in New England today. The situation is serious. People are suffering and will continue to suffer. There is no reason for further delay in taking action. Any action which will obtain the relief which is needed should be taken at once.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. How many persons in the Senator's State listened to the Fuel Administrator when he requested more than a year ago that users of fuel oil convert to coal?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe that as many as could obtain the material with which to convert, converted to the use of coal.

Mr. GUFFEY. During the last World War I was in Washington as a member of the Petroleum War Service Committee. I have been in the oil business all my life. We had some problems then, but they were child's play as compared with the transportation problems which confront us today. As I recall, not a single tanker was sunk by a submarine during that war. We were bringing oil up from the Gulf of Mexico with tankers in ample quantities. At the end of the war we had more production than we had when the war started. There is ample production at the present time. The problem is purely one of transportation. The Oil Coordinator has been trying to tell people in the East, in the North, and in Pennsylvania that there is a shortage in transportation and not in the production of oil.

During the present month, a 28-day month, the East Texas oil field, with which I am familiar, was shut down 10 days. If it were operating all the time it could produce an additional 3,800,000 barrels of oil a day; but there are no transportation facilities.

A great many Senators criticized the Oil Administrator when he advised people to change their heating methods from oil to coal, and they did not do so. They would receive one report from the Senate and another from the House. One report would be to the effect that there was no shortage, and another report would announce a shortage. The shortage was not in the oil, but in transportation. Any person who studied the problem could find that out.

Two weeks ago the railroad men of the country, at the suggestion of the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, got together and arranged to transport 150,000 barrels more oil in tank cars and in containers. We have not advised our people at home, and did not do so last year, to convert from fuel oil to coal. If that had been done, most of the present trouble would have been averted, but we did not ask our constituents to convert at the right time.

There will be another shortage in transportation in from 6 months to a year. Every time we send more troops overseas we must send more fuel oil and gasoline so that they may be properly supplied. I predict that before another 3 months shall have elapsed we shall have to send overseas 200,000 barrels more oil a day than we are sending at the present time. Therefore, Senators may as well educate their constituents to the conversion of oil-heating equipment to the use of coal. I believe that situation will prevail in Pittsburgh, in the West, and wherever transportation is inadequate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator from Pennsylvania in favor of building a pipe line?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes; I am in favor of it. I did not criticize Secretary Ickes when the recommendation was made for the so-called Big Inch pipe line, but I think that the pipe line should be extended to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. BRIDGES. So do I.

Mr. GUFFEY. If Senators would consult Secretary Ickes and his oil committee—and he has the brains of the oil industry on that committee—they would receive the proper answers to all these questions in 1 hour's conference. I hope those in doubt about the situation will do so.

WILLIAM KOVATIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 393?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 393) for the relief of William Kovatis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William Kovatis, formerly of the United States Marine Corps, shall be entitled to medical care at Government expense at a facility of the Veterans' Administration, until a finding by competent authority that no further improvement can be made by continued treatment, for the injury sustained at the naval prison, Portsmouth, N. H., on November 3, 1941: *Provided,* That no compensation, retirement pay, back pay, pension, or benefits other than benefits provided for herein shall be held to have accrued prior to or subsequent to the enactment of this act: *Provided further,* That nothing contained in this act shall operate to change the nature of the discharge given to William Kovatis on May 18, 1942.

PERMANENT LOAN TO THE UNITED STATES BY THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 319) 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.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky tell us whether or not the Government now is making an appropriation to the National Gallery of Art and, if so, in what annual amount?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is an appropriation, the amount of which I do not now recall, for the maintenance of the National Gallery of Art. The bill relates to a \$5,000,000 bequest, which it is desired on the part of the donor to give to the National Gallery of Art.

We already have such bequests which are loaned to the Government through the Treasury, and they bear a rate of interest which is fixed in the statute. Heretofore, from time to time bequests of this kind have been made in cash or in its equivalent. The policy has been to loan the money to the Government through the Treasury, and it bears a uniform rate of interest of 4 percent.

The bill is simply for the purpose of carrying out the policy heretofore adopted of accepting the bequest and authorizing that the money be loaned to the Government at a rate of interest fixed in the act itself, and it is in harmony with the policy which the Library of Congress and the National Gallery of Art have followed with respect to such bequests.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that, of course, the point which struck my notice with reference to the bill was that we could borrow \$200,000 a year at a rate of interest a very great deal less than 4 percent, and could annually appropriate \$200,000 in perpetuity to the National Gallery of Art. That is what we are really doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is true that we could borrow money at a lower rate of interest than 4 percent; but that is the percentage which has been fixed by law in regard to all such bequests; it is a uniform rate and, of course, offers itself as an inducement for such bequests which rich people wish to make to the Library of Congress or to the National Gallery of Art. It is in order that that may be done that passage of the bill is necessary.

Mr. DANAHER. I can understand that it could not be done unless we had such a bill on the statute books; but it is going to cost the Government \$200,000 a year in perpetuity, or at least the difference between that amount and the cost of borrowing that same amount if we were to appropriate the money directly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is true in a sense, but we would not have the benefit of the bequests if we simply endeavored to finance directly.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 319) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to receive into the Treasury from time

to time as a permanent loan by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art to the United States sums in cash of not to exceed \$5,000,000 in the aggregate, and to pay interest on the principal amount of such loan at the rate of 4 percent per annum, payable semiannually. Such interest is hereby permanently appropriated for payment to the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art.

CHARLES F. KEGEL

The bill (S. 167) for the relief of Charles F. Kegel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$450 to Charles F. Kegel, of Turner, Mont., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of his truck, such truck having been destroyed on December 5, 1936, by a fire which burned a garage at Turner, Mont., in which it was stored for the purpose of safeguarding its load, consisting of property used in connection with Resettlement Administration projects: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ARTHUR A. SCHIPKE

The bill (S. 171) for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur A. Schipke, of Meriden, Conn., the sum of \$148.15, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for property damage resulting from a collision between his automobile and a Department of Agriculture truck in Union, Conn., on March 10, 1939: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

DR. PAUL ROGER ZAHLMANN

The bill (S. 173) for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$51, to Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann, of New Haven, Conn., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment for professional services rendered to Charles Huelsman, an employee of the Work Projects Administration, who sustained injuries while engaged in the performance of his duties as such an employee: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid

or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 355) for the relief of R. S. Howard Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the bill is a most unusual one. I wonder if we may have an explanation of it from the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Neither the author of the bill nor the Senator who reported it is present at the moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Then I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection of the Senator from Connecticut, the bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS GROWING OUT OF MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY ERADICATION CAMPAIGN

The bill (S. 403) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with calendar No. 32, Senate bill 403, which was passed over, it being a bill to run back into the ancient history of Florida's fruitfly, and to reach forward into the Treasury for about \$10,000,000, I should like to have pending a motion to recommend the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion will be pending.

RICHARD BARKER

The bill (S. 404) for the relief of Richard Barker was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard Barker, of Lockport, La., the sum of \$1,500, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in moving his residence adjoining the Government right-of-way due to caving of the bank of the Intracoastal Waterway Canal, at Lockport, La., during the year 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

MRS. ERNESTINE FUSELIER SIGLER

The bill (S. 405) for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler, of Oberlin, La., the sum of \$1,200, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her and for expenses incurred as the result of an accident, involving an Army truck engaged in Third Army maneuvers on September 25, 1941: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

HOWARD M. SANDUS

The bill (S. 418) for the relief of Howard M. Sandus was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,700 to Howard M. Sandus, of Waukegan, Ill., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for hospital and medical expenses incurred, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of the motor vehicle in which he was riding as a passenger being struck by a United States Army truck, at the intersection of United States Highway No. 41 and Illinois State Highway No. 22, on April 16, 1941: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 439) for the relief of Perkin's Gins, formerly Perkin's Oil Co. of Memphis, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is the Senator who sponsored the bill present in order that he may explain to us something about the proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not observe either the author of the bill or the Senator who reported it on the floor at the moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the bill is apparently the predecessor of 220 contract claims of similar nature, dating back to 1918. We had better have an explanation of it. Therefore, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, under objection.

HAZEL M. LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 52) for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$5,738.85,"

and insert "\$1,798.85"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Hazel M. Lewis, of Powers, Oreg., the sum of \$1,798.85, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for damages as a result of personal injuries sustained by Hazel M. Lewis when assaulted by Richard T. Foster, an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps assigned to Camp China Flats F-105, Fifty-four Hundred and Forty-third Company, on September 5, 1938, at Powers, Oreg.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VODIE JACKSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 517) for the relief of Vodie Jackson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$3,686," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vodie Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn. (post-office address, Fulton, Ky.), the sum of \$3,686, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his wagon, in which he was riding, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Fulton, Ky., on October 18, 1940: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT T. GROOM, DAISY GROOM, AND MARGARET GROOM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "Margaret Groom", to insert "Turpin"; on page 2, line 3, after the words "Robert T. Groom", to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$952"; in line 5, after the words "Daisy Groom", to strike out "\$5,500" and insert "\$4,000"; at the end of line 5, to strike out the words "personal injuries sustained" and insert "all damages, in-

cluding hospitalization, suffered"; at the end of line 7, to strike out the comma and "\$7,500" and insert "Turpin, \$3,500"; and at the end of line 8, to strike out "personal injuries sustained", and insert "all damages, including hospitalization, suffered", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, his wife, and Margaret Groom Turpin, his daughter, all of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the respective sums hereinafter specified in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States arising out of a collision which occurred near Murfreesboro, Tenn., on October 21, 1941, when an automobile driven by Robert H. Pate, a United States mail carrier, ran into the automobile of the said Robert T. Groom: To the said Robert T. Groom, \$952 as compensation for property damage and other damages sustained by him; to the said Daisy Groom, \$4,000 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her; and to the said Margaret Groom Turpin, \$3,500 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin."

EMILIANO LOPEZ AND ELIZA R. LOPEZ

The bill (S. 493) for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez, Santa Fe, N. Mex., the sum of \$615.30. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Emiliano and Eliza R. Lopez for damages arising out of an accident in which Patricio Lopez, minor son of the said Emiliano and Eliza R. Lopez, suffered personal injuries when the truck which he was driving collided with a truck owned by the United States and used in connection with Indian Service operations in the Pueblo Nambé, Santa Fe County, N. Mex., on August 12, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the bill or its general objectives. I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain it, if he is available. If not, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection of the Senator from Oregon, the bill will be passed over.

(This bill was subsequently considered and passed.)

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMY ASSIGNED TO DIVING DUTY

The bill (S. 427) to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted men of the Army of the United States assigned to the duty of diving shall receive additional pay, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, at the rate of not less than \$5 per month and not exceeding \$30 per month: *Provided*, That officers and enlisted men employed as divers in actual salvage or repair operations in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find in accordance with instructions prescribed by the Secretary of War that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall receive, in addition to the foregoing, the sum of \$5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof so employed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 617) for the relief of Homer C. Chapman was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in connection with Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 617, let me say that the report in the file would indicate that the claimant sought to enlist in the United States Army on June 9, 1899; that 4 days later he entered a hospital; that a month and a half later was discharged from whatever service he had rendered; and that at this late date, having all the time been found to be mentally defective, he would be restored, under the bill, to all the benefits enjoyed by honorably discharged soldiers. I assume the restoration would date back to 1899. I note that the Secretary of War filed an adverse report recommending that the bill be not passed. If there be any reason why the facts, as I understand them, should justify the adoption of the measure, I shall be glad to have an explanation made accordingly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to comply with the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill was passed by the Senate at the last session, having been unanimously recommended by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It was also recommended by the House Committee on Military Affairs. It has been rerecommended at this session because the facts of the case, while they are as

the Senator has described and as they are set forth in the bill, are clearly that this man became ill of the "flu" or some similar disease, and while he was suffering from a high fever was inconsiderately diagnosed as insane. As soon as the fever passed, the man recovered his normal mental condition and has been an outstanding and effective citizen of Wyoming ever since. The purpose of the bill is to correct what was an obvious error and rather an unfair decision against the soldier.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. How much will it cost the Government to reinstate this beneficiary on the rolls back to 1899?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no statement to that effect in the report of the Secretary of War, and I assume, therefore, that it was not considered that such would be the result. My understanding is that the bill authorizes the beneficiary to obtain whatever pension benefits there may be from now on.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it may well be that the explanation which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will completely dissipate whatever doubts I may have with reference to this measure, but I should like to ascertain what the facts may be with respect to the monetary benefits which will accrue. I, therefore, respectfully ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over under objection.

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was temporarily out of the Chamber, having been called to the telephone. I wish to ask what disposition was made of calendar No. 32, Senate bill 403, for the relief of certain claimants in Florida who suffered losses and damages by reason of the campaign conducted for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can assure the Senator that the bill went over.

GRANT TO SAN DIEGO OF CERTAIN LAND

The bill (S. 621) 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 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to grant and convey, under such conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, to the city of San Diego, State of California, for use as a public street, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a strip of land containing 5,950 square feet contiguous to Lytton Street between Barnett Avenue and Rosecrans Street at the United States Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif.

SEC. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands hereby granted to the city of San Diego shall be used for any other purpose or purposes, or shall cease to be maintained by the city of San Diego for the

purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over under objection.

ADDITIONAL SHIP-REPAIR FACILITIES

The bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a few days ago the very able and courteous Senator from Massachusetts spoke to me about the bill when it was placed on the calendar. I suggested that consideration of the bill should wait until the call of the calendar. I should like to have an explanation of the bill from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this is a bill of considerable importance to the Navy. It authorizes the appropriation of \$210,000,000 for ship-repair facilities, principally floating drydocks. The losses the Navy has sustained at sea and the damages which have occurred otherwise to its vessels have necessitated a great expansion in the building of floating drydocks. Such drydocks are of various sizes, some designed to take care of cruisers which are damaged, others to service destroyers, and others submarines. In many instances such floating docks accompany the fleet. The Navy has estimated that it needs \$133,000,000 to acquire mobile drydocks for the present year and \$77,000,000 is the estimated cost of collateral facilities and work incidental thereto. Heretofore \$385,000,000 have been authorized for ship-repair facilities, all of which has been allocated except \$20,000,000.

It has become very important to the naval program to increase in every possible way the floating-dock facilities. Drydocks, as we all know, are all in constant use in the building of new vessels. The floating drydocks are built rapidly and in such a way that they are able to go out to sea, so that when a vessel with the fleet is damaged it may be returned to use immediately the repairs are made, and often they can be made at sea without the necessity of taking the vessel to a drydock on land.

I think that covers the explanation. The report is rather long, but it will be noted from the report that the Navy is of the opinion that the deficiency in such floating-dock facilities will increase as the Navy itself expands. The deficiency in drydocks for cruisers and vessels of similar size for 1943 is estimated at 4 and in 1945 as 7. This bill provides for the building of 5 cruiser floating docks. In the case of destroyers and vessels of similar size, the estimated deficiency in drydocks for 1943 is 9, and

for 1945 it is 45. The number of floating drydocks recommended is 18.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to attract the attention of the distinguished Senator to this language in the report:

There is a pressing need for vastly increased drydocking facilities all over the world to aid in the prosecution of the war.

Are we building for our own use or for the use of our partners in the war?

Mr. WALSH. These are entirely for our own use. They are not embraced or included in any lend-lease program.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I was next going to ask. These drydocks are floatable, of course?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And can be maneuvered from one place to another and eventually can be returned to our own country or its possessions?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; that is true.

Mr. McNARY. I wanted to have that made plain.

Mr. WALSH. The report is rather interesting and rather complete. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 51) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1446) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize an appropriation of \$210,000,000 for additional ship-repair facilities, to consist of floating drydocks and collateral equipment and facilities. The bill also provides authority for the acquisition of land, but it is not now definitely known that it will be necessary to exercise this authority. The bill is similar to previous authorization acts of this nature,

and is, accordingly, phrased so as to permit flexibility in this, as in other particulars, in order to provide for the changing developments of the war.

The Navy Department has estimated that, in order to provide essential mobile drydocking facilities, there will be required a total of \$210,000,000. Of this sum, \$133,000,000 is the estimated cost of the required mobile drydocks, and \$77,000,000 is the estimated cost of collateral facilities and work incidental thereto.

There is a pressing need for vastly increased drydocking facilities all over the world to aid in the prosecution of the war. The increase in the United Nations' navies and merchant marines, and the extension of the operations of our fleets, will accentuate and aggravate this need. In addition, the British Admiralty has made urgent requests for this country to provide it with docking facilities in the active theaters of war.

Mobile floating docks are recommended as the most efficient and satisfactory for the purpose. The advantages of mobile docks include the following: They will be able to follow or accompany the fleets, thus facilitating prompt repairs. By affording quick service wherever it is most needed, they will serve to maintain units in active service in all spheres of operation and will thereby increase the striking power of the navies. The construction of graving docks and other types of drydocks require long periods for construction in locations where the difficulties of transportation of men, equipment, and materials from the United States will be considerable and will involve the employment of vessels. The construction of mobile docks will require less time and will not require the use of vessels needed for other war services.

The committee understands that the Navy Department has made a comprehensive global study of the drydocks available to the United Nations for accommodating the various types and sizes of vessels which will be involved in the prosecution of the war. This study is summarized briefly in the table below. The table shows that there is a great deficiency in available drydocks, and that the mobile docks proposed to be authorized will satisfy the need only in part. The table also summarizes the estimated costs.

Type of vessel served by drydocks	Deficiency in drydocks		Number of floating drydocks recommended	Estimated cost	
	1943	1945		Per unit	Total
Cruisers and vessels of similar size.....	4	7	5	\$11,200,000	\$56,000,000
Destroyers and vessels of similar size.....	9	45	18	3,000,000	54,000,000
Patrol craft and vessels of similar size.....	75	93	25	800,000	22,500,000
Total.....					133,000,000

All deficiencies cannot be met because of the requirements for other war purposes. The drydocks recommended are reported to be within the quantities of materials available to the Navy Department under present allocation programs.

Although the Navy Department has definite plans for the use of the drydocks to be provided by this bill, the committee was not informed as to where they will be located. This will be determined by the needs existing when such docks become available.

The committee is advised that the Navy Department has given careful consideration to the steel requirements for the proposed mobile drydocks and has designed a program for their construction under which the average steel requirement will be 5,811 tons a month and the maximum in any one month will be 11,000 tons. This has been correlated with other naval construction so as to keep the total consumption of steel plate in any one month below the present allocations of

steel to the Navy Department. The whole program is designed to be completed in 20 months. The maximum consumption would occur in August 1943. When the landing-craft program is completed, the Navy's steel requirement will be lessened.

The Navy Department reports that it will be possible to construct the docks without impairing the essential shipbuilding program. If, in any one month, there is insufficient steel to carry on all of the shipbuilding programs together with the drydock program, the construction of the docks will be temporarily suspended.

The recommended docks will be self-contained as far as possible, but they will require certain collateral facilities and incidental work in order to make them fully effective. Such facilities and work may include berthing piers, temporary shop buildings, tools, temporary power supplies, and other services, as well as dredging and the moorings of the drydocks. The estimated cost of these facili-

ties and work is \$77,000,000. The total appropriation is therefore \$210,000,000.

This authorization is in addition to existing naval authorizations for ship-repair facilities totaling \$385,000,000, substantially all of which has been committed, or tentatively committed, except for a necessary small reserve for contingencies.

The need for the recommended mobile docks is very urgent and commencement of construction at the earliest possible date is necessary. In order to expedite such commencement, the Navy Department requested the approval of the President to contract for the entire program, within the estimates herein submitted. This approval was given subject to the condition that the Navy Department could complete the drydock program out of its present assignment of steel without impinging on its essential programs. Arrangements have been made to conform to this condition.

Pursuant to the above Presidential approval, contracts were made for 48 drydocks with the following contractors:

For cruisers and vessels of similar size
[Each drydock consisting of 7 sections]

Number of sections	Contractor	Location
12.....	Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.	Morgan City, La.
5.....	do.	Eureka, Calif.
8.....	Pollock-Stockton Shipbuilding Corporation.	Stockton, Calif.
6.....	Everett-Pacific Co.	Everett, Wash.
4.....	Pittsburgh-Des Moines Co.	Pittsburgh, Pa.

For destroyers and vessels of similar size

Number of drydocks	Contractor	Location
18.....	Pacific Bridge Co.	Alameda, Calif.

For patrol craft and vessels of similar size

Number of drydocks	Contractor	Location
3.....	Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.	Newburgh, N. Y.
6.....	Quincy Barge Builders.	Decatur, Ill.
6.....	George D. Auehter Co.	Jacksonville, Fla.
6.....	Doullut & Ewin.	Mobile, Ala.
4.....	The Foundation Co.	Kearney, N. J.

Section 3 requires the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congress every 60 days, or more frequently, all acquisitions of land effected under the authority of this bill.

Section 4 provides that any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may

be leased in accordance with the Lend-Lease Act but that they cannot be otherwise disposed of and that title thereto shall remain in the United States. The committee is of the opinion that, while it may be in the national interest to lease the above items to other members of the United Nations, still, where it is practicable to do so, title thereto should remain in the United States.

There are confidential details of the contemplated program with which members of the committee have been acquainted but which for obvious reasons are not included in this report.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives sets forth the views and recommendations of the Navy Department on this bill. This letter is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 22, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize additional ship-repair facilities.

There is a pressing need for vastly increased ship drydocking facilities all over the world. As the United Nations' navies and merchant marine increase in number and as the operations of our fleets are extended into new areas, this need will be accentuated and aggravated. This prospective condition indicates the necessity for the construction of highly mobile floating docks which can follow the fleets or accompany them. In addition, the British Admiralty has made urgent requests for this country to provide it with docking facilities in the active theaters of war.

Mobile floating docks are considered the most desirable to meet our current and prospective needs, not only because of their mobility but also because graving docks and other types of drydocks require long periods for construction in locations where the difficulties of transportation of men, equipment, and materials from the United States will be considerable. Furthermore, by constructing mobile docks, it is possible to have such facilities ready for use wherever they are most required.

A comprehensive global study has been made of the drydocks that will be available to the United States for accommodating the various types and sizes of vessels which will be involved in the prosecution of the war. The results are summarized briefly in the table below, which also indicates the number of floating drydocks recommended to partially eliminate the deficiencies, as well as the estimated costs of the drydocks themselves.

Type of vessel served by drydocks	Deficiency in drydocks, December—		Number of floating drydocks recommended	Estimated cost	
	1943	1945		Per unit	Total
Cruisers and vessels of similar size.....	4	7	5	\$11,300,000	\$56,500,000
Destroyers and vessels of similar size.....	9	45	18	3,000,000	54,000,000
Patrol craft and vessels of similar size.....	75	93	25	900,000	22,500,000
Total.....					133,000,000

All deficiencies could not be met because of the requirements for other war purposes. The numbers recommended are considered to be within the quantities of materials available to the Navy Department under present allocations.

In order to expedite the drydock construction, approval of the President was requested and granted to contract for the entire program within the estimates herein submitted. This approval was given subject to the condition that the Navy Department could com-

plete it out of its present assignment of steel without impinging on its essential programs. Arrangements have been made to meet this proviso.

Although the drydocks will be self-contained as far as possible, they will still require certain collateral facilities and incidental work in order to make them fully effective. These facilities and work may include berthing piers, temporary shop buildings, tools, temporary power supplies, and other services, as well as dredging and the moorings for the drydocks. The estimated cost of these items is \$77,000,000. The total request for authorization, therefore, is \$210,000,000. Such authorization is required at this time because existing authorizations for ship-repair facilities totaling \$385,000,000 are already committed or tentatively committed, except for a necessary small reserve for contingencies.

The Navy Department recommends enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL, Acting.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to explain section 4 of the bill. What is the purpose of that section?

Mr. WALSH. Section 4 reads as follows:

Hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), but not otherwise disposed of, for periods not beyond the termination of the present war, but title thereto shall remain in the United States.

That amendment was placed in the bill in the House of Representatives. This, by the way, is a House bill, and, probably, if passed by the Senate today, and enacted into law, will become Public Law No. 1. The provision referred to was put in for the purpose of retaining the control and title to these floating docks, so that, at the end of the war, they will return to the possession of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, it has the effect of putting a limitation on that part of the Lend-Lease Act?

Mr. WALSH. It certainly has.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RENTAL ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN OFFICERS

The bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume this is to be supplemental to the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Which I think was later modified in 1942?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. What change does it effect?

Mr. WALSH. The committee took occasion to write a rather extended report, as the Senator will observe, and went into the whole question of pay of naval officers, and allowances of various kinds, so that all the information would be in a document available to all Senators.

The bill now before the Senate deals only with the rental allowances of officers of the Navy, the Army, and the Marine Corps who are without dependents. Officers who have dependents would not be affected by the proposed legislation.

In the act increasing the pay of enlisted men and officers enacted in 1942 provision was made that rental quarters should not be given to officers who were without dependents and who were longer than 3 months in the field service. The Comptroller General's Office ruled that every Army officer and every Marine Corps officer is in the field service, now that we are in war. Previous to the war, entering the field service meant participating in maneuvers, being away from one's habitation or home, and where the Government itself would furnish quarters.

When an officer is at sea, if he is without dependents, he is not given rental allowances, but if he is at sea for less than 3 months, or is in the field service, he is given the rental allowances, on the theory that he will be away only a short time, and when he returns he will have a home to which to go.

The proposed legislation is necessary, for if it is not enacted and the rental allowances permitted, the Navy and the Army will have to spend millions of dollars in providing facilities for all their officers. As we know, facilities for living quarters are now provided at a post of duty, and rental allowances are made when they are not. Therefore the Comptroller General realizes that his ruling is probably not in compliance with the intention of Congress, or with the spirit of existing law, and he has suspended putting into operation his ruling until March 1, in order that the proposed legislation may be enacted, which, briefly, will give officers who are without dependents rental allowances when the Government does not furnish them with a place to sleep. When they are with troops, they are not given allowances, when they are with ships they are not given allowances, but when they are in Washington and have dependents, they are given rental allowances. Under the ruling, if they have no dependents, they are not given rental allowances. This bill would permit them to get rental allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, from a hasty examination of the report and the bill, I am unable to find any estimate of the cost to the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct. The Navy Department is unable to give an estimate, but I call the attention of the Senator to page 6 of the report, wherein it is stated:

The Navy Department is unable to make any worth-while estimate of the cost to the Government if the proposed legislation is enacted into law. Without such legislation, however, it may be necessary to construct quarters for officers throughout the country at a tremendous cost and use of critical materials; enactment, therefore, could result in an over-all saving.

Mr. McNARY. In the days gone by, what have these men done?

Mr. WALSH. They lived in bachelor quarters or were paid rental allowances.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator says this applies only to bachelors.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; practically; to those without dependents. If a man has a dependent mother, he is given a rental allowance.

Mr. McNARY. During all the years covering the history of the country, these men have gotten along without quarters being furnished them. Why now are we supplying them quarters, and what is the immediate urgency?

Mr. WALSH. Such an officer is furnished Government quarters. In the absence of quarters he is paid a rental allowance. Heretofore he has either been furnished quarters or been paid the rental allowance. Now there are no quarters for him, and the Comptroller General under a recent ruling will not authorize the payment of rental allowances. At the Naval Academy at Annapolis, for instance, there are not nearly enough quarters for married officers or for those with dependents.

Mr. McNARY. I understand.

Mr. WALSH. When they go outside, there is a rental allowance. When there is no room for them and they have to go to a hotel, they are given rental allowances.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that, but what I want to know is why we now find ourselves without the required quarters. Is it because we have enlarged the armed forces?

Mr. WALSH. Absolutely. There has been a tremendous expansion, as the Senator knows. Heretofore we have not had this problem.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I desired to have brought out. Heretofore we have gotten along without the expenditure. Now the necessity is due, if at all, to the expansion of the armed forces.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. McNARY. I have no idea of objecting, because I can see some reason for the proposed legislation, but I am sorry that the naval authorities, and my very able friend the Senator from Massachusetts, are unable to give any estimate of the liability that would fall upon the Treasury of the United States to implement the proposed legislation. Perhaps the information can be obtained by the other House.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth paragraph of section 6 of the Pay Readjustment

Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field duty unless his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty, except for temporary periods of sea duty not exceeding 3 months, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any, and such certifications shall be conclusive: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters."

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the discussion on the floor, I ask to have printed in the Record the report from the Committee on Naval Affairs on Senate bill 641.

There being no objection, the report (No. 52) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to permit the payment of rental allowance to an officer without dependents while on field duty, when his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense, or while on sea duty for temporary periods not exceeding 3 months. The bill also provides that whenever competent superior authority certifies that quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate, such certification shall be conclusive.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF SERVICE PAY

The Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, fixed the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. For officers of these services, the law prescribed pay and allowances according to rank, consisting of pay, subsistence allowance, and rental allowance. In addition thereto, officers and enlisted men were entitled to 50 percent additional pay for duty involving flying.

The subsistence allowance was fixed at \$18 per month for all officers without dependents, and an allowance for officers with dependents ranging from \$18 to \$54 per month according to the rank of the officer.

Rental allowance was provided for officers with dependents in amounts ranging from \$40 per month to \$120 per month, according to rank; the rental allowance being allowed to officers with dependents; except when Government quarters were assigned for the officers and dependents. Officers without dependents were not entitled to rental allowance while on field or sea duty, nor when assigned Government quarters.

The Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, also provided pay for enlisted men of all the military services at rates ranging from \$30 per month to \$157.50 per month, according to rating and length of service. This act also provided for a money allowance for quarters and subsistence for enlisted men not quartered or subsisted in kind, at rates prescribed by the President, not to exceed a total of \$4 per day.

EXPLANATION OF THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, Public Law 607, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 16, 1942, reenacted in substance most of the provisions of the Joint Service Pay Act of June 10, 1922, but increased the pay in the case of ensigns of the Navy, and officers of

corresponding rank in the other military services; and generally increased the rates of rental and subsistence allowance in the case of officers.

This act also increased the pay of enlisted men and increased the maximum allowance for quarters and subsistence allowance to \$5 per day. In addition, it provided for payment

of a quarters allowance to enlisted men of certain grades (chief petty officers, and petty officers, first and second class) with dependents, for periods during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependents.

The following tables show pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men:

TABLE I.—Pay of officers and warrant officers in active service

[Act of June 16, 1942; effective June 1, 1942]

Grade		Pay period	Annual base pay	Monthly rates											Rental allowance and subsistence allowance (30-day month)			
Army	Navy			Initial monthly pay	Over 3 years' service	Over 6 years' service	Over 9 years' service	Over 12 years' service	Over 15 years' service	Over 18 years' service	Over 21 years' service	Over 24 years' service	Over 27 years' service	Over 30 years' service	With dependents		No dependents	
															Rent	Subsistence ¹	Rent	Subsistence ¹
General	Admiral																	
Lieutenant general	Vice admiral																	
Major general	Rear admiral (upper half)		\$8,000	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$666.67	\$120	\$42	\$105	\$21
Brigadier general	Rear admiral (lower half)		6,000	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	120	42	105	21
Colonel	Captain	6	4,000	333.33	350.00	366.67	383.33	400.00	416.67	433.33	450.00	466.67	483.33	500.00	120	42	105	21
Lieutenant colonel	Commander:																	
	Over 30 years' service	6	4,000	500.00									500.00	120	42	105	21	
	Less than 30 years' service	5	3,500	291.67	306.25	320.83	335.42	350.00	364.58	379.17	393.75	408.33	422.92	120	63	105	21	
Major	Lieutenant commander:																	
	Over 23 years' service	5	3,500	393.75									408.33	120	63	105	21	
	Less than 23 years' service	4	3,000	250.00	262.50	275.00	287.50	300.00	312.50	325.00	337.50	350.00	362.50	105	63	90	21	
Captain	Lieutenant:																	
	Over 17 years' service	4	3,000	312.50						325.00	337.50	350.00	362.50	105	63	90	21	
	Less than 17 years' service	3	2,400	200.00	210.00	220.00	230.00	240.00	250.00	260.00	270.00	280.00	290.00	90	42	75	21	
First lieutenant	Lieutenant (junior grade):																	
	Over 10 years' service	3	2,400	220.00						260.00	270.00	280.00	290.00	90	42	75	21	
	Less than 10 years' service	2	2,000	166.67	175.00	183.33	191.67	200.00	208.33	216.67	225.00	233.33	241.67	75	42	60	21	
Second lieutenant	Ensign:																	
	Over 5 years' service	2	2,000	175.00		183.33	191.67	200.00	208.33	216.67	225.00	233.33	241.67	75	42	60	21	
	Less than 5 years' service	1	1,800	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50	195.00	202.50	210.00	217.50	60	42	45	21	
	Chief warrant officer:																	
	Over 20 years' commissioned service and with creditable record	4	3,000	325.00						337.50	350.00	362.50	375.00	105	63	90	21	
	Over 10 years' commissioned service and with creditable record	3	2,400	230.00				240.00	250.00	260.00	270.00	280.00	290.00	90	42	75	21	
	Less than 10 years' commissioned service	2	2,100	175.00	183.75	192.50	201.25	210.00	218.75	227.50	236.25	245.00	253.75	75	42	60	21	
	Warrant officer	1	1,800	150.00	157.50	165.00	172.50	180.00	187.50	195.00	202.50	210.00	217.50	60	42	45	21	

¹ Allowances in this column are on the basis of a month of 30 days. For a month of greater or less number of days the amounts should be correspondingly increased or decreased.

² The maximum allowances which will accrue to a commissioned warrant officer will be such that the total of base pay, pay for length of service, and allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters will not exceed \$458.33 per month. Deduction of the necessary amount should be made from the rental allowance.

NOTES

All commissioned officers are entitled to a 10-percent and warrant officers to a 20-percent increase in base pay for any period of service while on sea duty or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Admirals are entitled to a personal money allowance of \$2,200 per year. Vice admirals are entitled to a personal money allowance of \$600 per year.

No person, active or retired, shall suffer, by reason of this act, any reduction in pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this act (sec. 19, act of June 16, 1942).

Officers and warrant officers shall receive an increase of 50-percent of their pay when detailed to duty involving flying (sec. 18, act of June 16, 1942).

Retired officers and warrant officers shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on active duty (sec. 15, act of June 16, 1942).

TABLE II.—Pay of enlisted men in active service

[Act of June 16, 1942; effective June 1, 1942]

Grade		Pay grade	Monthly rates										
Army	Navy		Base under 3 years' service	Plus 5 percent over 3 years' service	Plus 10 percent over 6 years' service	Plus 15 percent over 9 years' service	Plus 20 percent over 12 years' service	Plus 25 percent over 15 years' service	Plus 30 percent over 18 years' service	Plus 35 percent over 21 years' service	Plus 40 percent over 24 years' service	Plus 45 percent over 27 years' service	Plus 50 percent over 30 years' service
Master sergeant	Chief petty officer (permanent appointment) ¹	1	\$138	\$144.90	\$151.80	\$158.70	\$165.60	\$172.50	\$179.40	\$186.30	\$193.20	\$200.10	\$207
	Chief petty officer (acting appointment) ¹	1A	129	132.30	138.60	144.90	151.20	157.50	163.80	170.10	176.40	182.70	189
First sergeant	Petty officer, first class; officers' stewards, first class and officers' cooks, first class.	2	114	119.70	125.40	131.10	136.80	142.50	148.20	153.90	159.60	165.30	171
Staff sergeant	Petty officer, second class; officers' stewards, second class; officers' cooks, second class; and musicians, first class.	3	96	100.80	105.60	110.40	115.20	120.00	124.80	129.60	134.40	139.20	144
Sergeant	Petty officer, third class; fireman, first class; officers' stewards, third class; officers' cooks, third class.	4	78	81.90	85.80	89.70	93.60	97.50	101.40	105.30	109.20	113.10	117
Corporal	Nonrated men, first class (except fireman, first class; and musician, first class); fireman, second class; musician, second class; mess attendants, first class.	5	66	69.30	72.60	75.90	79.20	82.50	85.80	89.10	92.40	95.70	99
Private, first class	Nonrated men, second class (except fireman, second class; and musician, second class); fireman, third class; mess attendants, second class.	6	54	56.70	59.40	62.10	64.80	67.50	70.20	72.90	75.60	78.30	81
Private (first 4 months)	Nonrated men, third class (except fireman, third class); mess attendants, third class.	7	50	52.50	55.00	57.50	60.00	62.50	65.00	67.50	70.00	72.50	75

¹ This pay grade also includes officers' chief stewards and officers' chief cooks.

FAMILY ALLOWANCE

The dependents of enlisted men of the fourth to seventh pay grades (apprentice seamen to petty officer third class) are entitled to a family allowance consisting of a contribution from the Government and an amount deducted from the pay of the man. The amount paid to dependents varies according to the number and class of dependents. The family allowance is payable to wife and children without requiring a showing of dependency. For other classes of dependents—i. e., mother, father, brother, or sister—the allowance is payable only where the person is dependent on the enlisted man for substantial support. For the purpose of payment of allowances in the case of dependents of enlisted men, determination of the question of dependency is made by the department concerned. The law providing for family allowance is operative only during war and for 6 months thereafter.

EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT IN S. 641

The Comptroller General has decided that under the provisions of section 6 of the act of June 16, 1942, which prohibits the payment of rental allowance to officers without dependents "while on field duty," all officers serving on shore, with troops, either within or without the United States, are on field duty. This construction of the law prohibits payment of rental allowance to officers without dependents, serving ashore, with troops, even though they are not assigned public quarters. The Comptroller General also decided that officers without dependents serving on sea duty for temporary duty not exceeding 4 months, are entitled to rental allowance only where the department concerned certifies that the shore duty is paramount to the duty he is required to render at sea.

The amended language in S. 641 will have the following effect:

(a) It will permit payment of rental allowance to an officer serving on field duty if his commanding officer certifies that he was necessarily required to procure quarters at his own expense.

(b) An officer without dependents will be entitled by law to rental allowance while on temporary sea duty for not to exceed 3 months.

(c) Payments of rental allowance will be authorized in the case of an officer who is assigned quarters, provided a competent superior authority certifies that such quarters are not occupied because of being inadequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents.

The Navy Department is unable to make any worth-while estimate of the cost to the Government if the proposed legislation is enacted into law. Without such legislation, however, it may be necessary to construct quarters for officers throughout the country at a tremendous cost and use of critical materials; enactment, therefore, could result in an over-all saving.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department. It meets with the approval of the War Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. O'DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS and several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'DANIEL. For what purpose does the Senator from North Carolina desire to interrupt?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to ask unanimous consent that we return to Calendar

No. 41, Senate bill 495, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States. Unfortunately, a moment ago I was called out of the Chamber to answer a telephone call when the bill was reached on the calendar.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate recur to the consideration of Calendar No. 41, Senate bill 495?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I objected when the bill was reached on the calendar, in the absence of an explanation. The able Senator from North Carolina is now present, and I shall be glad to give him an opportunity to explain the nature of the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the bill provides the same benefits for members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps that are granted members of the armed forces. For instance, it provides for increased pay for overseas service, and transportation in many instances, to which they are not entitled now. It also provides for uniform allowances. In other words, up to the present the members of this corps have not been in the Army, and the enactment of this bill would make them a part of the Army. Every woman who becomes a member of that force relieves some man for combat duty.

In further explanation of the bill, it will authorize the appointment and the enlistment of women in the Army for the duration of the present war, plus a period of 6 months.

Mr. McNARY. If the proposed legislation shall be enacted, would it place the WAACS on a legal parity with the WAVES?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my understanding.

Mr. McNARY. At the present time the boat is unbalanced, as it were?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is unbalanced at the present time. I see in the Chamber the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I believe he will agree to that.

Mr. McNARY. I am willing to accept the Senator's word without any verification or supporting testimony.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. So the purpose of the bill is to place women serving in the Army and those in the Navy on an absolute equality?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Exactly.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

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

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. For what purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. For further inquiry with reference to Senate bill 495.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Texas. I notice that in lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 3, of Senate bill 495, we depart from the form hitherto

utilized in legislation as to the period within which the bill would operate if it should become a law. The Senator will notice, beginning with line 25, on page 2, the words "That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war," and so forth. The Senator will certainly see that it does not say "until the cessation of hostilities in the present war." In other words, the very terminology employed differs from the provision we have hitherto relied upon in legislation, to end the legislation at about a given time, at the time of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, or at a fixed date.

My point is that in order to make this language uniform with that which we have hitherto adopted in legislation temporary in character, we should strike out the word "of" after the word "period" in line 1, page 3, and insert "until the cessation of hostilities in"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "prescribe", insert "or until January 1, 1945, whichever is earlier."

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war and for 6 months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, a component to be known as the "Women's Army Auxiliary Corps."

Sec. 2. The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213). All laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to enlisted men or former enlisted men of the Army of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries shall, in like cases and except where otherwise expressly provided, be applicable respectively to enlisted personnel and former enlisted personnel of such corps and their dependents and beneficiaries.

Sec. 3. The commissioned officers of such corps shall consist of women appointed as officers in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728), and ordered into the active military service of the United States. They and their dependents and beneficiaries shall have all of the rights, privileges, and benefits accorded in like cases to other persons under that act.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such additional regulations applicable to such corps and to the members thereof as he may deem necessary. The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and the Army Nurse Corps shall be the only women's organizations in the Army of the United States.

Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no woman appointed as an officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions hereof who has previously held an appointment as an officer of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps established pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 14, 1942 (Public Law 554, 77th Cong.), shall be entitled to any uniform allowance payable to officers of the Army of the United States.

Such officers who have not received a complete issue of uniforms, insignia, accessories, and equipment prescribed under the provisions of section 8 of such act of May 14, 1942, may be issued the remainder of such prescribed articles, and all such officers who have heretofore received, or may hereafter receive such complete issue, or any part thereof, may retain such articles as their personal property.

Sec. 6. Effective on the last day of the second calendar month following the date of the approval of this act, the act of May 14, 1942, as amended, except section 11 thereof, is hereby repealed. Section 11 of such act of May 14, 1942, shall not be applicable to enlisted personnel or commissioned officers of the corps established by this act except in cases in which its applicability is based upon the status of such enlisted personnel or commissioned officers as former members of the corps established by such act of May 14, 1942. Enlistment or acceptance of appointment under the provisions of this act shall terminate service under the act of May 14, 1942, and personnel who were enrolled or appointed under the act last mentioned who do not so enlist or accept appointment hereunder will be discharged. The Secretary of War is authorized to provide transportation and sleeping accommodations, or an allowance in lieu thereof at the rate of 5 cents per mile, for the travel from her last duty post to the place of her acceptance for appointment or enrollment to any member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps established pursuant to the provisions of such act of May 14, 1942, who is not appointed or enlisted in the Army of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Mr. DANAHER. I move to amend the amendment of the committee in the particulars I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 1, after the word "period", it is proposed to strike out the word "of" and to insert "until the cessation of hostilities in," and on page 3, line 4, after the word "prescribe," to insert "or until January 1, 1945, whichever is earlier."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have no objection to the amendments.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

THE WORK OF THE OFFICE OF CENSORSHIP

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, one of the most difficult problems of a free government during time of war is to enforce restrictive supervision over communications. This responsibility touches the people of America in their most sensitive privilege—freedom of expression. It requires supervision of matter which may be safely printed in the newspapers, broadcast over the radio, or transmitted through the mails without damage to our war program.

The Director of Censorship, Mr. Byron Price, is administering this duty with a minimum amount of friction or shock to the American people. Recently he submitted to the Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report of the objectives and methods of the Office of Censorship. I have had the privilege of examining that report, and I believe that a summary of it will be informative to the Members of the Senate. With the consent of the Vice President, and of the Director of Censorship, I ask unanimous consent to have the summary printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

JANUARY 21, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In the hope that Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress will familiarize themselves with the work of the Office of Censorship, and will give constructive thought to improvements, I take the liberty of outlining below the objectives and present operations of this war agency.

Censorship has always been an integral part of armed combat. In most of our previous wars, communications to and from, and within, zones of combat have been censored directly by the military under the general constitutional powers of the Commander in Chief. In the limited cases where civilian censorship agencies have been set up, a direct link with military requirements has been preserved. Censorship can have no possible justification in a free country except as an aid to the armed forces in their contact with the enemy.

The present Office of Censorship is under civilian direction, but the basis of its operations in the field of communications was formulated by the War and Navy Departments. Long before Pearl Harbor, Army and Navy officers were detailed to plan for censorship. A comprehensive study of American experience in this field, and of the methods employed by other democracies, was made by a joint Army and Navy Board. Schools were set up in the departments and certain officer personnel was trained for war service in censorship.

On the night of December 7, 1941, this personnel was put to work on the mails and cables at the direction of the President. Subsequently, in Section 303 of the First War Powers Act, Congress underlined the operation through statutory enactment. On December 19, 1941, the President issued Executive Order No. 8985 which established the Office of Censorship and gave it discretionary authority to censor communications of all types entering or leaving the country.

The Army and Navy personnel already employed in this work was detached from the departments and detailed to the Office of Censorship. Since then some of these officers have been withdrawn, but cable and radio censorship remains today under the direct supervision of Capt. H. K. Fenn, a regular naval officer, while examination of the international mail is supervised by Col. W. Preston Corderman, of the Regular Army. Both Captain Fenn and Colonel Corderman serve as Assistant Directors in the Office of Censorship.

At the very beginning, we adopted two rules of procedure as basic to this operation. These rules have been reiterated time after time in instructions to our personnel.

First, no information is to be allocated to anyone, or even copied from private communications, unless it relates to the war. The

regulations which are constantly before all of our censors begin with the cardinal statement: "That which does not concern the war does not concern censorship." We have assumed that Congress in no wise intended that censorship should be used to enforce peacetime statutes or discover personal or political foibles.

Second, the greatest care must be taken to restrict the distribution of such information within the Government, and to make certain that none of it is circulated outside the Government. To that end our examination of the mail and cables is conducted in guarded rooms by employees who have been acquainted with those sections of the Espionage Act which relate to unauthorized disclosure, and who have signed the most binding pledge of secrecy; allocation to other Government agencies is according to a closely restricted plan based entirely on war interest; delivery to the agencies is by locked and guarded pouch, receivable only by designated officials who have been required repeatedly to give the most positive assurances that the material will be used only for war purposes; and each page of the material itself carries a special warning that no copies are to be made, and that the information is to be communicated only "to those officials whose knowledge of it is necessary to the prosecution of the war."

As a result of experience and consultation, we have been constantly narrowing the scope of this distribution. The responsibility resting with censorship, we have declined numerous applications from other Government agencies for classes of information which cannot be convincingly connected with the war effort.

It has been a cardinal principle also that censorship must not unduly delay the mails and cables. Our stations are required to operate with dispatch. In the case of cables, the delays are a matter of minutes, except for the small percentage of cases where inquiry appears to be necessary. In most instances letters now are cleared and returned to the mails the same day they are received by censorship. Many delays due to shortage of shipping space and other war dislocations have sometimes been attributed without warrant to censorship.

The rank and file of our personnel, recruited through civil service, has been selected with a view to general and specialized ability and has undergone continuing training. Many have come into the service at a personal sacrifice.

Aside from the military, which in the main occupies executive posts, our staff has been recruited under the civil-service regulations. Recruiting continues, since we have not yet been able to assemble qualified personnel to achieve the degree of control contemplated by the original Army-Navy plan and apparently also by Congress. It has been found necessary to do the bulk of our work outside of Washington, and censorship stations have been set up at various points of easiest access to the mail routes, cable heads, and radiotelegraph stations. Altogether, our censors have available to them daily more than 1,000,000 pieces of mail, and some 70,000 messages sent by electrical means of communication.

In section 303 of the First War Powers Act, the Seventy-seventh Congress saw fit to express its intent only in general terms. Both objectives and methods were left to administrative discretion. We have, therefore, laid out policies and formulated procedures based on the lessons of the past and the requirements of common sense.

Our operation is directed toward these two purposes:

To keep information from the enemy.

To gather information which can be used against the enemy.

These objectives closely parallel the recognized purposes of censorship of communications in the First World War. In fact, the

same two principles have activated censorship in all free countries in all wars.

The methods which must be followed to carry out the first objective—suppression of information of value to the enemy—are fairly obvious. In practice we have applied the remedy to all persons without discrimination, deleting military information from mails and cables whether it appeared in communications from suspected spies or in innocently intended but indiscreet letters or messages sent by loyal American citizens. The usefulness of such information in the hands of the enemy would be the same in either case.

As to the collection and treatment of information which will aid affirmatively in defeating the enemy, many complications arise. Manifestly, such information often will be of border-line utility. Manifestly, if it is to be of any use at all, it must be communicated to other governmental agencies, and the problem of proper allocation involves important and sometimes difficult decisions.

Schools have been set up for all examiners of correspondence, and special instruction is given those who operate in such specialized fields as trade and finance. Our stations now are able to censor communications in 133 languages and dialects. We have established specialized units to handle such subjects as exported and imported motion-picture films, and philatelic enclosures, which in past wars have been a medium for transmission of code messages as well as a means of effecting transfer of funds. We have established small but competently staffed laboratories to examine letters for secret writing.

Through daily liaison we cooperate closely with a score of agencies concerned with the prosecution of the war. These agencies do not, however, exercise censorship functions, except in a few special instances. The Army and Navy censor the communications of their own personnel, at a great saving of expense and without any overlapping or other complication with the work of the Office of Censorship. The armed services likewise censor press dispatches sent from north Africa and other zones of combat. The Bureau of Customs examines mail and other written material sent by freight or express or carried by travelers, and the Board of Economic Warfare has certain censorship authority, under the statutes, in the field of technical data when transmitted in international communications.

The benefits which have resulted from censorship cannot be calculated. An infinite amount of military information, which otherwise would inevitably have reached the enemy, has been removed from circulation. Intercepted information turned over by censorship to the intelligence agencies, such as Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has assisted in the apprehension and conviction of enemy agents and the breaking up of conspiracies of various kinds to actively aid the enemy. The actual monetary saving to the Government, through arresting violations of wartime funds-freezing regulations, etc., has more than paid the expenses of the Office of Censorship for the current fiscal year. Public disclosure of details would be unwise because many cases still are under investigation, but full information will gladly be given in confidence to any committee of Congress which desires to have it.

Section 303 of the First War Powers Act, which deals with censorship refers only to communications between the United States and foreign countries. It does not mention communications between continental United States and the Territories and possessions, or between those Territories and possessions. Such communications have been censored since December 7, 1941, under the general constitutional power of the Commander in

Chief, since in every instance they pass to and from, or through, zones of combat. Some criticism of this operation arose during the last session of Congress and a bill relating to the subject, known as H. R. 7151, was considered but failed of passage. The legal aspects of the situation were discussed by the Attorney General at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing of December 14, 1942, the record of which is available in printed form.

In addition to the responsibilities in the field of communications, placed on the Office of Censorship by Executive Order No. 8985, the President designated this Office as the agency to supervise the voluntary efforts of press and radio in withholding certain information from the enemy. The personnel employed in this branch or our activity is small, but the results are large and significant. One of the most effective factors in preventing the enemy from learning our military secrets is to keep the information from general circulation domestically.

On January 15, 1942, we issued a Code of Wartime Practices for the American press, drawn up after extensive consultation with other Government agencies and with the industry. The code was in the form of a request to newspapers and all other publications to refrain from publishing information on a given list of subjects, such as the movements of troops and ships, exact war production statistics, and the development of new military models, unless such information was given out officially. The code has been revised from time to time in the light of experience, and many border-line questions arising under it are settled daily by a highly experienced staff in our Washington headquarters.

A similar code was issued for domestic broadcasters. In addition to the request that news items be carefully screened for unauthorized military information, radio stations were asked to discontinue certain types of "quiz" and "open microphone" programs to preclude the possibility that enemy agents might gain possession of the microphone on their own motion and send messages over the air in code. The staff of trained radio personnel which administers this code also supervises the censorship of the short-wave stations which are beamed to foreign countries.

In dealing with press and radio, the Office of Censorship has confined its request strictly to the field of information. In no case has it sought to control editorial or other opinion, or criticism. Publishers of all classes—covering the field of newspapers, magazines, books, trade publications, etc.—and the entire group of large and small broadcasters have cooperated magnificently in this voluntary endeavor. As a result, an incalculable amount of dangerous military information is being kept out of general circulation every hour of every day.

Indeed, the cooperation of the country as a whole has been highly gratifying. Censorship in all its forms is so repugnant to a free people, so un-American in its concepts and its operations, that public uneasiness and widespread criticism would normally be expected. Instead, with very few exceptions, the public has been patient and understanding, quick to realize that censorship is a necessary evil and annoyance in wartime, and conscious that the staff is doing the best that human endeavor can do to administer censorship fairly and evenly and with no motive but to serve the national good. Mistakes have been made, and we have sought always to profit by the experience.

The Office of Censorship now has 14,377 employees of whom 968 are in Washington. Of the total 12,726 are civilian, and 1,651 military. Our expectation is that the grand total will be increased by the end of the

current fiscal year to 18,180, which was the number contemplated by the House Appropriations Committee in the last Congress. Our current annual appropriation is \$26,500,000, and we hope to keep our expenditures within that figure.

I have written similarly to the Speaker of the House.

Respectfully submitted.

BYRON PRICE,
Director of Censorship.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am compelled to leave the Senate for a few minutes for a conference. I move that the Senate now proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky for that purpose?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John J. Keegan, of Florida, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for the term of 6 years from March 15, 1943 (reappointment).

By Mr. MCFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii, vice Ingram M. Stainback.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles D. Lawrence, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Frederick W. Dallinger, resigned.

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

Capt. George L. Weyler to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of August 1942.

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

Sundry postmasters.

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

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the first name on the Executive Calendar, under the heading of War Manpower Commission is that of Louis Bloch, of California, to be program control technician. I move that that nomination be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina to recommit the nomination first appearing on the Executive Calendar to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is the first group of new positions created by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under his blanket authority. I am wondering whether the Military Affairs Committee has any information regarding the nature and extent of the organization which is thus being created? Can the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] tell me how large this organization in total personnel is to be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not recall at the moment the exact number of employees who will be under the direction of Mr. McNutt.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Michigan will turn to page 53 of the hearings I think the answer to the Senator's inquiry will be found. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] asked this question of Governor McNutt:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some clear answers as to the 64,000.

It having been said that including the selective service there would be 64,000 persons over-all under the jurisdiction of the War Manpower Commission.

I started to get it and was interrupted. I think it would definitely clarify my mind on it.

We have a total number of people that you are going to get of 64,000. What part of that 64,000 is selective service?

Mr. BARNETT—

He was with Mr. McNutt—

Twenty-eight thousand.

Senator GURNEY. Twenty-eight thousand?

Mr. BARNETT. That is right.

Senator GURNEY. That leaves 36,000?

Mr. BARNETT. That leaves 36,000.

Mr. McNUTT. Of which 21,000 are United States Employment Service.

Senator GURNEY. That leaves 15,000 or more.

Mr. BARNETT. Then 12,000 of them are in National Youth Administration.

Senator GURNEY. That leaves 3,000.

Mr. McNUTT. That leaves 3,000.

Senator GURNEY. What is the 3,000 made up of? Three hundred and fifty men above \$4,500?

Mr. BARNETT. You have got the existing training within industry staff, which we now have of 298, I think, and then the apprentice training, which is 333 people. The national roster already established has 350.

Then there is a table which was presented afterward, and which is published in the hearings on page 54, giving

the complete break-down departmentally and in the field, as follows:

Number of authorized positions in the War Manpower Commission

	Departmental
Office of the Chairman	18
President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice	33
Office of the Executive Director	491
Bureau of Placement	878
United States Employment Service	
Bureau of Program Planning and Review	379
Bureau of Training	44
National Youth Administration	231
Training Within Industry	76
Apprentice Training Service	55
Bureau of Manpower Utilization	17
Bureau of Selective Service	1,430
Regional offices	
Total	3,652

In the field service, similarly broken down, the total is 60,184—an over-all total of 63,836.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator now tell me what is the relationship between the United States Civil Service Commission and these Manpower Commission appointees?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I pointed out the other day when the Senator first raised this question—and I am speaking now because I looked into the matter personally and asked for the hearings at which Governor McNutt appeared—the law which appropriated \$100,000,000 for the President for the purpose of setting up necessary agencies to carry on the war, authorized him to appoint personnel without regard to the Civil Service laws; but in spite of that blanket clearance, the practice has been installed and followed of having each of these positions and appointees cleared through the Civil Service Commission. As a matter of fact a representative of the Civil Service Commission—his name appears in the hearings—sits on the War Manpower Commission, and in response to questions asked by me and others it was brought out that in every instance these places are cleared through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has the floor. Does he yield, and, if so, to whom?

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Last week Mr. Mitchell, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, was present before the Committee on the Judiciary and testified in connection with another bill. He said that the Civil Service Commission made examinations of these new set-ups, so far as the personnel here in Washington was concerned; that in the field they did not have the force and they did not have the time to make such examination; but that upon the recommendations of new agencies, they certified the appointees pro forma, without making the examination, as I recall his testimony, and I think I recall it accurately. That testi-

mony has not as yet been printed, but I have seen a copy of it today. The kind of certificate made is purely perfunctory, according to the testimony of Mr. Mitchell, the Chairman of the Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we are now discussing the specific nominations which are before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, but the question was asked as to whether the Civil Service Commission aided in the selection of these appointees. The Civil Service Commission does aid in the way which I have described, which is substantially no aid.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon, while we were discussing Executive nominations, I made the statement that Mr. Mitchell had testified that the Civil Service Commission did not have jurisdiction over certain matters in the field. I did not have his testimony available at the time when I discussed the matter, but I have it now, and I desire to cite it.

On page 17 of the record made in the Committee on the Judiciary, the following occurred:

Senator McFARLAND. Don't you approve the qualifications of these men in the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. MITCHELL. We approve some of the regional directors.

Senator McKELLAR. Don't you approve all the regional directors?

Mr. MITCHELL. Very recently, since you passed the resolution.

I do not know to what resolution he referred.

I resume the quotation:

When the Office of Price Administration was first set up it operated with funds from the President, but they were left in part outside of the civil-service system. Then, later on, when Congress authorized the establishment of the Office of Price Administration as a statutory agency, these positions were placed under the civil-service system and Mr. Henderson was made head of it. The order at that time was that the work be started and to watch it. We had no eligible register and they nominated these people to us for these different types of jobs. We passed on their qualifications in general.

Again, on page 36, I find the following:

Mr. MITCHELL. No. I don't personally; I don't know who they are, but may I interject here that again the salaries, outside of Washington, are not fixed by the Civil Service Commission, by the Classification Division. The salaries in the field are not fixed.

Senator McKELLAR. That is very—well, gentlemen, the thought here that Mr. Mitchell has made, is a very enlightening statement. He says the salaries of all these people out in the field are not fixed by the Civil Service Commission. Well, most of these salaries are out in the field. If the Civil Service fixes the salaries in the city of Washington, how is it that the Civil Service Commission does not fix the salaries outside of the city of Washington?

Again, on page 37:

Mr. MITCHELL. The Civil Service Commission had nothing to do with salaries until 1923. At that time Congress enacted a law which provided that the classification system be established giving them jurisdiction over salaries in the departments in Washington. Later a bill was passed, the Ramspeck bill,

which provided that the classification system be extended to the field, upon the request of the Civil Service Commission, by the President.

Again, on page 38:

Senator McFARLAND. Mr. Mitchell, wouldn't it be almost impossible for you to extend that service to the field with your present personnel? Aren't you worked to death now with all these new jobs coming in?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; you are absolutely right in that, Senator. Of course, if it is a desirable thing to do, I think in the long run, it would be extended to the field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts from Mr. Mitchell's testimony given a day or two ago before the Committee on the Judiciary be printed in the RECORD at the place where the nominations were discussed and where I made a statement concerning Mr. Mitchell's testimony.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask who fixes the salaries?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The salaries are fixed under the Classification Act, and it is because of the apparent desire to comply with the Classification Act that the rather long and involved titles to which the Senator drew attention the other day have been adopted. I asked precisely the same questions of Governor McNutt and his associates.

May I now call attention—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wyoming leaves that point, I notice on page 2 of this list of nominations, for instance, that there is the position known as area director. At one point such a position pays \$5,600 a year, at another point \$6,500 a year, and at another point it pays \$4,600 a year. In each instance an area director is involved. Is that difference in pay the result of discretion in the appointive power?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot lay my finger on the exact testimony, but my understanding of that is that it results from the difference in the sizes of areas, in the amount of work that has to be done in the areas, the geographical extent of the areas, and the population.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think Chicago would voluntarily confess that it is smaller than Cleveland, although the pay seems to be smaller for the area director in Chicago whose name appears on this list.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The chances are that there is some difference in the responsibility.

I was about to answer the Senator's first question. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] propounded this question, which appears on page 46 of the hearings:

Senator JOHNSON. The point I am trying to get at, suppose the Senate confirms one of these nominations, then does it have to be approved, before or afterward, by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BARNETT. The Civil Service has approved them before their submission.

Senator JOHNSON. That is necessary?

Mr. BARNETT. Not legally required, but we want their approval of the qualifications of every man we appoint.

Then, omitting a few lines, the Senator from Colorado again said:

Senator JOHNSON. What I am trying to find out is to what extent civil-service rules apply in these appointments. I think it is a very important point for this committee to understand.

Mr. McNUTT. Well, as a matter of policy we clear these nominations with Civil Service before they are sent to the Senate.

Senator JOHNSON. And to what extent does their investigation go?

Mr. BARNETT. I could clear that up.

Mr. McNUTT. Go ahead.

Mr. BARNETT. The Civil Service, upon request, investigates all these war-service appointments primarily on the question of loyalty and character.

The previous employment record will be checked, if we have any question about it, and ask them to check it. Ordinarily, the previous record of appointment has been checked by our regional director before he recommends the case to us.

We ask Civil Service to make the study of the man's qualifications, to see if it meets the standards that we have agreed upon with them for these jobs, and to check his character and loyalty.

After having spent about 2 hours questioning Governor McNutt and his associates, I was satisfied that they were doing the best they could to comply with the standards of the civil service and the Classification Act, which is being followed by the civil-service agency of the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for the opinions of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the Senator's kind word.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to advise the Senator from Michigan that I have consulted the Civil Service authorities and find that they certify appointees on 24 hours' notice without having an opportunity to consult them or know anything about them. If they do not certify them in 24 hours they are accused of impeding the war effort. So far as these appointees are concerned, from what I have learned, the Civil Service Commission does not count.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I have the same impression as has the Senator from Vermont. I will say to the able Senator from Vermont that if the War Manpower Commission desires to employ someone it sends his name to the Civil Service Commission. If he is approved, his name is submitted, and if he is disapproved another name is submitted.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Civil Service Commission is expected to give its approval within 24 hours.

Mr. WALSH. When approval is not given, it is embarrassing to the Senator whose endorsement accompanies the submission of the name. It is merely a matter of form. No thorough investigation is made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then the practical effect would be that the Manpower Administrator can name whom he pleases

to whatever position he wishes to create, at approximately whatever salary he desires the employee to receive, within the rather loose general framework of the civil service law and the Classification Act.

Mr. WALSH. I believe that to be true. However, I also believe that if it were apparent that the applicant had had a criminal record, or was completely lacking in educational qualifications, the Civil Service Commission would not approve his appointment.

I repeat that the embarrassing thing is that instead of a Senator being asked to recommend someone from his locality or State, he is submitted a list of names of those whom the Civil Service Commission will approve. Therefore a Senator is first denied any initiative in the matter, and secondly, he is placed in the position of apparently rejecting a civil-service nomination instead of a nomination which has only the appearance of civil-service approval.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the practice followed in the case of the Senator from Massachusetts, I think he has been given a rather unusual degree of supervisory authority, because no such submission has ever been made to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator from Wyoming ascertain that the nominees from his State were approved by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently those in authority over the region in which the State of Wyoming is located have been cleared in this manner.

I believe, Mr. President, that there may be some misunderstanding of the situation. In order that my position may be understood, it should probably be called to the attention of the Senate that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, while sitting as a member of the deficiency subcommittee, of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is chairman, during the past year I have repeatedly questioned the heads of war agencies about the manner in which selections were made. There can be no doubt that a great deal of authority, power, and discretion has been extended to the agencies in the selection of their personnel, but it was done upon the authority of Congress. When Congress made the appropriations, under which the emergency agencies were created, and waived certain laws, it did so in the belief that speedy action was required, and that in the interest of the successful mobilization of our forces, as well as in carrying on the war, a great deal of discretion should be vested in the President and in the heads of the various agencies whom he selected.

Mr. WALSH. I think we all agree on that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will be through in just a moment. I am trying to lay the ground work—

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator is only laying the ground work now, he has embarked upon quite a long address.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not desire to make a long address, but I do wish to answer the Senator. I wish to satisfy him that the compliment which he paid the Senator from Wyoming a little while ago is perhaps not altogether misplaced. In the Appropriations Committee and in the Military Affairs Committee a sincere effort was made by the members of both committees to make certain that competent employees and officers were selected.

In the instant case I see on the desk of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] a file which was built up as a result of several questions asked by myself, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and other members of the committee. It contains a dossier on each of these nominations. A great many of the nominees are already in the Government service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a dossier so lacking in certain phases of information that the distinguished chairman had to change his mind with respect to one of the nominees when he obtained a little more light on the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That may have been the result of a suggestion from one of the Senators from the State involved.

My feeling is that we should not impede the action of the War Manpower Commission with respect to these nominations unless there is definite evidence that there has been an abuse of discretion. I believe that all the members of the committee sought in good faith to determine whether or not there had been any abuse of the discretion which had been vested in Governor McNutt, and I think there was not.

I do say, however, that in the past the various agencies, as well as the Civil Service Commission, have not given as much attention as they should give to the selection of personnel. Over a long period of years—long before the war began, and, indeed, long before this administration began—it has frequently been the practice of administrative bureaus to arrange for positions and salary groups by creating imposing names of the character mentioned here.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere in any way with the personnel of the War Manpower Commission. I do not want to have anything to do with the selection of any nominee or employee which the Manpower Commission may have. I agree that, under the circumstances, broad discretionary powers must be allowed. I also agree that in the first instance lump-sum appropriations must be made for personnel.

However, Mr. President, I return finally to the conviction that, since that is the war system under which we must operate, there should be at least one point where these positions, when created, pass in review before the Senate. I know of no possible way in which that may be done except by enactment of the McKellar bill, and that is why I am in favor of it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Mich-

igan, as well as other Members of the Senate, to page 53 of the hearings, from which I read as follows:

Senator HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation. If we are organizing an administrative force here of some 64,000 people, and we are going out into civil life to get those people to staff this organization, we are augmenting the very thing that we are expected to cure, are we not?

Then skipping a few lines:

Senator HOLMAN. I understand that; but by taking out the needed employees from the domestic economy of our country, who should be devoting all their time to the war effort, we are just augmenting a situation which we should be attempting to cure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining nominations in the War Manpower Commission will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest James Jaqua, of California, to be head employment specialist in the Bureau of Training, Washington office.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is to be no further discussion of these nominations, I ask that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

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

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James O. Blythe, Jr., to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

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

THE ARMY

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I hereby withdraw the nomination of the following-named officer to be Brigadier General: Paul Edmund Burrows.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, pursuant to the message from the President, the nomination of Paul Edmund Burrows to be brigadier general should be withdrawn from the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination is withdrawn from the calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move that the remaining nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

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

THE NAVY

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

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed during today's session.

LABOR CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES— NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will recur to the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe most Senators are familiar with my views regarding racketeering in labor by unscrupulous labor leaders during this great war crisis. Such activity has seriously retarded our war effort, and still is retarding our war effort, while millions of our brave sons are fighting on foreign battlefields, and many of them are dying because of insufficient weapons of war with which to protect themselves against the ruthless enemies. The shortage of war equipment is caused by strikes, slow-downs, absenteeism, and other rackets of the big labor barons engaged in such business for their own selfish, personal profit and prestige.

This is a new Congress; and for the benefit of the new members of this body, I want to take a little time today again to explain my views on this important subject. From the first day when I became a United States Senator I have stated my views and have introduced bills and offered amendments intended to stop the racketeering and to speed up war production. The Seventy-seventh Congress failed to act on my bills. I introduced them again early in this session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and it is my sincere hope that this Seventy-eighth Congress will enact all of them. They include the following: Senate bill 189, introduced on January 7, 1943, to outlaw the use of force and violence in preventing any person from engaging in any lawful vocation; Senate bill 190, introduced on January 7, 1943, abolishing restrictions which encourage the 40-hour week; Senate bill 191, introduced on January 7, 1943, abolishing the closed shop; and Senate Joint Resolution 4, introduced on January 7, 1943, giving to all of our citizens freedom to work.

Because I have so long and so consistently advocated lengthening the workweek beyond the limit of 40 hours, I am glad that our President finally has proved by his actions in issuing an Executive order on the subject that he, too, recognizes the urgent necessity of lengthening the workweek. However, I cannot bring myself to the belief that the matter should have been handled by Executive order instead of by legislative enactment, because I believe in constitutional government, and our Constitution plainly states that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." The order, as issued, is very confusing and impractical, and has all the earmarks of class legislation by Executive order. It jumps minimum workweek hours the distance of 8 hours in one long jump without providing for sliding it up gradually to best suit the conditions of employers and employees of individual institutions of various character, except insofar as it gives to the Manpower Commission some latitude in its administration. It completely ignores the interests of the overburdened taxpayers of the present generation and of future unborn generations who must pay the enormous additional cost of labor based on time and one-half for so-called overtime. It widens the present disgraceful disparity of income between our farm population and our nonfarm population by, over night, increasing by 30 percent the income of all affected nonfarm labor now working 40 hours per week, and decreasing the income for our farm population by preventing further increases in prices of farm products which are being produced at increased cost. It will tend to increase inflation by increasing buying power and decreasing production of consumer goods. It will further lower the morale of our already grossly mistreated and greatly discouraged dwindling farm population by attempting to force many of our highly qualified farm mechanics who have gone into factories, to return to the farm at almost starvation farm wages or farm income, or have their deferments canceled and be placed in the armed forces at an earlier date.

During the past several months I have stated at various times on the floor of this Chamber that, to my way of thinking, our policies with reference to agriculture were unfair and unjust and, because of that, were sure to bring on a serious food shortage in this country. That very thing has now happened, and at this time the food shortage in this Nation is so acute that strict rationing has been imposed on many articles. Unless we immediately reverse the trend of our unfair treatment of farmers, and give them treatment as fair and just as that which we give to our nonfarm population, I am convinced that the present serious food shortage will fast become more acute, and may reach famine proportions. Such a condition, of course, would seriously affect our war effort unless the war is won very soon. I say that with the full knowledge that our farm population is composed of sturdy, uncompromising, and patriotic people, and regardless of their personal welfare, they will continue to work and sacrifice and

do everything else within their power to produce enough food and fiber to feed and clothe our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies. But the handicaps and Government restrictions which have been imposed upon the farmers are so great that maximum food and fiber production simply is impossible.

While I deplore the miserable and unjust treatment which has been cooked up and dished out to our farmers and ranchers by our impractical and inexperienced, bungling bureaucrats in Washington, it is not entirely for their personal welfare that I am fighting. It is chiefly for the welfare and safety of our Nation as a whole that I am fighting; because without sufficient food and fiber we cannot win this war, and now is no time to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The farmers of the Nation have always constituted the backbone of our Nation; and for our Government to freeze the prices of their products to a point where their average per capita income amounts to only approximately 26 percent of the average per capita income of our nonfarm population, and then overnight by Executive order to raise the income of all affected nonfarm 40-hour-week workers 30 percent is, in my opinion, very unfair and unjust, and I believe it is wholly unnecessary. Those and many other features of the Executive order add to its impracticability and the confusion which its operation will create.

Being a sincere advocate of lengthening the workweek as a means of helping us win the war at an earlier date, and now having the definite assurance that our Commander in Chief also favors lengthening the workweek, I hope the Congress will recognize its legislative responsibilities and duties and will do the job the right way, by legislation. I hope the Senate will consider promptly the bills which I have already introduced and those which I shall introduce today which, I believe, if enacted will end much of the confusion, help abolish many injustices, foster some Government economy, and hasten victory for us and our allies.

Mr. President, ever since the United States started on its national defense program it has become increasingly evident day by day that our national defense effort has been seriously retarded because of labor conditions, strikes, and production restrictions throughout the industries of the country; and since we have entered the war period I have been impressed that there has been a continuation of all of those conditions which retard the war effort, except that actual strikes have been reduced in number.

I should like to invite the attention of Senators today to some of the more fundamental aspects of this question. Why was it that when this country first started on its general program of national defense, we had a wave of strikes throughout the entire Nation? We are told about how good the labor unions have been during recent months. I think it is well in this connection to look at the whole picture.

Back in 1940, Congress, at the request of the President, passed the National Guard Act and other laws which author-

ized the calling of the boys of the Nation to the armed services as a means of training them to defend the Nation against attacks which even then appeared to be imminent. Now let us see what the record shows. The statistics published by the United States Department of Labor show that from September 1940 to the end of 1941, we lost in this Nation, in round figures, 26,000,000 man-days on account of strikes. Did the strikes stop after Pearl Harbor? No.

The figures of the United States Department of Labor show that from the date of Pearl Harbor, through October 1942, strikes in the United States caused a loss of approximately four and one-half million man-days. When the Nation is facing the emergency which it now faces and which it has faced since 1940, why is it that the Nation has been swept by mass strikes?

Why was it that when we started out to build Army camps in which to house our soldier boys, it became the regular, established practice at nearly all of the buildings projects that a representative of the labor unions was present and that no man could work on many of the jobs until he had first paid his part of the tribute to those organizations?

Why is it today that throughout the country working rules which result in the unnecessary use of labor are being enforced in industries, at a time when the Nation faces a great manpower shortage? Why is it that we have maintained in this country the limitations of the 40-hour workweek when the farms of the country have been practically depopulated of labor in order to furnish workmen to carry on our war industries? Why is it that we have to endure the spectacle of seeing the War Labor Board render rulings which require employers to discharge their employees who for any reason decide they do not want to pay the union dues?

There can be no honest, sincere disagreement that all those things are interfering with the war effort. On the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House, we hear speeches in criticism of organized labor and in criticism of the various boards and bureaus of the Government. I think that the American people are entitled to fix the responsibility for those conditions. So far as I am concerned, I want to state as my very definite opinion that responsibility for the conditions which are slowing down the war effort does not lie entirely at the hands of the labor union racketeers throughout the Nation, but rests upon the Congress of the United States, which has by legislation enthroned in power in the Nation all elements of organized labor, both the good and the bad. Responsibility comes because the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation which has resulted in producing these conditions of which we now complain. But it is not enough for us to say here that the Congress of the United States in earlier sessions was responsible for creating the conditions of which we are now complaining.

The power to make laws is vested in Congress. It is not vested in the executive department of government or in the

judicial department of government. If we have in this country today a rule of the bureaucrat, who is not selected by the people, who is not responsible to the people, then we cannot escape the fact that this condition has come about because Congress has become the willing tool of other departments of government to write the laws they were told to write, and these laws have resulted in the conditions which I have already described.

We stand today as representatives of the people of this great Nation and we have the responsibility to correct conditions which threaten not only the present war effort, but which threaten the very fundamental principles of democratic government itself. Shall we content ourselves by simply standing on the floor of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate and complaining about the activities and the abuses of the power of these agencies which the Congress of the United States has created?

I hope not. I hope that there lies in the hearts of the Members of the United States Senate, and of the Members of the House of Representatives, a determination to do something more than merely talk about the evils which exist. I hope that there lies in the minds of my colleagues here in the Senate a determination to do something about them. And with that thought in mind, I want to suggest some very definite and concrete things which I think we can do about it, and which I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to do. The subjects which I shall now discuss are in addition to those I have already suggested.

The first matter I wish to discuss is the National Labor Relations Act. Respect for the time of the Members of the United States Senate precludes the possibility of my reviewing in full the history of the workings of this piece of legislation. It is not necessary for any of us to rely upon outside sources entirely in order that we may appraise fully the extreme abuses of the principles of democratic government inherent in the actions which have been taken by the National Labor Relations Board. For a detailed study of this, I most respectfully invite the attention of the Senate to the report of the House committee headed by the Representative from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I do not believe any Member of the Senate could read this report without reaching the opinion that the actions of the National Labor Relations Board, under authority of the National Labor Relations Act, when viewed collectively, constitute the blackest chapter in the history of governmental agencies in the United States. Here we find reports which show that the Board deliberately selected as trial examiners men who any reasonable man would have known were very partisan; men who the Board, apparently, knew would give no consideration to the rights of the employer, and but little, if any, even to the rights of organized labor if it did not happen to

be the particular branch of organized labor with which these partisans were in sympathy.

We have here the record to show that the power of the Government was used to blackmail and to force employers to take action which they were not required to take under the law. We have in this report facts to prove that representatives of the Board conspired to have charges filed against employers, and then later to sit as judges as to what should be done about them. There are in the record of this investigation facts to show that the administration of the Board was absolutely soaked with communism.

I do not believe any impartial man can read this report without arriving at the conclusion that the action of the Board during the period covered by the report was such as to serve to absolutely intimidate every employer in this country, and to create in the mind of every employer a feeling that he had no option except to go ahead and do whatever the wild-eyed labor racketeers demanded that he do, that his case would be prejudged before it ever reached the National Labor Relations Board, and therefore he would have no chance to secure fair and reasonable consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield.
Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks the abuses he has enumerated as disclosed in the Smith report were the result primarily of the law, or of the functions of the National Labor Relations Board, or of both.

Mr. O'DANIEL. My answer would be, of both.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, Congress has no power to appoint the members of the National Labor Relations Board, and assuming that the Board violated the spirit and the letter of the act, as the Senator has alleged, then, of course, the Congress has no remedy.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Except insofar as the legislation is concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. So I think that when the Senator fixes the responsibility for the abuses, there should be a distinction between those which may properly be laid at the door of the Congress, and those which may properly be laid at the door of the executive department. Otherwise we will be assuming a larger share of the responsibility than our constitutional functions require.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his observation, with which I heartily agree.

It was the attitude of the National Labor Relations Board disclosed in the report which was used so effectively as the club by organized labor to destroy or dominate American industry, and it was this situation which laid the foundation for the power of the various phases of organized labor to reach such a point that they believe they can stand

today, if necessary, and defy Government itself.

What I should like to impress upon Members of the Senate is the fact that responsibility for all this does not rest on the National Labor Relations Board; it does not rest on the executive department of Government, which recommended this legislation; the responsibility rests upon the Congress of the United States, which alone, in our form of government, had the power either to pass or decline to pass the National Labor Relations Act. I say, furthermore, that so long as we sit in the United States Senate as representatives of the people, and so long as we are content to allow this National Labor Relations Act to remain on the statute books of this Nation, just that long the responsibility for the things which happen in its administration becomes our own responsibility, and we cannot shove it aside and say that somebody else is responsible.

We in the Seventy-eighth Congress have the power to repeal the National Labor Relations Act if we so desire; we in the Seventy-eighth Congress have the authority to modify and amend the National Labor Relations Act if we wish to do so; and I say that we have more responsibility than the Congress which enacted the law because it may be said that those in the Congress who enacted the law did not realize at the time the dangers which this type of legislation carried with it. But we today can act in the light of experience; we do realize the danger; we have seen the law in operation; we have seen the National Labor Relations Board use the power of this act to blackmail American employers; we have seen the law used as a means of advancing the interests of the C. I. O. over the interests of the A. F. of L.; we have seen the law used at other times to advance the interests of the A. F. of L. over the interests of the C. I. O. We have seen its partisan use against both the employer and against particular labor unions which did not suit the representatives of the Government who at that time might be dealing with a particular situation under the law.

Therefore, we are charged not only with the same responsibility that faced the Congress of the United States which passed the law, but we are also charged with the additional responsibility of permitting the law to remain on the statute books even when we know of its abuses, even when we know of its dangers.

I realize the argument will be presented that all the facts to which I have referred, which were brought out in the report of the Smith committee, represented conditions that existed during the administration of persons who are no longer members of the National Labor Relations Board, and that we now have on this Board men who have adopted a more reasonable attitude in the administration of the law. I am willing to admit that the present members of the National Labor Relations Board are a great improvement over those who preceded them, but I am not willing to admit that

the present administration of the National Labor Relations Board is such as to demonstrate that it is possible to so administer this law that it will be fair among all those whom it affects, nor am I willing to admit that we now have an unbiased and unprejudiced administration of the act.

In this connection, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the decision rendered by the United States Supreme Court a few days ago—January 18—in the case of the National Labor Relations Board against the Indiana & Michigan Electric Co. This is a most interesting case and, I think, reveals very clearly the workings of the minds of those who compose the National Labor Relations Board. I shall not take time to quote all this decision, but I do want to refer to some items in it.

In this case Local No. B-9, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, had gone to the company and claimed they represented a majority of the employees of the company. There was a controversy about this; the company questioned the fact that this local did represent a majority of its employees. The case went to the National Labor Relations Board. The Board rendered a decision against the company, but after the opinion of the Board was delivered, the company appealed to the Board to permit it to submit additional evidence, as it claimed it would be able to show to the Board a course of depredations, including dynamiting of property for which the company alleged this union was responsible. The Board declined to reopen and review the case. The case was taken to the court of appeals, and the court of appeals ordered the Board to reopen this case and hear the evidence which the company proposed to submit.

Right here, in order to get the facts of this case before Senators and correct in the Record, I want to quote from the decision of the United States Supreme Court; the opinion of the Court having been delivered by Mr. Justice Jackson. Here are the apparent facts in this case as summarized by the Supreme Court:

For present purposes we take to be true the facts stated in the petition or offer of proof on the basis of which the court below directed a remand. These facts were stated on oath, and have not been denied. Petitioner says that we must hold that even if true they are immaterial. On this assumption of truth the case is as follows:

On November 12, 1938, Samuel Guy, the business manager of Local B-9 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, filed in amended form with the Board charges that the company had been guilty of several unfair labor practices. On the same day the Board through its regional director issued a complaint against the company, setting November 28, 1938, as a hearing date, and events of violence ensued in the following sequence as related to the company's steps in defense of the case:

The company filed its answer on November 23, 1938. On the following day, 4 days before the hearing, cables at one of the company's South Bend substations were dynamited. The hearings proceeded, and the trial examiner's intermediate report recommended generally against the company.

On September 1, 1939, the company filed its exceptions to the intermediate report. On September 5, three of its transmission line poles were sawed off, and on September 8, a

transmission line tower was dynamited. On October 17, 1939, the oral hearing on the exceptions was set before the Board at Washington for November 9, 1939. Two days later another transmission line tower was dynamited. On October 28, two transmission poles at different locations were dynamited. Another transmission tower was so destroyed on October 30, 10 days before the oral hearing, and two more at different parts of the system on November 23, 1939. All carried high-voltage lines, and some were located along public highways or railroad tracks.

On February 19, 1940, the company filed with the Board a petition to reopen the case and receive further evidence. This petition alleged the commission of the depredations upon its property as set forth above and further that: John R. Marks, assistant business manager of Local B-9, and Earl Freeman, one of its members, both of whom had been witnesses against the company and three others, were arrested after February 1, 1940, and charged with the commission of some or all of the depredations, and with having conspired to commit them all. Except Marks, each had made confessions stating that Marks paid them sums of money aggregating \$2,325 for committing such acts.

One of them states that Marks had caused the first dynamiting to intimidate the company in connection with the hearing, and three stated that he had caused later ones to intimidate it in connection with the oral argument. The company proposed by the evidence of dynamiting to discredit Marks and Freeman, on whose testimony the trial examiner appeared to rely. It also sought to discredit Guy, who also had been a witness, on the claim that he knew, or must have known, of the use of the \$2,325 of the union's money for the purpose of destroying respondent's property. But it claimed more. It asserted evidence of a conspiracy to destroy property to influence the pending case, which it contended was not a good faith labor controversy, but an unlawful effort of Local B-9 to coerce respondent to require its employees to join the union.

On February 28, 1940, the Board denied the company's petition. It held that "the matters recited therein have no relation to the issues in this proceeding." The Board went on to make findings on the issues, expressly reciting that it did so "upon the entire record in the case." While the Board did not designate all of the testimony for printing, it has certified it all to us, it has stricken no testimony of any witness in question from the record, and has made no finding that any specific parts of it were not relied upon.

Now, Mr. President, let me impress here the statement made by the Board as quoted in the opinion of the Supreme Court. I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that it was the expressed opinion of the Board that even if all the charges which the company alleged to be true, were true, that the matters recited therein have no relation to the issues in the case. I say that that is a remarkable statement. Here we have a case where the company alleged its property was dynamited, that transmission poles were destroyed, that the lives of its employees and the lives of citizens generally were jeopardized, and the company alleged further that this was accomplished by the same agents of this labor union whom the Board was ordering the company to bargain with, but still the Board says that even if all this were true, the Board's original opinion directing the company to bargain with this union still stands.

I appeal to my fellow Senators as fair-minded men, charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the American workmen and the rights of the citizens of this Nation, to answer in their own minds, what labor conditions may we expect to develop in this country in the future if we permit a law to remain on our statute books under which an agency of this Government may say deliberately and officially to an employer that, "All you say about these people, with whom we have ordered you to engage in collective bargaining, being dynamiters, may be true," under which the Board says to the employer, "It may be that this labor union dynamited your transmission lines in order to force you to bargain with them; it may be that they are criminals; but, nevertheless, they represent the union and you must bargain with them."

Mr. President, I say that if this is what the law means, if the National Labor Relations Board is right when it says that under the law a thug or a dynamiter may serve as the representative of employees in collective bargaining, and that the employer must, irrespective of this fact, meet with such thugs and dynamiters around the conference table to negotiate a contract to cover his employees, then it is high time that such a law be taken off the statute books of this Nation.

Later the National Labor Relations Board ordered the reinstatement of some of the employees, and payment of back wages, and the Board petitioned the circuit court to enforce this order. Later the company answered this petition and at the same time petitioned the circuit court to remand this case to the Board for further hearing. In this petition the company referred to its earlier petition in which it stated under oath that the employee, Freeman, whom the Board had ordered the company to reinstate along with two other members of the brotherhood, had been convicted in the courts of the dynamiting described in the first petition which had been filed, and had been sentenced to a term of from 2 to 14 years in the State penitentiary, and that two others had pleaded guilty to similar acts. One of those sentenced said he had obtained the money to purchase the dynamite and to pay the dynamiters from the treasury of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. B-9.

The company pointed out in its petition that during the hearings the trial examiner had urged the company's attorney to settle the case, and that the attorney for the company had brought to the attention of the trial examiner the dynamitings which had occurred, and had also referred the Board representative to practices and methods of the officers of this union and to the record in the case of Michael J. Boyd, the international vice president of the union, who had previously been convicted in a similar case. The company stated in its petition that the examiner of the Board replied:

Well, your company will be required sometime to recognize Local B-9 and you might as well do it now.

Mr. President, I most respectfully invite all Senators to read this entire opinion of the Supreme Court, because even thus far I have not brought out all the facts in this case: I think it is to the credit of the Supreme Court of the United States that by a majority opinion the National Labor Relations Board was ordered to review this case and to consider all the evidence. But it is significant to consider in this connection the fact that the National Labor Relations Board, in its construction and interpretation of the law, felt that it had a right to contend that a dynamiter already convicted in the courts and already sentenced to the penitentiary, as well as others guilty of destroying company property, still had a right to claim to be the legal representatives of the employees of this company.

I introduced at the last session of Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, designed to protect the right of every man in this country to join a labor union or to stay out of a labor union as he might see fit. I have reintroduced this joint resolution at this session of the Congress, and I shall aggressively urge its adoption.

I am not unmindful, however, of the fact that the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is a slow process, and, therefore, I feel that it probably would not be wise at this time absolutely to repeal the National Labor Relations Act, because it does have some sections which, if properly administered, would serve the interests of the great rank and file of the working people. I say frankly that if the constitutional amendment which I have proposed were adopted, there would be no need for the National Labor Relations Act, because the Constitution itself would be the guaranty to employees throughout this Nation that their rights to act individually or collectively to improve their labor situation would be protected in that Constitution.

But until this is done, it might be better to amend the National Labor Relations Act and take out of the act some of the most glaring objections and some of the things which have been the basis for much of the undemocratic action taken by the National Labor Relations Board. I have, therefore, prepared and will introduce today bills to amend the National Labor Relations Act. In the proposals which I am offering to amend this law, I have not sought to remove all the objectionable features of this law, but rather to deal only with those cases in which the abuse of power has been most glaring.

At this time I invite the attention of the Senators to three bills which I am proposing to amend the National Labor Relations Act. I am not trying to rewrite the act. Certainly I am not trying in any way to take away from labor any of the protection which it is guaranteed by the act. The three bills which I am proposing will, I believe, meet with the approval of this body. I believe they will be approved by those who believe the general purpose of the Na-

tional Labor Relations Act to be good; and I believe they will be approved by those who doubt the value of this law.

The first bill which I offer to amend the law is the following:

Amend subsection (3) of section 2, by adding at the end of this subsection the following:

"Provided, however, That the Board shall have no power to order the reinstatement of an employee or order payment of back wages to an employee where the employee has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer; nor shall any employer be required to accept as a collective-bargaining agency to represent his employees any person or organization that has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any labor dispute or in connection with any effort to organize the employees of said employer."

It is obvious that this bill is designed to accomplish two purposes, and two purposes only: First, it is designed to guarantee that employees who become thugs and who dynamite and unlawfully seek to destroy the property of their employer will thereby sacrifice any protection which, as employees, they would be entitled to under this act. In other words, it says to the employer that the National Labor Relations Board shall not have authority to order him to reinstate and pay back wages to employees who have unlawfully engaged in violence and the destruction of his property.

The bill has another purpose, and that is to say to the employer:

You will not be required under this law to accept as collective-bargaining agents to represent your employees persons or organizations who have willfully engaged in violence or the unlawful destruction or seizure of your property.

We know that under the present law employers are being ordered to reinstate and pay back wages to employees who have engaged in these practices, and we know that under the present law employers are being ordered to accept as collective-bargaining agents individuals and organizations who have been guilty of violence and the unlawful destruction of property. I believe that it is the responsibility of the United States Senate to see that these practices are stopped, and that is all that the bill would do.

The second bill which I am proposing is to amend section 8. This bill would amend that section by adding at the end of the first line of the section, following the word "employer", the words:

A labor organization, or an officer, member, or employee of a labor organization, or any other person or persons.

In other words, if this bill amending the act should be passed the law would then provide that it would be an unfair labor practice for any employer or labor organization or anyone else to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed to them under the law. As the law now stands, it is a violation of the law for the employer to coerce and intimidate his employees, but a labor organization can use

all the coercion and intimidation it may desire to use without in any sense violating the law.

It is my conception that this law was designed in the beginning to protect the rights of employees, and that it was never the intention of the law that powerful labor organizations should be allowed to use all the power and coercion they desired to use, but that the employer, and the employer alone, should be restrained from such action. If this bill should be enacted, every restraint which the law now carries against the employer attempting to coerce his employees would still remain in the law; the only thing this bill would do would be to put labor organizations under the same restraint which the employer is now under. They, too, would be prevented from using coercion and intimidation.

The third bill which I propose to amend the law would read as follows:

Amend section 8 by adding a new subsection to be numbered subsection (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Nothing in this act shall be construed as preventing the employer from expressing his opinion concerning any matter affecting the relationship between employer and employee. The employer shall be free to state to his employees his opinion and preferences concerning any labor organization, or organizations, seeking to secure the right to represent his employees and such right shall include the right of the employer to free, open discussion of all the issues involved: *Provided,* That the employer in such discussion shall not threaten to deprive his employees of any rights which they have under the law."

This bill is submitted on the theory that employers throughout this country are not all crooks. It is submitted on the theory that the employer should have the right, so long as he does not attempt to coerce his employees, to express to them his opinion concerning any proposed effort to unionize his plant. It may be said, and I think it can truly be said, that the Supreme Court of the United States has already upheld this right under the present law; but the fact is that the National Labor Relations Board still seeks to use the law as a means of intimidating employers, and it will continue so to use it unless the law is amended. I believe that we, as representatives of the American people, should realize that there are thousands upon thousands of small employers throughout the Nation who are not able financially to spend the amount of money which they must spend to take a case to the Supreme Court of the United States. Therefore, these small employers are intimidated by the rulings of the National Labor Relations Board, and they are deprived of the right to discuss these matters with their employees.

I therefore believe that the law should be so amended as to take out of the present act the power which the National Labor Relations Board has so successfully used to intimidate and coerce the small employers throughout the Nation and to deprive them of the right of free speech and the right to discuss these matters frankly with their employees.

Let me summarize the results which would be achieved if the three bills which I am offering to amend the National Labor Relations Act should be enacted. First, we would serve notice on the people throughout the Nation that the Senate of the United States is opposed to the use of force and violence and the destruction of property by employees of a company, and that employees who engage in such action and the labor organizations which willfully aid them in such action will not be allowed in the future to operate under the cover of the law.

Second, we would extend the protection which the law now gives to employees against the coercion of their employers, and we would provide that in the future all employees of every company in the United States shall be free to exercise their rights under the law and that they shall be protected not only from the coercion of employers, but also from coercion of labor organizations and all other persons.

Third, we would announce to the world the policy that the Senate of the United States believes in protecting the right of free speech and believes in allowing such vital matters as the relationship between employer and employee to be the subject of free and open discussion based on the merits of the controversy.

I believe that the adoption of three bills to amend the law in those ways would tremendously improve its operation. Therefore, I introduce three bills having those purposes, and ask that they be referred to the proper committee for prompt consideration.

The bills (S. 726) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, (S. 727) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and (S. 728) to amend the National Labor Relations Act were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Monday, February 15, 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

James S. Miller, February 1, 1943.
Gordon G. Braendle, February 16, 1943.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR NAVY

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Floyd C. Camp, December 16, 1941.
Bosquet N. Wev, January 1, 1942.
Clarence E. Coffin, Jr., January 1, 1942.
William A. Deam, January 1, 1942.
Paul F. Johnston, January 1, 1942.
William M. Searles, March 1, 1942.
Albert C. Burrows, March 1, 1942.
Irwin F. Beyerly, March 1, 1942.
Stephen H. Ambruster, March 20, 1942.

Thomas A. Donovan, June 30, 1942.
Frank McD. Nichols, June 30, 1942.
Richard E. Hawes, June 30, 1942.
Charles E. Weakley, June 30, 1942.
Henry S. Persons, June 30, 1942.
Samuel C. Anderson, June 30, 1942.
Joseph B. Berkley, June 30, 1942.
Jacob W. Waterhouse, June 30, 1942.
Edward F. Hutchins, June 30, 1942.
John A. Collett, June 30, 1942.
William H. Watson, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Clayton C. Marcy, June 30, 1942.
Roy S. Benson, June 30, 1942.
Samuel B. Frankel, June 30, 1942.
John Andrews, Jr., June 30, 1942.
William M. Walsh, June 30, 1942.
Kemp Tolley, June 30, 1942.
Frederic S. Keeler, June 30, 1942.
Clayton C. McCauley, June 30, 1942.
Finley E. Hall, June 30, 1942.
William I. Darnell, June 30, 1942.
William J. Galbraith, June 30, 1942.
Royce P. Davis, June 30, 1942.
Harry N. Coffin, June 30, 1942.
James T. Hardin, June 30, 1942.
David J. Welsh, June 30, 1942.
Lloyd K. Greenamyre, June 30, 1942.
Donald T. Eller, June 30, 1942.
Gustave N. Johansen, June 30, 1942.
Frank P. Mitchell, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Rob R. McGregor, June 30, 1942.
Daniel Carlson, June 30, 1942.
Edward J. Burke, June 30, 1942.
Francis D. Jordan, June 30, 1942.
Erle V. Dennett, June 30, 1942.
John P. Rembert, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Adolph J. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Almon E. Loomis, June 30, 1942.
John Raby, June 30, 1942.
Alexander H. Hood, June 30, 1942.
Roderick S. Rooney, June 30, 1942.
Egbert A. Roth, June 30, 1942.
Donald F. Weiss, June 30, 1942.
Edward C. Stephan, June 30, 1942.
Jacob W. Britt, June 30, 1942.
Charles R. Fenton, June 30, 1942.
Whitmore S. Butts, June 30, 1942.
Carl A. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
Charles E. Brunton, June 30, 1942.
George L. Kohr, June 30, 1942.
James H. Flatley, Jr., June 30, 1942.
George A. Sharp, June 30, 1942.
William S. Stovall, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Leroy C. Simpler, June 30, 1942.
Thurlow W. Davison, June 30, 1942.
Augustus R. St. Angelo, June 30, 1942.
Carl E. Giese, June 30, 1942.
Philip R. Osborn, June 30, 1942.
Carl G. Christie, June 30, 1942.
John H. McElroy, June 30, 1942.
William J. Richter, June 30, 1942.
James H. Hean, June 30, 1942.
Griswold T. Atkins, June 30, 1942.
Peter H. Horn, June 30, 1942.
Charles B. Martell, June 30, 1942.
James H. Howard, June 30, 1942.
Bruce E. S. Trippensee, June 30, 1942.
Donald W. Gladney, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frederick V. H. Hilles, June 30, 1942.
Paul L. de Vos, June 30, 1942.
William B. Epps, June 30, 1942.
Manley H. Simons, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Richard R. Briner, June 30, 1942.
Harry B. Dodge, June 30, 1942.
Kleber S. Masterson, June 30, 1942.
Herman N. Larson, June 30, 1942.
Joseph A. E. Hindman, June 30, 1942.
John R. Craig, June 30, 1942.
Marshall E. Dornin, June 30, 1942.
Volckert P. Douw, June 30, 1942.
Frank I. Winant, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Raymond W. Johnson, June 30, 1942.
Richard M. Nixon, June 30, 1942.
James A. Adkins, June 30, 1942.
Ephraim P. Holmes, June 30, 1942.
Wilfred A. Walter, June 30, 1942.
Walter M. Foster, June 30, 1942.
William C. Butler, Jr., June 30, 1942.
George B. Chafee, June 30, 1942.
Frank L. Johnson, June 30, 1942.

Francis E. Bardwell, June 30, 1942.
William H. Kirvan, June 30, 1942.
Lot Ensey, June 30, 1942.
Peter R. Lackner, June 30, 1942.
Hugh T. MacKay, June 30, 1942.
Herman A. Fiecczentkowski, June 30, 1942.
Thomas B. Haley, June 30, 1942.
Mell A. Peterson, June 30, 1942.
Burrell C. Allen, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Samuel M. Randall, June 30, 1942.
Alexander S. Heyward, Jr., June 30, 1942.
John O. Kinert, June 30, 1942.
Martin C. Burns, June 30, 1942.
Donald F. Krick, June 30, 1942.
John W. Ailes 3d, June 30, 1942.
Edward S. Carmick, June 30, 1942.
George C. Seay, June 30, 1942.
Dudley W. Morton, June 30, 1942.
John R. McKnight, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Lynne C. Quiggle, June 30, 1942.
William S. Estabrook, Jr., June 30, 1942.
John E. Lee, June 30, 1942.
Henry O. Hansen, June 30, 1942.
Bernhart A. Fuetsch, June 30, 1942.
Jack S. Dorsey, June 30, 1942.
Otis J. Earle, June 30, 1942.
Gifford Scull, June 30, 1942.
Howard G. Corey, June 30, 1942.
Alfred E. Grove, June 30, 1942.
Lance E. Massey, June 30, 1942.
Eugene T. Sands, June 30, 1942.
James W. Davis, June 30, 1942.
Clyde B. Stevens, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Frank P. Luongo, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Kenneth McL. Gentry, June 30, 1942.
Thomas L. Wogan, June 30, 1942.
George M. Holley, June 30, 1942.
Robert J. Esslinger, June 30, 1942.
William M. Drane, June 30, 1942.
Albert S. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Joseph E. Dodson, June 30, 1942.
James D. L. Grant, June 30, 1942.
Frank B. Miller, June 30, 1942.
Warren H. McClain, June 30, 1942.
John B. Gragg, June 30, 1942.
Robert H. Taylor, June 30, 1942.
Edgar J. MacGregor 3d, June 30, 1942.
Paul P. Blackburn, Jr., June 30, 1942.
Parke H. Brady, June 30, 1942.
Edward C. Renfro, June 30, 1942.
Charles W. Lord, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Rollin E. Westholm, July 1, 1941.
Alfred D. Kilmartin, July 1, 1941.
David Nash, December 8, 1941.
Francis D. Walker, Jr., December 16, 1941.
Eli T. Reich, January 1, 1942.
John J. Flachsenshar, January 1, 1942.
William C. Thompson, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Robert B. Kail, January 1, 1942.
Ross E. Freeman, January 1, 1942.
Marion F. Ramirez de Arellano, January 1, 1942.
Norvell G. Ward, January 1, 1942.
Jack M. Seymour, January 1, 1942.
Ted A. Hilger, January 1, 1942.
Thomas R. Mackie, January 1, 1942.
Howard S. Westin, January 1, 1942.
William S. Sampson, January 1, 1942.
Arthur V. Ely, January 1, 1942.
Walter J. East, Jr., January 1, 1942.
William S. Guest, January 1, 1942.
Eugene A. Barham, January 1, 1942.
George Philip, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Amos T. Hathaway, January 1, 1942.
Samuel Nixdorff, January 1, 1942.
Edwin Denby, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Dennis C. Lyndon, January 1, 1942.
Louis H. Bauer, January 1, 1942.
Slade D. Cutter, January 1, 1942.
Francis X. Maher, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Harold W. McDonald, January 1, 1942.
Stanley W. Lipski, January 1, 1942.
Frederick R. Matthews, January 1, 1942.
Page Knight, January 1, 1942.
Robert Van R. Bassett, Jr., January 1, 1942.
Manning M. Kimmel, January 1, 1942.
Harold H. Larsen, January 1, 1942.
John M. Ennis, January 1, 1942.

Edward F. Scott, January 1, 1942.
 Ralph L. Ramey, January 1, 1942.
 Stephen H. Gimber, January 1, 1942.
 Kenneth G. Schacht, January 1, 1942.
 Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 George R. Lee, January 1, 1942.
 Theodore H. Winters, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Thomas A. Baldwin, January 1, 1942.
 Ronald K. Irving, January 1, 1942.
 George A. O'Connell, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Horace C. Laird, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Earle G. Gardner, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Rodney J. Badger, January 1, 1942.
 Allan C. Edmands, January 1, 1942.
 George S. Lambert, January 1, 1942.
 Henry G. Shoner, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 John G. Downing, January 1, 1942.
 Sibley L. Ward, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Robert M. Hinckley, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Joseph W. Antonides, January 1, 1942.
 James L. Jordan, January 1, 1942.
 Phillip K. Sherman, January 1, 1942.
 Joseph E. Rice, January 1, 1942.
 Jack R. Crutchfield, January 1, 1942.
 Joseph A. Crook, January 1, 1942.
 Otto F. Kolb, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 Millard J. Smith, January 1, 1942.
 Earl R. Crawford, January 1, 1942.
 George A. Wagner, Jr., January 1, 1942.
 John H. Turner, January 1, 1942.
 Ovid McM. Butler, January 1, 1942.
 George W. Grider, January 1, 1942.
 Harry B. Stark, January 1, 1942.
 David R. Connoie, February 1, 1942.
 Walter F. Schlech, Jr., February 1, 1942.
 David S. Brown, February 10, 1942.
 William G. Holman, February 20, 1942.
 Henry C. Schwane, Jr., March 1, 1942.
 John F. Ryder, March 1, 1942.
 Donald W. Wilson, March 1, 1942.
 Carl W. Heywood, March 1, 1942.
 Robert A. Bonin, March 1, 1942.
 David C. Richardson, March 1, 1942.
 Thomas K. Kimmel, March 1, 1942.
 Charles S. Manning, Jr., March 25, 1942.
 Thomas B. Dabney, March 28, 1942.
 James R. Hansen, April 21, 1942.
 John N. Boland, May 1, 1942.
 Porter W. Maxwell, May 7, 1942.
 Bennett C. Oelheim, May 9, 1942.
 Theodore C. Lyster, Jr., June 1, 1942.
 John V. Noel, Jr., June 1, 1942.
 Hoyt D. Mann, June 1, 1942.
 George H. Whiting, June 3, 1942.
 Malcolm C. McGrath, June 5, 1942.
 Jack C. Moore, June 10, 1942.
 Paul E. Summers, June 24, 1942.
 William A. Small, June 27, 1942.
 Gilven M. Slonim, June 30, 1942.
 William A. Ellis, June 30, 1942.
 Donald G. Gumz, June 30, 1942.
 Paul C. Stimson, June 30, 1942.
 Everett M. Link, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Marshall F. Thompson, June 30, 1942.
 Richard R. Pratt, June 30, 1942.
 Joseph B. Icenhower, June 30, 1942.
 Gordon Fowler, June 30, 1942.
 Frank E. Hayler, June 30, 1942.
 John K. Fyfe, June 30, 1942.
 James W. McCauley, June 30, 1942.
 Ed R. King, June 30, 1942.
 David Zabriskie, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Bruce R. Ware 3d, June 30, 1942.
 Richard W. Meyers, June 30, 1942.
 Robert H. Caldwell, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 James B. Rutter, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Richard S. Bull, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 David S. Seaman, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 John H. Carmichael, June 30, 1942.
 Daniel M. Entler, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Forrest W. Simoneau, June 30, 1942.
 Phillip G. Wild, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Harlan G. Kirkpatrick, June 30, 1942.
 Robert C. Morton, June 30, 1942.
 Harry F. Holmshaw, June 30, 1942.
 Samuel G. Shilling, June 30, 1942.
 Jud F. Yoho, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Fred D. Michael, June 30, 1942.
 Donald G. Dockum, June 30, 1942.

William H. Shea, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 William H. Wright, June 30, 1942.
 Edward J. Huxtable, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Ormond G. Sexton, June 30, 1942.
 Walter W. Boyd, June 30, 1942.
 John R. Millett, June 30, 1942.
 Ralph A. Embree, June 30, 1942.
 Renfro Turner, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 William J. Lederer, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Paul H. Bjarnason, June 30, 1942.
 Louis J. Gulliver, Jr., June 30, 1942.
 Van Ostrand Perkins, June 30, 1942.
 Frank C. Graham, June 30, 1942.
 Thomas W. Samuel, June 30, 1942.
 Paul B. Ryan, June 30, 1942.
 John J. Kircher, June 30, 1942.
 William E. Lewis, June 30, 1942.
 Ralph R. Humes, June 30, 1942.
 Edward E. Hoffman, June 30, 1942.
 The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942:
 John J. Wells
 Thomas W. McDaniel, Jr.
 Harold E. Gillespie
 Assistant Surgeon Robert C. Ray to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.
 The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
 Jerome B. Casey, August 1, 1941.
 Clarence R. Connell, January 1, 1942.
 Assistant Paymaster Charles H. Keyser to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.
 Acting Chaplain Joseph P. Mannion to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.
 The following-named assistant surgeons to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:
 Charles W. Collins, Jr., January 25, 1942.
 Ralph N. Westfall, January 25, 1942.
 Samuel Zurik, January 25, 1942.
 Richard W. Rommel, January 25, 1942.
 Walter F. Fitzpatrick, Jr., January 25, 1942.
 Marshall Eskridge, January 25, 1942.
 George L. Abrams, January 25, 1942.
 John L. Tullis, January 25, 1942.
 George E. F. Stocker, January 25, 1942.
 Paul F. Maness, January 25, 1942.
 George D. Broyles, Jr., January 28, 1942.
 Harold E. Williamson, February 2, 1942.
 Murray H. Brown, February 16, 1942.
 Atlee B. Hendricks, February 20, 1942.
 Francis E. Schlueter, March 9, 1942.
 Thomas A. McGoldrick, Jr., March 12, 1942.
 Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Frank G. Reynolds, A-V(N), United States Naval Reserve, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of November 1940.
 Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Melvin V. Young, DC-V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 13th day of August 1942.
 The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
 John C. Hetler, November 7, 1940.
 Stephen B. Lee, November 7, 1940.
 Robert P. Kelley, November 19, 1941.
 Joe B. Scatchard, Jr., November 19, 1941.
 John M. Malloy, November 19, 1941.
 Stanley J. Scott, November 19, 1941.
 George C. McCarten, November 19, 1941.
 Frederick W. Beck, November 19, 1941.
 Jay W. Martin, November 19, 1941.

Clarence W. Linden, November 19, 1941.
 Robert H. Wilson, November 19, 1941.
 Stuart H. Smith, November 19, 1941.
 John D. Smith, November 19, 1941.
 Robert C. Roesler, November 19, 1941.
 James R. Miller, Jr., November 19, 1941.
 Woodford L. Flowers, March 23, 1942.
 The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:
 Harlan F. Winn, December 15, 1940.
 William C. Owens, December 15, 1940.
 George T. Swiggum, December 15, 1940.
 William F. Weaver, December 15, 1940.
 Wilfred J. Williams, December 15, 1940.
 William E. Davidson, December 15, 1940.
 Edward F. Grable, December 15, 1940.
 Gordon A. MacDonald, December 26, 1940.
 Robert E. Bennett, December 31, 1940.
 Harry F. MacKay, January 8, 1941.
 Frederick T. Ebersole, January 13, 1941.
 Don L. Clark, February 3, 1941.
 John A. Dominy, February 21, 1941.
 Vincent G. Lauters, February 24, 1941.
 Edgar G. Crawford, May 18, 1941.
 Antoine P. Parker, May 18, 1941.
 Charles J. Simandi, May 18, 1941.
 William F. Luce, May 26, 1941.
 John D. Burky, November 18, 1941.
 Walter M. Eger, November 18, 1941.
 Thomas J. Doyle, January 19, 1942.
 Donald M. Rait, October 1, 1942.
 Joseph J. Newman, December 1, 1942.
 William W. Olmstead, December 1, 1942.
 Richard D. Pinkerton, December 1, 1942.
 Thomas E. Barnett, February 20, 1943.
 William E. Norcross, February 20, 1943.
 William H. Patterson, February 20, 1943.
 Donald R. Rooke, February 20, 1943.
 Peter H. Smith, February 20, 1943.
 Dennis K. Culp, February 20, 1943.
 William S. Ralston, February 20, 1943.
 Wilburn J. McFarland, Jr., February 20, 1943.
 James C. Young, February 20, 1943.
 Miltiades J. Prassas, February 20, 1943.
 John A. Erickson, February 20, 1943.
 Joseph R. Braheney, February 20, 1943.
 Everett H. Bourquard, February 20, 1943.
 Spencer R. Smith, February 20, 1943.
 William T. Maley, Jr., February 20, 1943.
 Verne M. Tregonis, February 20, 1943.
 Charles Allegrone, February 20, 1943.
 Donald H. Bennett, February 20, 1943.
 Warren S. Bellows, Jr., February 20, 1943.
 John H. McAuliffe, Jr., February 20, 1943.
 Sidney Mank, February 20, 1943.
 Norman L. Martinson, February 20, 1943.
 Edward G. Underhill, February 20, 1943.
 Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Eugene C. Lytle, DC-V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 28th day of October 1942.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate Monday, February 15, 1943:

IN THE ARMY

Col. Paul Edmund Burrows to be a brigadier general, for temporary appointment, in the Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Monday, February 15, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Hooker A. Doolittle to be a consul general of the United States of America.

C. Burke Elbrick to be a consul of the United States of America.

Ernest de W. Mayer to be a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

James O. Blythe, Jr., to be a passed assistant dental surgeon to rank from November 20, 1942.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Ernest James Jaqua to be head employment specialist, at \$6,500 per annum, Bureau of Training, Washington office.

Charles W. Patrick to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, San Francisco area office.

George D. Penniman, Jr., to be labor utilization analyst, at \$6,500 per annum, Washington regional office.

Daniel J. Boyle to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

Frederick J. Graham to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

David G. Nagle to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, Boston regional office.

Harold L. Rothschild to be head labor utilization analyst, at \$6,500 per annum, Minneapolis regional office.

Carlos Stageberg to be senior labor utilization analyst, at \$4,600 per annum, Minneapolis regional office.

Louis C. M. Abolin to be assistant labor utilization analyst (trainee), at \$4,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

Thomas J. Corcoran to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, Syracuse area office.

Donald Theodore Larin, to be senior agricultural employment specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, Minneapolis regional office.

Aloysius J. McGinty, to be area director, at \$5,600 per annum, Albany area office.

Edward L. Stevens, to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, Washington regional office.

Hervey Allen, to be information specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, Atlanta regional office.

Dr. Paul C. Barton, to be assistant director, at \$5,600 per annum, for the Procurement and Assignment Service of the Bureau of Placement, Washington office.

Chester W. Hepler, to be area director at \$5,600 per annum, Chicago area office.

William Parkinson, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, Omaha area office.

T. Hilliard Cox, to be program control technician, at \$5,600 per annum, Kansas City, Mo., regional office.

William P. Edmunds, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, Cleveland area office.

Marion A. Gregg, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, Youngstown, Ohio, area office.

Merriam H. Trytten, to be principal employment specialist (physics), at \$5,600 per annum, Bureau of Training, Washington, office.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

Walter Krueger
Millard Fillmore Harmon

To be major generals

Joseph May Swing
Louis Aleck Craig
Edwin Jacob House
Idwal Hubert Edwards
Robert Walter Crawford
Paul William Baade
Nathan Farragut Twining
Harris Marcy Melasky
Ulysses Simpson Grant 3d
William Claude McMahon
Alfred Maximilian Gruenther

To be brigadier generals

Albert Pierson
Wyburn Dwight Brown
Verne Donald Mudge
Frank Huber Partridge
William Joseph Flood
Robert Chauncey Macon

Clyde Charles Alexander
Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr.
Herbert Ludwell Earnest
Dennis Edward McCunniff
Charles Leslie Keerans, Jr.
Bob Edward Nowland
William Henry Donaldson, Jr.
Robert Wells Harper
Jonathan Lane Holman
John Kirkland Rice
Jens Anderson Doe
John Gordon Williams
Edwin Eugene Schwien
William Donald Old
Alexander Oscar Gorder
Frederick Lewis Anderson, Jr.
Marcellus Lowry Stockton, Jr.
Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg
Clarence Ames Martin
Robert William Strong
Walter Ernst Lauer
Clarence Howard Kells
Hugh Nathan Herrick
Aubrey Hornsby
Paul Bernard Wurtsmith
Robert Kauch
Norman Daniel Cota
Ray Guy Harris
Bryant Edward Moore
Philip Edward Gallagher
Leland Ross Hewitt
George Luke Usher
Frank Lawrence Whitaker
Lester Smith Ostrander
George Platt Tourtellot
Troup Miller
Truman Hempel Landon
Horace Harding
Alvan Cleveland Kincaid
Pierre Mallett
Paul Everton Peabody
James Cave Crockett

To be major general

Harry Hubbard Johnson

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Richard L. Conolly
Frank J. Lowry
Ralph W. Christie

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Clara G. Ross, Bellamy.
Bobbie B. Hardegree, Talladega.
Effie Segó, Waterloo.

ARKANSAS

Kenneth B. Lasswell, Helena.
Lucy A. Stedley, Heth.
Oscar A. Teague, Hickory Ridge.
John S. Moses, McCaskill.
David A. Massey, Palestine.

CALIFORNIA

Alice E. Simmons, Alpine.
Bessie K. Gore, Glen Ellen.
Oliver W. Parkison, Felton.
Mary C. Tierney, Freedom.
Michael L. Mery, Jr., Inverness.
Florence M. Smith, Laws.
Myrtle D. Jennings, Mount Eden.
Mary L. Cogan, Santa Margarita.
Janet D. Watson, Tahoe.
W. Howard Skinner, Vista.

CONNECTICUT

Virgil C. Geddes, Brookfield.
John P. Mahoney, Long Hill.
Clarence H. Davenport, Washington.

MARYLAND

Calvin L. Miller, Gambrills.
William F. Keys, Mount Rainier.

MISSOURI

Andrew J. Henson, Bell City.
Daniel C. Selvidge, Collins.

Lulu M. Williams, Marston.
Roswell P. Lane, Naylor.
Elmer S. Foster, Neelyville.
Hugh I. Holmes, St. Charles.
Albert B. Iffrig, St. Peters.
Charles F. Halligan, Union.

NEBRASKA

Max C. Jensen, Bridgeport.
Bert Winters, Broadwater.
Edith E. Fahrlander, Brule.
Toble H. Wilken, Bruning.
Curtis B. Benger, Callaway.
Kenneth R. Newcomb, Cambridge.
William H. Lefl, Carleton.
Gladys J. Brown, Crookston.
Lloyd H. Metzger, Culbertson.
Don Dey Ermand, Dalton.
Russell Mooberry, Dorchester.
Paul W. McCoy, Edison.
Walter O. Troxel, Elsie.
Oscar C. Thomas, Franklin.
Bryan J. Snyder, Fullerton.
George L. Koehler, Geneva.
John H. Holden, Gordon.
Clifford R. Frasier, Gothenburg.
Urv V. Dobbs, Grant.
Dorothy M. Porter, Haigler.
Henry T. Dunn, Harrison.
George A. Kittle, Hayes Center.
Clyde Yardley, Hemingford.
George H. Looschen, Hooper.
Charles L. Schunk, Kenesaw.
Hugo Stevens, Kilgore.
Helen M. Cramer, Leigh.
Andres P. Peterson, Lindsay.
Juna M. Daly, Lisco.
Ethel L. Ossenkop, Louisville.
James C. Nelson, Mason City.
Mary Walsh Morrow, Merna.
Max R. Herrington, Millard.
LaVern A. Breeden, Minatare.
Eva G. Quick, Morrill.
Almira R. Boblits, Oconto.
Franklin D. Strobe, Orchard.
Matthew T. Liewer, Osmond.
James T. Haffey, Oxford.
Stanton A. Troutman, Pallsade.
Oscar A. Pilger, Pilger.
Martin Sorenson, Plainview.
William M. Goding, Potter.
Bert S. Amos, Sargent.
Amos Frieden, Shickley.
Bessie L. Baughan, Stamford.
Josh B. Keene, Sumner.
Walter P. Flynn, Ulysses.
Leo E. Kraft, Unadilla.
Lula Newman, Wallace.
John Q. Kirkman, Wood Lake.

NEW MEXICO

Callie C. Marshall, Bennett.
Rosalie Byrd, Elida.

NORTH DAKOTA

Andrew O. Williams, Bottineau.
Charles C. Shearer, Flasher.
Altha B. Waddell, Forbes.
George A. Swen, Gilby.
George W. McIntyre, Jr., Grafton.
Karl E. Fischer, Hague.
Francis O. Johnson, Hillsboro.
J. Benus Kinneberg, Leeds.
John E. Hunter, Mayville.
Louis J. Allmaras, New Rockford.
Arthur W. Hendrickson, Walcott.
Hans C. Nelson, Washburn.

OREGON

Edwin Allen, Forest Grove.
Frank C. Allen, Lake Grove.

PUERTO RICO

Cesar Rossy, Ciales.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul F. W. Waller, Myers.
Walker B. Graves, Pageland.
Louise P. McCain, Richburg.
Reuben Vance Lanford, Woodruff.

UTAH

Hyrum A. White, Beaver.
Mildred G. Allen, Escalante.
Ewell C. Bowen, Hiawatha.
Arnold C. Richins, Pleasant Grove.

VIRGINIA

John T. Trevey, Big Island.
Lena S. Perkins, Cedar Bluff.
William H. Smith, Jr., Charlotte Court House.

Rufus G. Roberts, Culpeper.
Clarence M. Sale, Falls Church.
Beveridge B. Cox, Gate City.
Robert E. Rodgers, Hampden Sydney.
Edna H. Jennings, Hickory.
James G. Albert, Honaker.
Joseph S. Rasnick, St. Paul.
Rufus W. Garris, South Hill.
Warren P. Clarke, Woodbridge.

WASHINGTON

Mary E. Theler, Belfair.
Bernt A. Hansen, Chinook.
Omar H. Snow, Cusick.
James B. Robertson, Kettle Falls.
Anna I. Foy, Lacey.
Tormod A. Myklebust, Lacrosse.
Harry A. B. Gavin, Malott.
Maston W. Carleton, Seahurst.
Pearl B. Burrill, Snoqualmie Falls.
Connie C. Wall, Winlock.

WEST VIRGINIA

Torrence Cook, Amherstdale.
John J. Tamburini, Bayard.
Thomas M. Deegan, Benwood.
S. Cleveland Underwood, Bethany.
Mark V. Brown, Bridgeport.
Katherine C. Brannen, Cabin creek.
Clark E. Heckert, Cairo.
Anna S. Been, Camden on Gauley.
James H. Moyer, Cass.
Maude Langdon, Champmanville.
Margaret C. Farry, Eastbank.
Arthur J. Duncan, Fayetteville.
George O. Sinsel, Flemington.
John J. Walker, Follansbee.
John C. Blanton, Freeman.
Clarence L. Perkins, Gassaway.
William O. Umstead, Grantsville.
Mayme E. Marquette, Harpers Ferry.
George W. Kilmer, Hedgesville.
Carl Hinton, Hinton.
Dorothy Webb Proffitt, Kingston.
Della A. Kelly, Montgomery.
Justus O. Eakin, New Martinsville.
Russell W. Casto, Nitro.
Poster Mack Kiger, Paden City.
Vesta Lee Connell, Pennsboro.
Milbur S. Moore, Pine Grove.
Julia T. Bradley, Power.
Durward P. Currey, Sandyville.
Newton S. Wood, Valley Head.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 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 eternal source of life and light, in all our ways we would acknowledge Thee, praying that our lives may be kept clean, upright, and secure. When all time and creation were in the cradle of immensity, Thou wert and art and evermore shalt be. Wilt Thou bless abundantly the United Nations with directive wisdom that all groanings and travail in pain and all re-

quiems which have filled the years may be no more and a stricken humanity shall emerge and look up at the open sky and fear no cloud.

Dear Lord, we given tribute today to Christian womanhood, strong and courageous; we rejoice that it is the heart of the Church and the conscience of the State. With consuming zeal and sacrifice it is toiling in distant lands, teaching, healing—the publisher of peace and the bearer of glad tidings in a world of flame and dread. We are grateful that it blesses our homes with ideals and standards which bulwark the children of tomorrow. With heart and soul it is fighting the most valiant battles ever fought, smiting ancient forms of wrong and rebuking each wrathful alien land. In Thee, enable us all to be nobler and more unselfish and find more incentive in our blessed Redeemer and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1943, 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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Croil Hunter.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article by William Philip Simms.

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

PROSECUTION OF TRUSTS

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

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

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, many of us regret the removal of Mr. Thurman Arnold as head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Thurman Arnold was a diligent, courageous, aggressive, nonpartisan prosecutor of all kinds of illegal trust combinations. It is hoped that other men of his stature and caliber will carry on the good work that he has begun. It is hoped that his promotion to the bench is not simply the removal of an effective trust buster, and is not the abandonment of antitrust prosecution by the Department of Justice, and is not evidence of a change in the Arnold policies on the part of the Government.

The grim business of war has, of course, suspended much domestic activ-

ity. Although some may be dormant, gigantic and illegal combinations in restraint of trade and competition still exist in this country. If we are not careful, these big trusts will completely dominate and control the post-war markets in their respective fields. Thurman Arnolds in the Department of Justice will then be greatly needed.

Many examples of needed trust busting could be enumerated. The Farm Machinery Trust is one such combination that certainly ought to be destroyed. The American Federation of Musicians, headed by Racketeer Petrillo, is another example. Other trusts threaten in the petroleum industry, the transportation industry, and the automobile industry. It is certainly hoped that Mr. Arnold's successor in the Department of Justice will be, as was he, aggressive and courageous in this business of antitrust prosecutions.

Mr. Arnold, we hate to see you go.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And I say to the gentleman that I do not believe Congress had any right to create a telegraphic monopoly a few days ago.

Mr. GOSSETT. I voted against that merger.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address.

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

SMALL VEGETABLE CANNING FACTORIES

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

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

[Mr. HARNES of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF FOOD

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

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

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

INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain correspondence I have had with a publisher on the west coast. Also, Mr. Speaker, to include excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of more than 20 years ago.

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

Mr. **GRANT** of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD**.

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

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial.

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

JOHN J. WILLIAMS AND FAMILY

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

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

Mr. **SIKES**. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the House will be glad to hear the story of the family of John J. Williams and the late Mrs. Carrie Williams, of Marianna, in Jackson County, Fla., for in this family there are six sons; six fine, stalwart boys of which any American family could well be proud. Each of those six sons is now serving in some branch of the Nation's armed forces.

I am sure that the Congress, appreciative as it always is of efforts toward winning the war, will join me in sincere praise and cordial congratulations for Mr. Williams and his six fine sons. This American family deserves the recognition of the entire Nation.

The boys are Warrant Officer John J. Williams, United States Army Air Forces (overseas); Corp. Max E. Williams, Camp McCoy, Wis.; Edward A. Williams, Fort Benning, Ga.; Frank I. Williams, United States Marines, Parris Island, S. C.; Willard D. Williams, United States Marines, Pearl Harbor, T. H.; Sgt. Tommy Williams, Camp Polk, La.

The youngest member of the family, Miss Betty Jean Williams, is not yet old enough to be a **WAAC** or a **WAVE**.

All together they are doing a great job for the cause of freedom.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **FLANNAGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **Appendix** of the **RECORD**, and to include therein a statement with reference to King College, one of the reservoirs of Americanism.

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

THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **FULMER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and include therein a copy of H. R. 1728, which has for its purpose the relief of the shortage of farm labor, and a copy of a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

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

(Mr. **LEA** asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the **Appendix**.)

Mr. **LEA**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and to insert a brief editorial.

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

MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. **MAY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of this week.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair has a suggestion to make, if nobody else does it. The Chair thinks it is very bad procedure for committees to sit during the sessions of the House when bills of large proportions are being read under the 5-minute rule, but the Chair will put the gentleman's request.

Mr. **WOODRUM** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would hope very much that the Military Affairs Committee would not be in session when the independent offices appropriation bill is being read for amendment, which I think will be on Wednesday. I have no objection to that committee sitting today and tomorrow, but on Wednesday I think the membership should be present when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. **MAY**. Mr. Speaker, let me make an explanation as to why the request was made. There are all kinds of legislation pending before the House Military Affairs Committee, not only in the form of amendments to the Selective Training and Service Act, but relating to the question of farm labor and deferments for industrial workers in this country. They are all vital to the welfare of the country. The only reason I wanted to sit during the sessions of the House was that we might discuss these matters and arrange some way to bring in legislation on some of the subjects. I do not want your committee placed in the attitude of being derelict in the performance of any duty, especially when it is one of such importance as these questions involve.

I will modify my request for the time being and ask unanimous consent that the House Military Affairs Committee may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House today and tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. **MCCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **VOORHIS** of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech by Maury Maverick delivered to the Holland Society of New York.

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

Mr. **BLACKNEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include A Tribute to the Flag.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. **HARTLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. J. PARNELL THOMAS, may be excused for 1 week due to the death of his beloved mother on Friday last.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BY-PASSING LOCAL BANKING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. **HILL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution and two letters.

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

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **ARENDS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from one of the papers in my district.

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

Mr. **SHAFER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial.

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

THE PLIGHT OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to Mr. Brown, Price Administrator.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **FULMER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. **PACE**].

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

Mr. **FULMER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of Georgia referring to H. R. 1408.

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

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. **SMITH** of Ohio. 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. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of Members of the House what appears to me to be an interesting statement, which will be found in full in the Appendix of the Record. This statement was taken from page 6 of the supplement to Fortune, December 1942, and is attributed to the editors of Fortune.

The editors of Fortune boldly assert, in substance, that there is no need to worry or be concerned about the size of the Federal debt because holders of Government securities are prevented by law from collecting, and that the Government does not have to pay. It should be noted the editors of Fortune seem to approve this arrangement.

It is clear from a reading of the views of the editors of Fortune, as expressed in the above-mentioned supplement, that they are in full agreement with the National Resources Planning Board's program to do away with the Constitution and free enterprise and set up in its place a totalitarian regime.

The views of the editors of Fortune are substantially the same as those of the National Resources Planning Board as expressed in their annual reports to the President and Congress and their other printed matter. In fact, they appear to be mere repetition of the stated schemes of that agency.

Coming as it has, in December 1942, this supplement of Fortune has the earmarks of being propaganda to influence Congress to appropriate funds for continuing the National Resources Planning Board.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on Saturday last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WENDELL WILLKIE

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IS WILLKIE DEAD POLITICALLY?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my sympathy to the Republican Party.

While a majority of them contend that Wendell Willkie is dead—some of them that he is now merely the osculating "somnambulist of a vanishing dream," others that he is the galloping ghost of a Republican nightmare—yet this morning news comes out of Indiana to the effect that the same group that forced his nomination before is going to attempt to nominate him for them again.

I believe it was Dryden who said:

Oh, 'tis a fearful thing to be no more,
Or if to be, to wander after death
And when the darkness comes
To glide in paths that lead to graves;
And in the silent vault where lies your
own pale shroud
To hover o'er it, striving to enter your
forbidden corpse.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 111)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the sixth annual report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1941, and ending June 30, 1942.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, February 15, 1943.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now going to recognize Members to make short memorial addresses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today the birthday of a great pioneer, Susan B. Anthony. Being from Kansas I speak with direct knowledge of her and her distinguished family. All the Anthonys were pioneers, and her two brothers, George T. Anthony and Col. Daniel R. Anthony took part in the struggle that made Kansas a free State. George T. Anthony became Governor and Col. D. R. Anthony made and unmade governors by reason of the influence of his powerful newspaper, the Leavenworth Times, which still carries on under the editorship of his grandson, Daniel R. Anthony 3d. Probably no single family in Kansas has more strongly influenced the life of Kansas. Miss Anthony, in her frequent visits to Kansas and her powerful appeals on the rostrum made Kansas one of the leading States in the cause of equal suffrage.

Today I only briefly express my appreciation of this truly heroic woman and the gratitude of Kansas to this great benefactress, not only to the members of her sex, but to the whole Nation. The mighty revolution which she above all others led can be visualized when I tell you that in my brief lifetime Susan B. Anthony was arrested, tried, and convicted of conspiring against the peace and dignity of the United States for

merely attempting to vote under the authority of the fourteenth amendment. History has made a huge joke of that trial and its verdict. Nowadays we do not even arrest women for running for Congress, however much some of their rivals might wish to.

The influence of Susan B. Anthony still lives in Kansas though her life work culminated when on August 26, 1920, the nineteenth amendment to the United States Constitution was proclaimed in effect which granted the right of suffrage without regard to sex.

Susan B. Anthony was one of the great dynamic leaders of America. She possessed all the great attributes of a crusader. In her character was woven those traits that triumph over all difficulties and discouragements. A powerful will that was stubborn as twisted steel. A determination that scorned denial. A soul sensitive to every injustice and tyranny over the mind or soul. A self-confidence that acknowledged no defeat. A courage that counted no cost, no odds. A creed that acknowledged responsibility only to her conscience and her God. In all American history she has few equals as a moral leader, and no superior.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the keynotes to the character of Susan B. Anthony were courage and a desire for justice. What is often lost sight of is the fact that she wanted justice for men as well as for women.

Born on a farm near Adams, Mass., Miss Anthony later moved to Battenville, N. Y., where her father ran a mill. It was his ambition to build up an industrial community which should be a model. He paid good wages and had good working conditions for those days. He established schools for both his men and women employees, thus founding a feeling of comradeship between employer and employees. Miss Anthony early resolved to work against injustice toward both men and women in labor, and it is due to her pioneer work and those who helped and followed her that working conditions for both men and women have been steadily improved.

Miss Anthony was preceded in my own district of Lowell, Mass., when the women in the textile mills in the early part of the nineteenth century were the first to organize to improve their working conditions, just as she is still followed by women working for equal rights for all.

She was a pioneer in more than the suffrage movement. She was for justice alike for both sexes and all colors and races. It is the courage of women following in the footsteps of Susan B. Anthony that has brought about the conditions in the United States today where women may do anything they are physically able to do.

This is in direct contrast with the countries under Hitler's domination, where the status of women has been set back generations. If Susan B. Anthony

were alive today she would be leading the fight to release the women of Europe from this decadence. With women in every phase of war work from the WAAC's and WAVES to welders it is only justice that they should have equal rights with men.

Courage and determination are New England traits, and it took tremendous courage for Miss Anthony to persist when even the women for whom she was fighting drew their skirts aside and turned their backs on her. Miss Anthony died in 1906. A month before, in her last speech, she said:

When will men see that what we ask is not praise but justice?

Ending with the dauntless words:

Failure is impossible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, Susan Brownell Anthony was born in South Adams, Mass., on the 15th of February 1820, and died at Rochester, N. Y., March 13, 1906. She taught school in New York during the years 1835 to 1850. In 1852 she assisted in organizing the Women's New York State Temperance Society, and in 1854 and 1855 she conducted conventions in many counties in New York State in behalf of female suffrage. In 1858 she advocated the co-education of the sexes. In 1860, through her influence, she secured the passage by the New York Legislature of the act giving married women the guardianship of their children and the possession of their earnings. In the year 1863, with Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, she started the publication of *The Revolutionist*, a paper devoted to the emancipation of women.

It was in 1872 that she cast her ballots at the State and congressional elections in Rochester, N. Y., to test the application of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States. For this she was indicted for illegal voting and was fined but the fine was never exacted.

Her last notable appearance was as a delegate to the International Council of Women in London, England, in the year 1899. In 1900 there was a great popular demonstration in our National Capital in celebration of her birthday, and in that year she retired from the presidency of the National American Women's Suffrage Association, which office she had held for a great number of years.

The day is past when Susan B. Anthony can be classed with propagandists and special pleaders—she belongs with the history makers of the Republic.

It is interesting to note that February is the birth month of the three great emancipators of American history—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony, whose natal day, February 15, we are today commemorating.

Susan B. Anthony changed the mind of our Nation. More than anyone of her time she changed the fabric of our civilization by improving the status of women—politically, socially, economi-

cally. While she neither began nor ended woman's struggle for equality, she has left upon the movement the stamp of an imperishable personality. She is the spiritual mother of all enfranchised women in the world today, and of all future generations.

An obscure school teacher, at the age of 33 she swore to change the mind of the ruling class of men as to the degraded position of women. Until the day of her death, at the age of 86, she never faltered in her determination to win equality for women.

My own State of New York has a prominent place in the history of the struggle of women to secure their emancipation. The first woman's rights convention in the world was called at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848. New York was also pioneer in a reforming of the English common law, so barbarous in its treatment of women.

The State of New York was the home of Susan B. Anthony during most of her life. Largely through her leadership it came to be known as the battleground for the rights of women. I want at this time to salute and pay tribute to Miss Anthony and to all of those splendid New York women who stood shoulder to shoulder with her in the fight for the ballot until it was attained.

Women who took up the struggle where Susan B. Anthony left off are now asking Congress to enact the equal rights amendment. America has always led in the emancipation of women. Surely we do not wish to lose this leadership. It is my considered opinion that no time should be lost in passing the equal rights amendment. This is the most fitting tribute that we, Members of Congress, can pay to Miss Anthony.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of appreciation of that great Christian character, Susan B. Anthony, and especially to her ideals. I am glad that at least a part of her ideals have been realized, and I would to God that her moral ideals could be further realized at this time.

If the moral security espoused by Susan B. Anthony could be realized at this time, it would certainly give relief to the millions of mothers of America whose sons are fighting the battles for decency, security, and democracy.

All honor to the memory of this great woman, and may America yet fully realize the fullness of her moral ideals.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, every session of Congress from 1869 to the year of her death in 1906 found Susan B. Anthony in Washington pleading the cause of suffrage and full equality for women before the Congress of the United States. Fourteen years after her death the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution became part of the law of the land. Women are still laboring for complete equality.

To that end they have drafted and had introduced in Congress a measure to give equal rights before the law, regardless of sex. When this amendment is passed and ratified, the work begun by Miss Anthony in 1850 will be completed, so far as this can be done by law.

California is one of the early suffrage States in the country, and women of California have taken a particularly big part in the move for the emancipation of women. Among the outstanding women in California who have given their utmost to this great cause was my friend Mrs. Amy Ransome and her co-worker, Mrs. Phoebe Hearst.

I am one of those who are working for this amendment, and am proud and happy to carry on the work begun by Miss Anthony so many years ago.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON].

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is eminently fitting that Maryland pay tribute to Susan B. Anthony, leader in the extension of the rights of women, on this one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of her birth.

If but one State in the Union allowed woman to speak for herself it should be Maryland, which was named for a woman, whose capital was named for a woman, and whose Mistress Margaret Brent was one of the earliest crusaders for equality.

It was in Maryland in 1648 that Mistress Brent demanded place and voice in the assembly as the executrix and representative of her kinsman, Lord Baltimore. Her petition was denied but she must have had some gallant supporters, as the archives record that the question of her admission was hotly debated.

It was not until some 200 years later that the demand for full equality for women was made again in Maryland—this time by that peerless leader, Miss Anthony herself, who lectured in Baltimore in the early 1870's. Immediately, associations were set up throughout the State to carry on the fight and these groups proved strong factors in the final ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment.

Time will not permit me to name the complete roster of those citizens of my State who have been prominent in this fight, from Mistress Margaret Brent to Edith Houghton Hooker today, for many years president of the Maryland branch of the National Woman's Party.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be associated with these honored citizens of my State. In fitting tradition, Maryland takes her rightful place in urging the adoption of the equal rights amendment so that henceforth women shall have at last a place and voice as Mistress Brent demanded back in the seventeenth century; so that henceforth the law of this land shall be in the immortal words of Susan B. Anthony, "man's rights and nothing more, woman's rights and nothing less."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the history of every great nation is marked

into epochs by the work of its pioneers, those extremists and cranks—for so they were regarded in their day—who have cleared a space for others to come after them.

The discovery of this great continent was such an epoch—from the first known voyages of the Norsemen to the discoveries of Columbus to the arrival of the covered wagon on our Pacific coast.

In the history of humanity Mary Wollstonecraft, who in 1792 in London published a fiery appeal entitled "The Rights of Women," was the Leif Ericson who sighted a new world for women. Susan B. Anthony, before whom we pay homage today, was the indomitable Columbus who, in spite of opposition and ridicule, sailed on and on till the eyes of faint-hearted friends were gladdened by the sight of the good green isles adjacent to a grand continent which surpassed all their expectations.

Florida is proud of our pioneers who, in writing pages in its own history, have thereby added pages to our Nation's history.

Miss Anthony lived through a long period of ridicule. She gained the respect of the whole country. Let us, in this Seventy-eighth Congress, write that respect into the Constitution so that American women can stand as equal citizens before the bar of justice.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are noted for our respect and deference for our women folk. We have uniformly conceded to women an individuality, an independence, and a freedom of conduct that are recognized as characteristic of the social, economic, and political life of our Nation.

The American home is the unit of that solid foundation on which has been built that structure of loyalty to the elemental virtues, the reverential religious conceptions of life, pride in character, sympathy for the unfortunate, self-sacrifice for the good of others, integrity, loyalty to duty, and that quality which finds happiness in doing good. Presiding over that home as the living embodiment of those qualities has been the wife and mother. The influence of that home on our early years has been such that it has been commonly true that erring youth, though he may temporarily depart from its precepts, in later years finds it drawing him away from his mistakes and back to the homely virtues of his boyhood home.

Out of these homes have come the stabilized and sturdy character of the people of our country, which today is manifested by the youth of our land on the battlefields and the seven seas of the world.

I have had the happiness of going through life with the thought that for me there was no better woman in the world than my mother. Countless thousands have that same inspiring memory.

Notwithstanding the superior place we have given to women in our civilization, it is true there have been relatively few women who, through a long course of

years, have had a Nation-wide fame. One of these has been Susan B. Anthony. She had a great conception of a new and enlarged sphere for women in the social, economic, and political life of our country. To that cause she unselfishly, effectively, and with rare persistence and ability devoted her life. In her case it was the dedication of a life to the service of others. The years rewarded her efforts. Her memory and fame have remained through the decades as an inspiration to millions who revere her as a symbol of those high qualities great souls give and which become the common assets of a nation.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Susan B. Anthony I also pay tribute to the pioneer women of Arizona, my State, who likewise possessed courage, foresight, and understanding and the desire to promote those principles of womankind which have given them equality with men. The women have earned the right to be free. Through their courage and foresight the women of Arizona now have the right to hold property and to enjoy an equal share in the community with their men. They are no longer chattels. They have equal rights in the political institutions and exercise the privilege of expressing their views and exerting their influence in governmental affairs, in religion, and all matters pertaining to our economic life.

I therefore pay tribute to this great woman today because her anniversary commemorates the beginning of the freedom for women and their right to be on an equal footing with men.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the first expression of the woman's rights movement in Maine was in 1868. It turned on the question of women being eligible for service on school committees. Here, as in Vermont, the men inaugurated the movement. The editor of the Portland Press endorsed the movement saying:

There is nothing in the way of the general adoption of such ideas but a lot of antiquated and obsolete notions, sustained by the laughter of fools.

The same year we have the report of the first suffrage society in Maine, which seems to place Maine in the van of her New England sisters. This report read:

A society has just been organized here called the Equal Rights Association of Rockland. It bids fair to live, although it requires all the courage of heroic souls to contend against the darkness that envelops the people. But the foundation is laid, and many noble women are catching the inspiration of the hour.

The Honorable John Neal, foremost in all good work in Maine, in a letter to the newspaper *The Revolution*, describes the first meeting called in Portland, in May 1870, to consider the subject of suffrage for women. He says:

The weather was unfavorable; nevertheless the small room, holding from 60 to 75, was crowded * * * with educated and in-

telligent women, and brave, thoughtful men, so far as one might judge by appearances, and about in equal proportion.

On August 12, 1871, the announcement that Colby University would be open for girls gave general satisfaction to the women of Maine. A press comment of the day says:

Four New England colleges are now open to women: Bates, at Lewiston; Colby, at Waterville; Vermont University, at Burlington, Vt.; and Wesleyan, at Middletown, Conn. Let's have no more women's colleges established, for the next decade will make them unnecessary, as by that time, all the colleges of the country will be opened to them.

October 26, 1872, another advance step was heralded abroad—Mrs. Clara Hapgood Nash, of Columbia Falls, was formally admitted to the bar as an attorney-at-law, having passed a more than creditable examination.

In a summary of progress in Maine for 1873, the Portland Press said:

Mrs. Mary D. Roberts has been licensed to preach by the Methodists; Mrs. Fannie U. Roberts, of Kittery, has been commissioned by the Governor to solemnize marriages; Clara H. Nash has argued a case before a jury in the Supreme Court; Miss Mary C. Lowe, of Colby University, has taken a college prize for declamation. They are the first Maine women who have ever enjoyed honors of the kind.

The right of women to hold office was asserted in the message of Governor Dingley, in January 1875, and the legislature passed the bill for this purpose recommended by the Governor.

Maine ratified the Nineteenth Amendment as the nineteenth State on November 5, 1919.

It is fitting to mention some of the faithful friends in Maine of the equal-rights movement.

First, Mary and Lavinia Snow, of Rockland, were active in the organization of the first society in 1868.

Second, Gail Laughlin, lawyer, member of the State legislature and leader of the Woman's Party in Maine and in the Nation.

Third, Mrs. Robert Treat Whitehouse, leader of the National Woman's Party in Maine at the time of the suffrage victory.

Fourth, John Neal, who sent out notice of the first suffrage meeting in Portland; Neal Dow, that untiring reformer; and Hannibal Hamlin, Lincoln's first Vice President, who presided at the first hearing of the National Woman's Suffrage Association before the Committee on the District of Columbia in 1870.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a pleasure and a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of this truly great American. The gaining of the ballot by women unquestionably constitutes one of the most significant reforms of history. To this cause Susan B. Anthony devoted her life, giving unreservedly of time and energy. Miss Anthony forged this great reform movement for the rights of women out of the steel of her times. She was skillful and courageous. No mob crying "shame on the women" intimidated her

in her heroic stand for the rights of women. She was the most persecuted woman of her day, but she was one of the most honored in the closing years of her life.

In honoring Miss Anthony I wish also to honor those women who pioneered for suffrage in my own State of Oregon. Oregon was one of the first States in the Union to grant suffrage to its women. Especially do I want to honor the memory of the late Abigail Scott Duniway, of Oregon. Mrs. Duniway, an outstanding leader in this movement, attended the Equal Rights Convention in Albany, N. Y., in 1884. She returned fired with enthusiasm and determined to win the vote for women. To the day of her death she never ceased to champion women and their rights. Her memory is honored in my State as a great leader in this worthy cause.

The visit of Susan B. Anthony to Oregon in 1896 was a red-letter day for the State. She came to address a Congress of Women held in Portland, in my district. She exerted a tremendous influence in the crusade for the ballot for women in our State.

The achievement of woman suffrage was, however, only a part of the program for women envisioned by Susan B. Anthony. She foresaw complete equal rights for women. The crusade in which she took such an important part still goes on. The passage of the equal-rights amendment, which has already been introduced in this session of Congress, would not only insure to the women of this and future generations equal rights with men, but would constitute the greatest possible tribute to the woman we honor today, Susan B. Anthony.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Wyoming, whom I have the high honor to represent, I wish to pay tribute to those sturdy pioneers who by their indomitable courage builded an empire on the prairies of Wyoming. There in old Cheyenne, in the Territory of Wyoming, nearly three-quarters of a century ago, women were first granted the right of suffrage.

It is significant also, Mr. Speaker, that Wyoming was the first State in the Union to install a woman Governor. Many women in the history of the world have presided over states, but never before did the free people of any state choose a woman to rule over them. Queens have ruled by the laws of inheritance, but in Wyoming the free people conferred upon Nellie Tayloe Ross a high distinction that will always remain in recorded history.

Wyoming is justly proud of that distinguished lady who served her State so well as its chief executive, and who now serves the Nation as Director of the Mint. By her outstanding service she ably promoted the cause of women in their battle for equal rights.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the appropriate expressions in memory of Susan B. Anthony I take occasion to pay tribute to the splendid services being performed by American women on the home front during the prosecution of this war.

A year and a half ago in a conversation with an aircraft manufacturer I queried him about the problem of manpower and he expressed the fear that the men taken into the armed services would leave the production of that great plant in a bad condition. I asked him, "What about women?" He said, "I do not believe they can do the job." It so happens that approximately 3 weeks ago I talked with him again on the same subject and he told me that 13,000 women had taken the places of the men, and were doing an excellent job in his aircraft factory.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, of the approximately 630,000 workers in this industry today, it is noteworthy to record the fact that of this number 175,000 are women. Of the new employees in 1943 we find more than 35 percent are women.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to this great American woman, I also pay tribute to the entire womanhood of America.

It has been said that if it had not been for the women of the South the Confederacy would have collapsed before it did; if it had not been for the women of the North the Confederacy would have won in the early stages of the war.

If it were not for the influences of women of the world today our civilization would collapse, Christianity would become a thing of the past, government would lose its power, society would lose its charm, and man would sink to the level of beasts.

Giving the women the right to vote has at least placed in their hands the use of a weapon by which they can manifest their consciousness of their responsibility. This woman, Susan B. Anthony, stands at the head of the list of those American women who brought that condition about. I would say of her, in the words of Shakespeare:

Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale
Her infinite variety.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my tribute to one of the foremost pioneers of woman's suffrage, Susan B. Anthony. In connection with this great lady's work, it is interesting to note that the battle for equal rights for women still goes on. This battle is now being waged by the National Woman's Party, among whose leaders are numbered several distinguished women in my congressional district.

I was interested in the remarks of one of the other speakers about women's contribution to defense and war industry.

I had the privilege of talking not long ago with an entrepreneur who told me that women are capable of doing better work in war production than men, because they are more conscientious; they are more careful, and they are more interested in their work. Therefore, they are making a vital contribution and can take the place of the men in defense plants who are called to war.

Fortunate it is for the Allied side that our women are assuming a more and more prominent part in the war effort. They are taking over men's responsibilities on the home front, thus assuring America of adequate fighting forces.

On this day of commemoration of the life of Susan B. Anthony, I salute the women of our country and pledge to them my unqualified support of their cause in attaining equal rights in a society in which they have always shouldered an equal share of burden and hardship.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLEY].

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, they who blaze the way for the races of mankind are not always among the throng when the end of the trail is reached.

Fourteen years after the death of Susan B. Anthony, the suffrage amendment which she wrote was ratified by the States. For more than 50 years she had labored for that triumph. Through all that time, with pen and by means of logical and eloquent speech, she pleaded for justice for women.

In addition, Miss Anthony's ideas, freighted with hope and carried afar by the power of sincere conviction, helped to form the purposes of many others who, in widely scattered communities, have carried on her tradition.

Outstanding among Delaware women who have pioneered in the cause of political equality is Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, twice chairman of the National Woman's Party. A White House picket, facing and serving a sentence of 60 days in the workhouse, within a short distance from the Capitol, working in France with Anne Morgan and with the American committee to reconstruct that devastated country, she has demonstrated an unflinching purpose and courage. She has led the equal-rights campaigns in the Delaware Legislature during a number of sessions.

The background of Mrs. Hilles explains in part her aptitude for leadership. Her father was United States Senator, Secretary of State under President Cleveland, and our first Minister to the Court of St. James's to have the title of Ambassador. She descends from other Senators of the United States, and her brother, the late Honorable Thomas F. Bayard, also served in our highest legislative body. Within recent months she participated in exercises held in Wilmington, Del., commemorating the adoption of the Federal Constitution, upon invitation of our Governor, the Honorable Walter W. Bacon. In this capacity she acted as a direct descendant of one of Delaware's signers of that immortal document.

Truly, it can be said that the Susan B. Anthony tradition is ably carried on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in these very difficult and disturbing days it is refreshing and inspiring to turn our attention to a woman who did so much to give us the right to call ourselves a democracy. I refer to the great Susan B. Anthony, whose name and memory we venerate today.

The Quaker inheritance of this great leader of the suffrage cause and her early training aroused in her a realization of the injustices to her sex. From out of the past we hear again the words of this great American woman, who has long since taken her place among the women of history:

Principle, not policy; justice, not favor. Men, their rights and nothing more. Women, their rights and nothing less.

Now, with consecration to the great cause to which Susan B. Anthony and her noble band of supporters gave their lives, women of today go forward. The National Woman's Party has taken up the torch lighted by these intrepid pioneers, and is waging a battle for the passage of the equal rights amendment which would outlaw all injustices and discriminations. This amendment provides that:

Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

Today in the offices, in the factories, in the fields of our all-out war effort—even in the armed forces themselves—do we find that the women are assuming their full part of the responsibility. Surely it would seem that they are now entitled to have those equal rights for which we are fighting all over the world. Many National and State organizations of women, notable among which is the Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs, have endorsed this amendment. This Congress should give it every consideration.

Liberty, justice, equality are fine words. Let us make them come true for the women of this country by giving careful consideration to this amendment at this session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in the month of February we commemorate the birthdays of three of the greatest emancipators of the race. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and a most distinguished woman, Susan B. Anthony.

In each generation there are men and women who stand out among the mass of our people—men and women who not only have more than ordinary talents, but who are eager and willing to sacrifice their lives, if necessary, in order to extend certain outstanding contributions for the good of the generations who live after them.

We honor, today, the memory of a great woman. She was an illustrious character. She had unusual talents. Most of all, because of the basic concepts

and beliefs to which she adhered and ever remained steadfast.

Susan B. Anthony was born of Quaker parentage February 15, 1820. She was nurtured and reared in the atmosphere of those surroundings and was impressed with those homilies of right thinking, right living, fair play, thrift, and industry.

During the adult years of her life she worked unceasingly for the cause of woman's suffrage. It was appropriate that Miss Anthony should come into her sphere of leadership after the foundation had been laid for the building of a greater humanitarian structure.

It is well that we pause to pay homage to the memory of a woman whose life work has become so important a part in the history of our country. It was for Susan B. Anthony to kindle the spark of public opinion in the great cause of the right of women to cast their vote.

We are honored today in paying tribute to a truly great woman, one of the great history makers of this republic.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a great many testimonials have been paid to Susan B. Anthony. Among others was a beautiful testimonial from Theodore Tilton, who had been for many years a resident of Paris, in which he said:

At the present day, every woman who seeks the legal custody of her children, or the legal control of her property; every woman who finds the doors of a college or a university opening to her; every woman who administers a post office or a public library; every woman who enters upon a career of medicine, law, or theology; every woman who teaches a school, or tills a farm, or keeps a shop; every woman who comes to Congress, every one who drives a horse, rides a bicycle, skates at a rink, swims at a summer resort, plays golf or tennis in a public park, or even snaps a kodak; every such woman, I say, owes her liberty largely to Susan B. Anthony and to her earliest and bravest co-workers in the cause of woman's emancipation.

So I pay my tribute not to Susan B. Anthony alone but to the bevy of noble women who assisted her.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on a bright Sunday morning, shortly after the first gun was fired at Lexington, the old minister at Cheshire, Mass., closed his sermon; then, his voice trembling with patriotic fervor, he asked every man who was ready to enlist in the Continental Army to stand forth. Young Daniel Read, with a bride of 2 months, was the first to step out into the aisle of the little meeting house.

Daniel Read was the maternal grandfather of Susan B. Anthony, whose memory we honor today. She, too, was chosen and commissioned to do high service for her country.

Miss Anthony's convictions as to equality stemmed from her deeply religious heritage. Her maternal grandparents were Baptists and the Anthonys were Quakers as far back as the sect was in existence. She herself attended the Unitarian Church but retained her membership in the Society of Quakers.

In spite of the fact that many churchmen saw that the principle of equality was founded in Christian doctrine, certain clergy of Miss Anthony's day had to

have the scales removed from their eyes, some by devious devices. Miss Anthony told of one Baptist minister who refused the loan of his church for a meeting and yielded only after several of the richest pew holders declared they never would pay another dollar toward his salary if he did not. He then made his appearance at the meeting, opened it with his blessing and closed it with his benediction.

Once when Miss Anthony was asked if she had not grown discouraged in those olden times, she replied, "Never—I knew my cause was just, and I was always in good company." Tennessee, I am proud to say, has had a share in that "good company." In January 1895 Miss Anthony was welcomed in Memphis. During the next month after her visit over some 500 women in Tennessee signed a petition urging political equality for women. And in our day, Mrs. Crozier French, Miss Sue White, and others have carried on the work begun by Miss Anthony.

In harmony with the deeply spiritual nature of the State of Tennessee, which does not wander far from "the ancient landmarks which the forefathers have set," Miss Anthony has said of her work:

I go in the strength of right, to make the right triumphant on the earth; I go in the name of the undone right to make it real; I go in the name of the forgotten justice to make it remembered in high places and in low; I go in the name of the silent and the silenced ones to give them voices.

Let us take her bequest to us to do this unfinished work, that her dreams may be realized—to establish the new justice and equality of right.

CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. CHURCH. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters, one from a judge in my district and another from the State board of agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. W. Arthur Simpson, of Vermont.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein concurrent resolutions of the General Assembly of Iowa, memorializing Congress,

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the other day I called attention to a magazine called Victory issued by the Office of War Information. This is absolutely useless—just propaganda. It is being sent across the waters.

I hold in my hands, and I shall call attention to it at greater length later, a letter from the State War Ballot Commission of New York indicating that shipping space was so scarce that they could not send any ballots to the boys overseas so they could vote. That is about the way they are running this thing. They do not want the boys to vote but they want to send out a lot of cheap propaganda. I think it is about time that these fellows were hauled up short.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in three instances, in one to include a letter from Judge R. V. Fletcher, vice president of the Association of American Railroads; in another to include a letter from Mr. Joseph B. Eastman in regard to transportation, and in the third to include an article from the National Grange upon the subject of transportation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LaFOLLETTE] at Winston-Salem, N. C., a few days ago.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 702) to permit the prepayment of the purchase price of certain housing sold to individuals by the Farm Security Administration, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the purpose of the bill it is to permit a debtor of the Farm Security Administration to pay his debt in advance of its maturity. This is certainly a worthwhile measure. The surprising part of it

is that legislation is necessary to permit it to be done. I realize that a similar bill passed the House late in the session last year, and, of course, this measure should be passed. My purpose in reserving the right to object at this time is to inquire if any other farm-credit agencies prohibit a debtor from paying his debt before it is due. If the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the author of the bill, is in possession of that information, I would appreciate learning it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In answer to the gentleman I may say that in all sales made under the Farm Security Administration for the past 10 years it has been sought to tie the purchaser up for a period of from 20 to 30 years before final payment could be made and title delivered to the purchaser.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman mean by that that by passing this act and permitting a farmer to pay his debts, the personnel of the Farm Security Administration will be drastically curtailed?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Their authority will be curtailed in that this compels them to give a warranty deed to the property when payment is tendered of principal and interest.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know what change has been made by the Farm Security Administration, but I see on the front page of the paper this morning, I think in an Associated Press dispatch, that a Negro farmer in my State has paid his loan entirely off, getting a clear deed to his farm. The contract was supposed to run for 40 years. Can the gentleman give us any information as to whether or not a change has been made so as to permit these farmers to do that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman the information, because I have not got it, but I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is optional and discretionary with the officials in the Farm Security Administration as to who is to be permitted to pay and who is to get a warranty deed to the land?

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman's bill propose to amend that so as to give every man that right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Every man who wants to pay up the purchase price, plus the interest, is entitled to get a deed under my bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that also apply to the Housing Administration, these houses that are being purchased from the Housing Administration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That applies to every agency or corporation in the Department of Agriculture only, where long-term contracts have been made by purchasers.

Mr. RANKIN. How about the rural houses? I am interested in them because a large number of my farmers have purchased those houses, and many of them would like to pay for them and get a deed and be through with it. Would the gentleman's bill reach them?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If they come under the Farm Security Administration or any other agency in the Department of Agriculture. Let me give the gentleman an illustration. Out in my district we have a place called Austin Acres. Approximately 50 families bought a home, each home having 1 or 2 acres in connection with it.

Mr. RANKIN. Farm homes?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; they were started under Mr. Tugwell. The gentleman will remember the rehabilitation program that went on for some time. Most of these people work in Austin, Minn., in the factories and business institutions of that place. They were tied up under long contracts, for a period of from 20 to 30 years. Most of them are making pretty good money at the present time, and many of them have reached the age of 50-odd years, and they feel that they would like to pay up their indebtedness and get title to their property. But the Farm Security Administration, which agency has jurisdiction over these homes, has refused to take payment, and give the deed to the property.

Mr. RANKIN. I can express my philosophy in respect to this matter in a few words. I am in favor of permitting every man to pay his home out and take title to it "from the center of the earth to the dome of the sky," if he can get the money. I am opposed to tying them up with these governmental agencies, to be supervised by some person in some bureau who does not know anything about farming, and who has no particular interest in these matters.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This bill will accomplish the result the gentleman mentions.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. In reference to the practice in the Farm Security Administration, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that last year in the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, our attention was called to charges of this character as having been made against the Farm Security Administration. Those charges were vigorously denied by officials of that Administration, who contended they had never in any instance refused to allow a borrower to make payments when he desired to do so except as to a reasonable period after purchase by borrowers in the farm-tenant land-purchase program. I am wondering from what source the gentleman obtained information upon which he bases the statements that he has made to the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is one of the officials down there named Baldwin.

Mr. TARVER. He is the Administrator.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I talked with him and I have talked with various subordinate officials on particular cases, where people have wanted to pay out, and they have refused to accept the payment in full and give a deed.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Baldwin is the gentleman who gave the subcommittee the testimony to which I referred a moment ago. In view of the evident confusion

with regard to what the facts are in the case of the Farm Security Administration, I shall be compelled to object to the present consideration of this bill, because I want to make some further investigation before we proceed further.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. I think a part of this confusion comes from the fact that there is written into the contract usually secured from the farm tenant or those purchasing the land a provision that they cannot pay out under 5 years. I think there is a 5-year provision in the contract, but, as I understand it, this would enable a man to pay off his land when he became able to pay for it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. You will find the provisions of the contracts written for 20 years, and they will tell you that a man cannot pay up his last payment until the end of the 20 years, because they want to keep control over his conduct in the handling of that property.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman may have in mind cases which were called to our attention, where a farmer has a farm which is desired by somebody else, perhaps a farm-tenant borrower who has paid nothing on his farm, and where a third person comes in and offers him a profit and seeks to pay up his debt for him, for the purpose of taking over his farm. That, of course, is a different matter from the case in which the farmer himself has the means and desires to finish paying for his farm and discharge his debt to the Farm Security Administration acting in his own behalf. When some real estate speculator wants to pay it for him for the purpose of taking over the farm himself, I think the gentleman will agree with me that that is a different matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is a different matter and is not involved here.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. FULMER rose.

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the committee.

Mr. FULMER. I hope the gentleman will not object to the passage of the bill. If the gentleman wants to go into this matter fully, there will be plenty of time between now and the time when the bill is considered in the Senate. You have read about certain tenants having paid up for the land and having obtained title to the fee, but I believe they are simply for publicity purposes. The tendency on the part of the Farm Security Administration is to do everything possible to continue with employees spending money, regardless of what the Congress intended them to do. It is the purpose of my committee sooner or later to go into a thorough investigation of this matter and to weed out some of the things they are doing and have them do the things that Congress intended them to do. Now, certainly, if they can do it now, this bill would not do any harm, but they want to continue that fellow, making additional loans and sometimes grants on his farm, to have people on

the farm to tell him when he shall get up and when he shall go to bed and what to do on the farm. Certainly this bill will not hurt anything.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman that the investigation which he proposes is something that is very desirable, but action should be deferred until after the investigation and not taken before.

Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will call the next bill.

TRAINING OF NONFARM YOUTH FOR FARM LABOR

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 75, to provide for the training of nonfarm youth for farm labor, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in order to reply to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who spoke with reference to the other bill. This joint resolution seems to be somewhat on "all fours" with the previous bill.

The gentleman from Georgia said that they can stop these men from selling their farms to people who want to speculate. Whenever you say to a man, "You cannot sell your farm to anybody," if that is not personal government gone to seed I do not know what it is. As a matter of fact, there are not many speculators who want these small farms. But if a man is in debt or if he has a son who has gone to the Army and he has nobody to work the farm for him and he wants to sell it, by the eternal gods, under the Constitution of the United States he ought to be permitted to sell it. I am not willing to give some agent down here in the Bureau the right to say when a man shall sell his farm or to brand some other man as a culprit because he wants to buy it.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Has the gentleman any information, aside from something he may have read in the newspaper, that in cases such as he has referred to the Farm Security Administration has refused the borrower the privilege of paying his debt?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not as much disturbed over the attitude of the Bureau as I am the attitude of the gentleman from Georgia. If his philosophy is written into the law of the land, it will mean personal supervision over every farm and every farmer by some agent down here who wants to say that this man, although he claims to be a farmer, although he has calluses on his hands, although he owns some mules and has a little money in the bank, he is a speculator and they do not propose to have this man sell his farm to him. I say that we do not want personal government in this country. We want consti-

tutional government, and constitutional government would provide that a man may sell his land to anybody who wants to buy it if he has the money and is willing to buy it, provided the owner is willing to sell it.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. May I point out that I announced no philosophy? I simply made inquiry in order to determine the facts upon which gentlemen were making speeches, and I find, regretfully, that they know nothing about the facts except what they may have read in the press.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I would like to state that this is bringing to the attention of Congress one of the dangers I have foreseen in this method of getting our farmers back on the farm. If you will read these contracts you will see that they carry in them a provision that the farmer must follow every direction from the Department of Agriculture in the operation of his farm or else he can be moved off of that farm by the Department of Agriculture. I have been contending all along that we should have legislation whereby the propositions of the operation of a farm and the ownership of a farm were separate and distinct. As long as we keep this under the Department of Agriculture and under an agency that is primarily dealing with the operation of farms, we are going to run into this problem.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] that in my opinion this is the most dangerous tendency toward the regimentation of the farmers of this country that I have ever known.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that a bill was brought in here at a previous session of Congress which dealt with the question of farm ownership entirely separate from that of farm operation. I regret that the House did not give that bill consideration, and I hope we can get a similar measure up for action by this Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call attention now to another very dangerous tendency; it is this: For the Housing Administration to go out and buy an acre or two of land, build a house on it for a farm tenant and sell it to him but holding a string on him that he cannot pay for it for perhaps 40 years. If he can pay for his home he ought to be permitted to pay for it. I am not for the taking of all the land by the Government and turning it over to a lot of bureaucrats. I may say to the gentleman that I feel he is striking at one of the most dangerous invasions of the fundamental

rights of the American people that I have witnessed in all the years of my experience.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have information from a source I consider unimpeachable, namely, the members of the War bond selling committees in my district, that some of the Federal security organizations are going to the people who have F. S. A. loans and telling them not to pay the principal on their debts, but to buy bonds instead.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I am not going to object, but will let them proceed with this bill, but I do most vigorously protest against any further steps toward the regimentation of the farmers, the putting of farmers in strait jackets. The way to gain more production is to take the ceiling off farm prices, let farm prices rise to their normal levels, and then you will not need even the Manpower Commission to regiment men for the farms. The people will respond themselves, and on top of that we shall not depart from real Americanism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the regular order is demanded then I must object.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for objecting to House Joint Resolution 75, the Fulmer bill, is because it provides for a host of Federal agencies to take a hand in the educational program to train youth for farm labor. I want to keep the youth of our country out of the hands of the Federal bureaucrats. Their interest is primarily the promotion of their own interest, and if they were given the authority this bill would confer they would use it to train the youth in the virtues of a politically planned economy and how not to farm.

Let the farmer receive adequate prices for his produce and leave it to him to train any help he may need for he knows how to do it.

God spare our youth from the baneful influences of the Federal bureaucracy.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1294, to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the purpose of this bill is to approve the transfer or sale of any equipment owned by the Government. It is not to be used in military establishments.

I call attention to the final sentence of the bill which directs that the funds derived from the sale of this property shall be placed in a special fund in the Treasury. Is it intended that after this property has been sold and the funds placed in this special account that Congress will appropriate out of that account for replacement, or is it automatic?

Mr. LANHAM. I think it would be automatic with reference to the replacement of the mechanical equipment that is taken out.

May I say to the gentleman that the bill as amended by the committee is exactly the same as the bill that passed the House last December. It was so late when that bill passed that the Senate did not have a chance to consider it.

Mr. COLE of New York. The funds are to be placed in a special account, yet is to be subject to appropriation by Congress, why would it not be simpler to cover this money into the general funds of the Treasury and thus save the employment of more accountants and bookkeepers?

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, it was testified before our committee that no additional personnel would be required.

It is the intention, under this bill, that this machinery, which is needed not for the comfort of someone in these various plants but for the actual production of war necessities, shall be sold, with the head of the department concerned agreeing, at whatever the replacement value may be of the mechanical equipment that is taken out. It was suggested to the committee that quite possibly after the war it might not be necessary to replace some of this equipment because it might not be needed where it was used before. Under such circumstances there would likely be additional legislation needed to free such funds; but there was an apprehension upon the part of the committee that, if these funds were not kept in a special fund to replace this equipment, it might be difficult when the war is over to get an appropriation for its replacement.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not the intention of the provision of the bill to which I called attention to require additional appropriations to be added to the special fund in order to replace any machinery that is taken under this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. In my judgment it would not require additional appropriations because the bill contemplates sales for cash at replacement figures.

Mr. COLE of New York. What agency then has authority to determine whether a replacement shall be made or not?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, it would come largely under the Public Buildings Administration. For instance, this is the situation in which replacements may not be necessary: There are many Government buildings around the United States in which are boilers that have never been used and which are very much needed now in the war effort. The reason they have not been used is that they were put in, not for immediate use but as an assurance that commercial concerns would not charge too great a rate for the services which those boilers could perform. If those rates did get to be exorbitant, then the boilers could be put into use. There are a great many of them that are idle around the country that may be devoted to the war effort. It may not be necessary after the war to replace some of those. The only necessity I should think for additional legislation, in view of the fact that this mechanical equipment is to be sold at full replacement for cash and the funds to be used for the replacement of this mechanical equipment, would be with ref-

erence to those cases where there was no necessity after the war to replace the equipment.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, it seems to me that a point of order should be made against the sentence providing for the setting up of a special fund to receive the proceeds of these sales. The usual rule is that incidental funds received from the sale of Government property shall go into the Treasury, and, of course, it would require an appropriation to take it therefrom. Apparently it is attempted here to set up a special fund which could be expended without action by Congress, and there would be in that fund money from the sale of pieces of equipment not necessary to replace. Under the explanation given by the gentleman from Texas it would require special legislation to get the money from that fund into the general funds of the Treasury; consequently I shall be constrained to offer a point of order against that particular provision.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, the committee was very much of the impression that we should have a definite special fund to replace this mechanical equipment where it is needed after the war, otherwise the money might be used for some other purpose, then they would come back to the Congress for appropriations to replace this equipment.

Mr. CASE. That is what they should do. The money could not be taken from the general funds of the Treasury and used for any other purpose except by direct appropriation by the Congress. Under the gentleman's statement there would be received a fund from the sale of unnecessary property that need not be replaced. It should not be in a special fund, because then it could be used by the agency without an act of Congress whether it was needed or not, as the gentleman from New York has shown.

Mr. LANHAM. In that instance I do not think it could be used where it was not going to be used for replacement, and, as I stated, I think legislation would be necessary. I do not know that it will be necessary to replace all of this equipment. But let me make this statement, Mr. Speaker: Some of this equipment is very urgently needed today in the production of our war materials. Private industries all over the United States, department stores and institutions of that kind have voluntarily been permitting the Government to use such mechanical equipment, and they have suffered the sacrifices incident to giving up that equipment. This is nothing on earth but an effort for the Government to follow in the course of the practice now being engaged in by private capital to promote the war effort. We have had it impressed upon us by the War Production Board that this is urgently necessary in order that this equipment for plants that are now begging for it may be had for the production of synthetic rubber and a few other things that are vital to the war effort. I may say that with that explanation, together with the

committee amendment, this bill is in exactly the same terms as the one which passed the House in December.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my opinion there should be a provision for restoration of this property, of course, but that the funds should go into the general Treasury. Therefore I object.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I expect to make will be made only against the sentence which provides that the money shall go into a separate fund to be expendable without appropriation. I do not desire to delay the basic purpose of the bill and will not do so. The good purpose that the gentleman from Ohio desires to accomplish would be accomplished by the making of a point of order against the one sentence, and that will not interfere with the acquisition of the equipment for the prosecution of the war. It is important that the bill be passed. I understand that some of the equipment that will be released is wanted for some of the synthetic rubber plants.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Could not the same thing be done more properly with an amendment?

The regular order was demanded.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order against a sentence in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill is not up for consideration as yet. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REHABILITATION OF VETERANS DISABLED IN THE PRESENT WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 801, to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point and to insert the bill and the report thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, be amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection known as subsection (f) and to read as follows:

"(f) Any person who served in the active military or naval forces on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war shall be entitled to vocational rehabilitation, subject to the provisions and limitations of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part VII."

SEC. 2. Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at

the end thereof a new part to be known as part VII and to provide as follows:

"PART VII

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war, who is honorably discharged therefrom, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for receipt of retirement pay, and is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement: *Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"2. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to prescribe and provide suitable training to persons included in paragraph 1, and for such purposes may employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary, and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and, in addition, he may, by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part.

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran, if entitled to pension in an amount less than the amount payable in accordance with the compensation rates for total and temporary disability, including additional amounts for wife, child, or children and dependent parents, provided by section 202, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 475), shall be paid increased pension which when added to the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled will aggregate an amount equal to such rates: *Provided*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement under oath showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such sworn statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the pension of such person to an amount considered equitable and just, but not below the amount of pension or retirement pay to which he would be entitled for service-connected disability if not following a course of vocational rehabilitation.

"4. Where any person while following a course of vocational rehabilitation as provided for in this part suffers an injury or an aggravation of any injury, as a result of the pursuit of such course of vocational rehabilitation, and not the result of his own willful misconduct, and such injury or aggravation results in additional disability to or death of such person, the benefits under laws applicable to veterans of the present war shall be awarded in the same manner and extent as if such disability, aggravation, or death were service connected within the meaning of such laws; except that no benefits under this paragraph shall be awarded unless application be made therefor within 2 years after such injury or aggravation was suffered, or such death occurred.

"5. The purpose of rehabilitation to restore employability lost by virtue of a material and permanent handicap due to service-incurred disability. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing in gainful employment persons trained under the provisions of this part.

"6. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation on the part of persons who are following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part. Penalties for the breach of such rules and regulations may, with the approval of the Administrator, extend to a forfeiture by the offender for a period of 3 months of such portion of the pension herein provided as will leave him not less than the amount of the monthly pension or retirement pay to which such person is entitled for service-connected disability, and such penalties may also extend to permanent discontinuance of all further benefits of this part.

"7. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the granting of leaves of absence to those following courses of vocational rehabilitation provided by this part where in his opinion such leaves do not materially interfere with the pursuit of such courses. Such leaves of absence shall not in the case of any person be granted in excess of 30 days in any consecutive 12 months except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That during leave of absence under this paragraph such person shall be considered to be pursuing his course of vocational rehabilitation under this part.

"8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of \$500,000 to be utilized by the Veterans' Administration under such rules and regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements not exceeding \$100 in any case, to persons commencing or undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation under this part, and advancement to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such installments as may be determined by the Administrator by proper deductions from any future payments of pension or retirement pay.

"9. The Administrator shall have the power to provide courses of instruction for personnel and may detail employees to attend the same and may detail any such personnel to attend courses conducted by other than Veterans' Administration agencies, including private organizations, and such employees in addition to their salaries shall be entitled to the payment of expenses incident to such detail, including transportation and tuition, as the Administrator by rules and regulations shall provide; and also in his discretion, to make, or, as by agreement with other agency or institution, cause to be made, studies, investigations, and reports inquiring into the rehabilitation of disabled persons and the relative abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of the several groups of the variously handicapped and as to how their potentialities can best be developed and their services best utilized in gainful and suitable employment, including the rehabilitation programs of foreign nations engaged in the present war. For this purpose he shall have the power to cooperate with such public and private agencies as he may deem advisable and to call in consultants who shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Administrator shall by rules and

regulations provide, for each day actually spent in the work provided for herein and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and other expenses. For the purposes of this part, the Administrator may accept uncompensated services upon such agreement as he may deem feasible."

Sec. 3. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, "Salaries and expenses, medical and hospital, and compensation and pensions", shall be available for necessary expenses, including but not confined to necessary medical care, and pension payment, payment or reimbursement of expenses in connection with supplying suitable training under this act; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

PROVIDING FOR REHABILITATION OF VETERANS
DISABLED IN THE PRESENT WAR

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 801) to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do pass.

This bill is identical with H. R. 7661 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was drafted in cooperation between the committee, representatives of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Veterans' Administration, except that H. R. 801 makes specific inclusion for increased rates to trainees having dependents. After hearings by your committee thereon October 7, 1942, H. R. 7661 was reported favorably and passed the House of Representatives, October 19, 1942. Hearings on this bill, H. R. 801, were conducted February 2 and 3, 1943. The representatives of the service organizations heretofore referred to strongly endorse and recommend immediate passage of this particular measure. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has advised the committee that this bill will accomplish the purposes sought and represents the most simplified manner of drafting by utilizing, as far as practicable, the existing laws pertaining to veterans. By making the act a part of the present system of beneficial laws there will be for application all of the administrative, regulatory, and penal provisions thereof.

Your committee are convinced that the matter of rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of the present war must be recognized as a separate and distinct function of the Federal Government as it has been heretofore recognized for disabled veterans of World War No. 1. The measure recognizes the necessity for administration of all veterans' benefits by one agency, namely, the one established for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration. Facilities of the Veterans' Administration are already established and will be utilized, as far as practicable, in the administration of this measure. The measure provides that the Administrator shall have the power and duty to provide suitable training to persons included in the act, and to utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and to utilize, with or without compensation as may be agreed, those of any other governmental agency, as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and also provides for contract with public or private institutions for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary under the act.

Enactment of this proposed measure will facilitate a most economical method of administering rehabilitation, with the assurance that it will be administered in correlation with related benefits and by an agency

fully informed regarding the problems of veterans generally as well as having the complete information pertaining to the individual disabled war veterans.

The proposed measure contains provisions designed to profit by the experience in administration of rehabilitation for World War No. 1 by the Veterans' Bureau, and will minimize duplication of existing agencies. This measure also avoids the complications, duplications, and impaired service to veterans which existed prior to August 9, 1921, when World War No. 1 veterans' benefits were administered by separate agencies. The act of August 9, 1921, placed rehabilitation with other World War No. 1 benefits under the Veterans' Bureau. Further consolidation of laws pertaining to veterans was effected by the act of July 3, 1930. This measure, H. R. 801, is in accord with such principle and policy.

No course of training in excess of 4 years may be approved nor may any training be afforded beyond 6 years after termination of the present war.

While pursuing training under the act and for 2 months after, until his employability is determined, each veteran, if entitled to pension in an amount less than the amount payable in accordance with the compensation rates for total and temporary disability, including additional amounts for wife, child, or children, and dependent parents, provided by section 202, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended shall be paid increased pension, which when added to the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled, will aggregate an amount equal to such rates.

The rates of compensation under this provision will be as follows:

If the disabled person has neither wife nor child, \$80 monthly; if he has a wife but no child, \$90 monthly; if he has a wife and one child \$95 monthly, and \$5 for each additional child; if he has no wife but one child living, \$90, with \$5 for each additional child; if he has a mother or father, either or both dependent on him for support, \$10 for each parent so dependent.

Speedy enactment of this measure is urged in order that rehabilitation will be available to our disabled veterans of the present war at present entitled thereto, and to discharge our obligation in this regard to the future eligibles.

The program of benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, such as hospital care, out-patient treatment, prosthetic appliances, and pensions, will be rounded out by extending the care to include rehabilitation—that is, care, training, and placement in gainful occupations in accordance with the liberal policy of the Government toward its war disabled.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war. It has the support of the veterans' organizations.

We do not want the veterans of this war placed under Social Security. We do not propose for the veterans of this war to be used as a common carrier to rake down billions of dollars of appropriations in years to come in order to take care of people some of whom never have worked or fought either. For that reason we have reported this bill which provides for the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war through the Veterans' Administration just as we did after the last war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This bill is identical with one that passed the House last year without any difficulty at all.

Mr. RANKIN. We brought this measure before the House during the last Congress and it passed without any controversy. However, since that time there has been a rising tide of social security sentiment among certain bureaucrats, and they now insist on putting the veterans under Social Security.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. As I understand, the bill was objected to.

Mr. RANKIN. No; the bill was not objected to.

Mr. BARDEN. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded by the gentleman from North Carolina. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 839, to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been granted on this bill. For that reason only, I object to its consideration at this time.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR PERSONS
IN THE MERCHANT MARINE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 131, to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill gives persons serving in the merchant marine the same reemployment rights that are given to members of the Army and the Navy, but restricted to May 1, 1940. I yield to no one in my admiration for the splendid work being done by the members of the merchant marine, but the situation in this case is different from that in the case of the Army and Navy. The men in the merchant marine receive high pay. Certainly, to the majority of those who enlisted in May 1940, the pay question was an important factor. I realize that today enlistments in the merchant marine are motivated largely by patriotism, but this was not the case in May 1940. I should think it would be better if this is made applicable only after Pearl Harbor.

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

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. In the absence of the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, may I point out to the gentleman that every argument he has made against this bill is equally applicable to the other legislation

Congress has passed for citizens going into the armed services.

Mr. KEAN. Certainly not, because the men in the armed services receive small pay, while in the merchant marine they receive very high pay.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is true, of course, that they get more pay in the merchant marine than they do in the armed services, but they do not get a lot of the protection that is given to the men in the armed services. I do not mean to do anything but praise the men who go into the armed services, but these men go voluntarily into the merchant marine, we do not draft them. Certainly it is not too much to give them the right of re-employment which we have given to the civilian employees of the Government and to employees from private industry who have gone into the armed services. These men have lost a larger proportion of those who served than any other branch of our activities connected with this war.

Mr. KEAN. I would certainly be glad to support the bill if the date were changed to December 7, 1941.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the War Shipping Board or the Maritime Service, should I say, is conducting a recruiting campaign to attract the attention of the young men of the country on the same basis as the recruiting campaigns being carried on by the Army and Navy?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. There is nothing more vital to our war effort than the manning of a cargo ship. We cannot fight unless we can send supplies. I hope the gentleman from New Jersey will not object to the consideration of this bill. We are not trying to give these men anything we have not given to others. As I recall, the date in the bill is the same as in other legislation passed for similar services.

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman will not accept an amendment, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 133, to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a very complicated bill. Will the gentleman from Georgia give an explanation of the bill to the House?

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey that this bill was reported in the last Congress and passed the House in almost the identical form in which it is presented here. It

has a great many provisions in it which are wanted by the War Shipping Administration. It has a few changes, none of any great importance, which were made to conform with amendments presented in the Senate during the last session. The bill did not pass the Senate. We have not included in the bill, however, one controversial amendment which the Senate put in its bill, an amendment dealing with section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, which has to do with the enhancement clause of the Merchant Marine Act. That was left out because we did not want anything controversial in this bill.

This bill deals with seamen's benefits, with insurance protection for seamen and their dependents, with the procedure of the requisition of vessels but not the payment of the price under section 902, and with the insurance administration, and coverage of vessels, and it contains some miscellaneous provisions.

I may say to the gentleman that I am not as familiar with the bill as the chairman of the committee would be if he could be here, but I can assure him that the bill passed the House once without any question and has been reported in the Senate with the provisions in the bill which are now presented.

Mr. KEAN. This is a unanimous report?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is.

Mr. KEAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) officers and members of crews (hereinafter referred to as "seamen") employed on United States or foreign-flag vessels as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration shall, with respect to (1) laws administered by the Public Health Service and the Social Security Act, as amended by subsection (b) (2) and (3) of this section; (2) death, injuries, illness, maintenance and cure, loss of effects, detention, or repatriation, or claims arising therefrom not covered by the foregoing clause (1); and (3) collection of wages and bonuses and making of allotments, have all of the rights, benefits, exemptions, privileges, and liabilities, under law applicable to citizens of the United States employed as seamen on privately owned and operated American vessels. Such seamen, because of the temporary wartime character of their employment by the War Shipping Administration, shall not be considered as officers or employees of the United States for the purposes of the United States Employees Compensation Act, as amended; the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; the act of Congress approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.); or the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States and certain other persons or reimbursement therefor", approved December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784, 77th Cong.). Claims arising under clause (1) hereof shall be enforced in the same manner as such claims would be enforced if the seaman were employed on a privately owned and operated American vessel. Any claim referred to in clause (2) or (3) hereof shall, if administratively disallowed in whole or in part, be enforced pursuant to the

provisions of the Suits in Admiralty Act, notwithstanding the vessel on which the seaman is employed is not a merchant vessel within the meaning of such act. Any claim, right, or cause of action of or in respect of any such seaman accruing on or after October 1, 1941, and prior to the date of enactment of this section may be enforced, and upon the election of the seaman or his surviving dependent or beneficiary, or his legal representative to do so shall be governed, as if this section had been in effect when such claim, right, or cause of action accrued, such election to be made in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration. Rights of any seaman under the Social Security Act, as amended by subsection (b) (2) and (3), and claims therefor shall be governed solely by the provisions of such act, so amended. When used in this subsection the term "administratively disallowed" means a denial of a written claim in accordance with rules or regulations prescribed by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration. When used in this subsection the terms "War Shipping Administration" and "Administrator, War Shipping Administration" shall be deemed to include the United States Maritime Commission with respect to the period beginning October 1, 1941, and ending February 11, 1942, and the term "seaman" shall be deemed to include any seaman employed as an employee of the United States through the War Shipping Administration on vessels made available to or subchartered to other agencies or departments of the United States.

(b) (1) Section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 177, 1383; 26 U. S. C. 1426) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Officers and members of crews employed by War Shipping Administration.—The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, to be performed after September 30, 1941, and prior to the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, on or in connection with any vessel by an officer or member of the crew as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, or, in respect of such service performed before February 11, 1942, the United States Maritime Commission. The term 'wages' means, with respect to service which constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, such amount of remuneration as is determined (subject to the provisions of this section) by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, to be paid for such service. The Administrator and such agents as he may designate for the purpose are authorized and directed to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws on behalf of the United States as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, but the Administrator and his agents shall not be liable for the tax on any employee imposed by section 1400 (unless the Administrator or his agent collects such tax from the employee) with respect to service performed before the date of enactment of this subsection which constitutes employment by reason of the enactment of this subsection."

(2) Section 209 of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 42, sec. 409), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(o) (1) Officers and members of crews employed by War Shipping Administration: The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, to be performed after September 30, 1941, and prior to the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, on or in connection with

any vessel by an officer or member of the crew as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration or, in respect of such service performed before February 11, 1942, the United States Maritime Commission.

"(2) The Social Security Board shall not make determinations as to whether an individual has performed services which are employment by reason of this subsection, or the periods of such services, or the amounts of remuneration for such services, or the periods in which or for which such remuneration was paid, but shall accept the determinations with respect thereto of the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and such agents as he may designate, as evidenced by returns filed by such Administrator as an employer pursuant to section 1426 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code and certifications made pursuant to this subsection. Such determinations shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, is authorized and directed, upon written request of the Social Security Board, to make certification to it with respect to any matter determinable for the Board by the War Shipping Administrator under this subsection, which the Board finds necessary in administering this title.

"(4) This subsection shall be effective as of September 30, 1941."

(3) Section 907 of the Social Security Act, amendments of 1939, is amended by inserting, after the phrase "attaining age 65", the following: "and 1 percent of any wages paid him for services which constitute employment by virtue of subsection (o) of section 209 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

(c) The War Shipping Administration and its agents or persons acting on its behalf or for its account may, for convenience of administration, with the approval of the Administrator, make payments of any taxes, fees, charges, or exactions to the United States or its agencies.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 222 (f) of Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and, whenever the Commission shall insure any risks included under subsection (d) or (e) of this section, or under this subsection insofar as it concerns liabilities relating to the master, officers, and crews of such vessels or to other persons transported thereon, the insurance on such risks may include marine risks to the extent that the Commission determines to be necessary or advisable."

(b) Whenever the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, finds that, on or after October 1, 1941, and before 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, a master, officer, or member of the crew of, or any persons transported on, a vessel owned by or chartered to the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration or operated by, or for the account of, or at the direction or under the control of the Commission or the Administration, has suffered death, injury, detention, or other casualty, for which the War Shipping Administration would be authorized to provide insurance under Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by this act, the Administrator may declare that such death, injury, detention, or other casualty, shall be deemed and considered to be covered by such insurance at the time of the disaster or accident, if the Administrator finds that such action is required to make equitable provision for loss or injury related to the war effort and not otherwise adequately provided for: *Provided*, That in making provision for insurance under this subsection the Administrator shall not provide for payments in excess of those gen-

erally provided for in comparable cases under insurance hereafter furnished under the said Subtitle—Insurance of Title II, as amended: *Provided further*, That any money paid to any person by reason of insurance provided for under this subsection shall apply in pro tanto satisfaction of the claim of such person against the United States arising from the same loss or injury. The declarations, findings, and actions of or by the Administrator under this subsection shall be final and conclusive.

Sec. 3. (a) The second proviso of section 1 of the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That such compensation hereunder, or advances on account thereof, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, and the fund so deposited shall be available for the payment of such compensation, and shall be subject to be applied to the payment of the amount of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime lien or attachment lien upon such vessel, or of any stipulation therefor in a court of the United States, or of any State, subsisting at the time of such requisition or taking of title or possession; the holder of any such claim may commence prior to June 30, 1943, or within 6 months after the first such deposit with the Treasurer and publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register, whichever date is later, and maintain in the United States district court from whose custody such vessel has been or may be taken or in whose territorial jurisdiction the vessel was lying at the time of requisition or taking of title or possession, a suit in admiralty according to the principles of libels in rem against the fund, which shall proceed and be heard and determined according to the principles of law and to the rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties, and any decree in said suit shall be paid out of the first and all subsequent deposits of compensation; and such suit shall be commenced in the manner provided by section 2 of the Suits in Admiralty Act and service of process shall be made in the manner therein provided by service upon the United States attorney and by mailing by registered mail to the Attorney General and the United States Maritime Commission and due notice shall under order of the court be given to all interested persons, and any decree shall be subject to appeal and revision as now provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

(b) The Administrator, War Shipping Administration, may determine at any time prior to the payment in full or deposit in full with the Treasurer of the United States, or the payment or deposit of 75 percent, of just compensation therefor that the ownership of any vessel (the title to which has been requisitioned pursuant to sec. 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.)), is not required by the United States, and after such determination has been made and notice thereof has been published in the Federal Register, the use rather than the title to such vessel shall be deemed to have been requisitioned for all purposes as of the date of the original taking: *Provided, however*, That no such determination shall be made with respect to any vessel owned by citizens of the United States after the expiration of a period of 2 months after the date of delivery of such vessel pursuant to title requisition except with the consent of the owner. Upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of State, such a determination may be made by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, with respect to any vessel, the title to which has been requisitioned pursuant to the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), which shall have been lost or destroyed or converted to naval or military use by the United States.

(c) In the event that a vessel the title or use and possession of which is requisitioned or taken pursuant to section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or the act of June 6, 1941 (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), is in the custody of any court, State or Federal, it shall be the duty of all agents and officers of the court having possession, custody, or control of said vessel, forthwith upon the filing with the clerk of said court of a certified copy of the order of requisitioning or taking, and without further order of the court, to comply with said requisitioning or taking and to permit the representatives of the United States Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, as the case may be, to take possession, custody, and control of said vessel.

(d) Section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection (d) thereof a paragraph to read as follows:

"The existence of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime claim or attachment lien upon such vessel shall not prevent the taking thereof pursuant to this section: *Provided, however*, That in the event any such claim exists the United States Maritime Commission may in its discretion deposit such portion of the compensation hereunder, or advances on account thereof, as may equal but not exceed the amount of such claims in respect of the vessel, with the Treasurer of the United States, and the fund so deposited shall be available for the payment of such compensation, and shall be subject to be applied to the payment of the amount of any valid claim by way of mortgage or maritime lien or attachment lien upon such vessel, or of any stipulation therefor in a court of the United States, or of any State, subsisting at the time of such requisition or taking of title or possession; the holder of any such claim may commence prior to June 30, 1943, or within 6 months after the first such deposit with the Treasurer and publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register, whichever date is later, and maintain in the United States district court from whose custody such vessel has been or may be taken or in whose territorial jurisdiction the vessel was lying at the time of requisitioning or taking of title or possession, a suit in admiralty according to the principles of libels in rem against the fund, which shall proceed and be heard and determined according to the principles of law and to the rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties, and any decree in said suits shall be paid out of the first and all subsequent deposits of compensation; and such suit shall be commenced in the manner provided by section 2 of the Suits in Admiralty Act and service of process shall be made in the manner therein provided by service upon the United States attorney and by mailing by registered mail to the Attorney General and the United States Maritime Commission and due notice shall under order of the court be given to all interested persons, and any decree shall be subject to appeal and revision as now provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

(e) (1) The second sentence of section 223 of subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "but the Commission may allow fair and reasonable compensation to any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States for servicing insurance written by such company as an underwriting agent for the Commission, and such compensation may include an allowance for expenses reasonably incurred by such agent but such expenses shall not include any commission paid by such agent in excess of 5 percent of the premiums in respect of such insurance."

(2) The last sentence of such section 223 is amended by striking out the clause in parentheses, and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence a comma and the following: "but in no case shall such allowance to the carrier provide for payment by the carrier of commissions in excess of 5 percent of the premiums paid for that portion of the direct insurance so reinsured."

(f) Section 224 (a) of subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by inserting after the word "subtitle" and before the comma following such word the words "or in section 10 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended."

(g) Section 225 of subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "All persons having or claiming to have an interest in such insurance, or who it is believed might assert such an interest, may be made parties to such suit, either initially or upon the motion of either party. In any case where the Commission acknowledges the indebtedness of the United States on account of such insurance, and there may be a dispute as to the person or persons entitled to receive payment, the United States may bring an action in the nature of a bill of interpleader against the persons having or claiming to have any interest in such insurance, or who it is believed might assert such an interest, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, or in the district court in and for the district in which any such person resides. In either of such actions any person claiming to have an interest in such insurance, or who it is believed might assert such an interest, if not an inhabitant of or found within the district within which either of such actions is brought, may be brought in by order of the court to be served personally or by publication or in such other reasonable manner as the court may direct, and if it be shown to the satisfaction of the court that persons unknown might assert a claim on account of such insurance, the court may direct service upon such persons unknown by publication in the Federal Register. Judgment in any such action shall discharge the United States from further liability to any parties to such action, and to all persons where service by publication upon persons unknown is directed by the court. The procedure herein provided shall apply to all actions now pending against the United States under the provisions of this subtitle, as amended."

(h) Section 226 (f) of Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'risks of war' shall include those losses which, in accordance with commercial practice prevailing from time to time, are excluded from marine insurance coverage under 'free of capture and seizure' clauses or clauses analogous thereto."

(i) Subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 523, 77th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof a section to read as follows:

"Sec. 229. In addition to the insurance functions authorized by the other sections of this subtitle, the War Shipping Administration may insure directly, or may reinsure in whole or in part any company authorized to do business in any State in the United States and which shall insure directly, any person who shall perform services or provide facilities for or with respect to any public or private vessel against legal liabilities (except liability to employees in respect of employer's liability and workmen's compensation) that may be incurred by such person in connection with the performance of such serv-

ices or the providing of such facilities, whenever in the opinion of the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, such insurance or reinsurance is required in the prosecution of the war effort and cannot be obtained at reasonable rates or upon reasonable conditions from approved companies authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States."

(j) The clause in parentheses in the first sentence of section 3 (b) of the act of June 6, 1941, as amended (Public Law 101, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows: "(including any interest or liability of the owner, charterer, or agent)."

(k) The second sentence of section 4 of such act of June 6, 1941, is amended by inserting after the words "national defense" and before the semicolon a comma and the following: "and when so chartered or operated may be insured as provided in said section 3."

SEC. 4. The United States shall, with respect to vessels owned by or chartered to the War Shipping Administrator under bareboat charter or time charter or operated directly by such Administrator or for his account, be entitled to the benefits of all exemptions and of all limitations of liability accorded by law to the owners of vessels. With respect to any such vessel, the term "the United States" shall include agents or other persons acting for or on behalf of the Administrator in connection with the operation thereof.

SEC. 5. The provisions of section 1 (a) of this act shall remain in force until the termination of title 1 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The termination of the provisions of such section shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any cause before such termination, but all rights and liabilities under law as modified by such provisions shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if such provisions had not terminated. The authority conferred upon the United States Maritime Commission by any provision of this act shall be vested in and exercised by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration in conformity with the Executive order of February 7, 1942 (No. 9054; 7 F. R. 837), as heretofore or hereafter amended.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 12, line 12, strike out "January 1" and insert "June 30."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING OF AIR PILOTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do so to get an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the chairman of the committee on the floor, but this bill is made necessary because of the new training program by which Civil Aeronautics Authority is entering into an agreement with the War and Navy Departments to train Army and Navy pilots who are in the service.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not believe the gentleman is explaining the bill correctly. This bill provides for some change in the

Civil Aeronautics Act. I notice that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], the author of the bill, has come into the chamber, and I ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Administration was engaged in the training of civilian pilots. Now they are training entirely sailors and soldiers from the Army and the Navy. They cannot expend any of their appropriation on that, under a decision of the Comptroller General.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand the gentleman, he says that all of the trainees in the Civil Aeronautics training program are in the armed forces.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. In active service.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFFAN. And under the act the C. A. A. cannot expend money except to train civilians.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. For the training of any enlisted reserves if they are in active service status?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Heretofore their money was confined to the training of civilians?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Do I understand there will be an increase in civilian pilots?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No, because they will not train any more. It is a matter of accounts.

Mr. STEFAN. Who is going to pay for this training?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The War Department wanted the Civil Aeronautics Authority or the Board to pay it from their appropriation, instead of from the Army and the Navy appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. Who pays it under this change?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the Civilian Aeronautics Administration have to pay for the training of enlisted reserves in active service? Will they have to pay them \$50 a month, instead of that coming out of the Army appropriation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; the whole thing, all expenses, will come out of the Civil Aeronautics appropriation.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the gentleman is in error about that, because there would not be enough money in the civilian pilot training program to do it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But that is a matter that they will ask the Appropriations Committee for.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I ask the gentleman further about the program: What is to be established with reference to the new men of the Army and the Navy to be trained? Are they to be trained at existing civilian pilot training fields?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes, and at schools and colleges and at the fields.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. At the present time there are many fields not at the schools and colleges, where men are being trained. Will those fields be continued or abandoned?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They will not be abandoned. It is not contemplated to use any new fields.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. My information from the Civil Aeronautics Administration does not check up with the statements the gentleman has made. They have advised me that fields close to colleges are to be used, and if they are at a distant point from the colleges those fields cannot be used in the present Army program. As far as the Navy is concerned, it will continue to use the civilian pilot fields, but that is not true of the Army.

Mr. BULWINKLE. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not understand it that way.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It is the present contemplated plan of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to reduce the contract fields under the Civilian Pilot Training Program, probably 60 to 70 percent.

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

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The Civil Aeronautics Board sent around people to work up sentiment for airfields in certain localities, and after the sentiment is locally worked up, then they tell them they cannot do it. I wonder how much of that is going on.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Certain communities have increased their school facilities. They have gone to the expense of housing facilities and apparently, under this program, as far as the Army is concerned, many of the present fields used by flight contractors for training civilian pilots will not be used by the Army.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In regard to the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am disappointed to hear what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] said about closing down 70 percent of the training fields in the United States, for the reason that the W. P. A. and the Civil Aeronautics Administration have gone into various communities and urged the communities to vote bonds and go into debt to buy airports, to expand airports, to buy additional land, indicating that they would improve them or that there would be some Federal assistance toward completing them. Many communities did this, thinking they were helping the defense program. The result is that in my district we have unfinished airports that are practically completed. The only thing left is to pave the runways. Here are fine airports with fine pilot instructors left high and dry. With the liquidation of the W. P. A. the citizens in my district are alarmed as to what is to become of the great investment they and the Government have made. Here are airports almost ready to be used which we are now told may be abandoned by the very Federal agencies which came to these communities and urged the people, induced them to vote bonds and go into debt to build these airports and to buy property. If what the gentleman from Oklahoma says becomes a fact, a great

outlay of community and Federal funds will represent waste. How can we justify such acts?

Mr. TABER. And they are still out urging people to do that sort of thing. In addition to that, after they get them worked up to the right pitch, then they let them down.

Mr. STEFAN. They must not abandon them. Our investment in them is too great.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The reduction program which the gentleman speaks of will not apply to this bill at all.

Mr. STEFAN. No, this bill has nothing to do with that. But it may affect the training program on fields in danger of abandonment.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the bill go over until we can look into the program a little closer with reference to the Army and their arrangement with the C. A. A. in connection with the flight training schools.

Mr. LEA. I would like to say to the gentleman that it is undesirable to do that unless he feels there is something of importance that is required, because this is laying the foundation for the new training program which will take in about 30,000 men a month. So it is important for them to know whether or not they can proceed under this plan.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Can the gentleman from California tell us how many of the existing flight fields which the Civil Aeronautics Administration is now using will be used in connection with the present contemplated program?

Mr. LEA. I cannot tell you the number, but this bill does not affect that question any more than it simply provides that those men who are in an active enlisted status can have training under the C. A. A., which the Comptroller General has held they cannot, under the present act, because the present act provides only for civilian training.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The C. A. A. has advised me that unless the flight training fields are in close proximity to the colleges that have been selected, the present fields will be abandoned and not be used for pilot training purposes.

Mr. LEA. That may be true, but that is not dependent at all on this bill. This bill has nothing to do with that.

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

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. As I understand this bill, in the original act regarding civilian pilot training we allowed around \$72,000,000 for that purpose last year. Now there is a balance left in the appropriation of about \$25,000,000. I understand that the Navy has turned over for civilian pilot training the sum of \$25,000,000 for the training of personnel for the Navy. Now this bill is to take care of the personnel within the Army, and to use the balance of the funds for the purpose of training the personnel of the Army.

Mr. LEA. It is the Army contract that caused this to be brought up at this time, but it does apply to both the Army and the Navy. It permits them to be trained by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, but

it does not change the burden of expense in doing it.

Mr. RABAUT. But it shifts the burden of expense out of the Army appropriation to the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. LEA. Not for the pay, but for the training.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the Army and the Navy ought to get together on this. Every time we hold hearings for an appropriation for the C. A. A. program we are up against some question of procedure between the Army and the Navy. They never seem to get together on civilian pilot training program. We are in a war. There must be cooperation in everything we do toward winning that war.

Mr. LEA. This bill affects only the appropriations made to the C. A. A. It permits those funds to be used for training the men on the active list, which otherwise could not be done.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 2 on the calendar, the bill (H. R. 1294) to authorize the sale or transfer of property belonging to the Government for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my objection to this bill was that the funds should revert to the general fund of the Treasury, and not in any special fund. With the understanding this feature would be corrected, I have consented to again call the bill up for passage.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever during the continuance of the present hostilities the President shall determine that any mechanical equipment appurtenant to any building or other real property owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use is urgently needed in the conduct of the war, and cannot otherwise be provided, the head of the department, agency, or establishment having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, is authorized to sell such property for cash for a price equal to the full replacement value thereof. Any funds realized from the sale of such property shall be deposited in appropriate special funds in the Treasury and shall be available, as the President may prescribe, for replacement of such equipment: *Provided,* That funds not obligated for such replacement within 2 fiscal years after the cessation of the present hostilities shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendment:

That whenever during the continuance of the present hostilities the President shall determine that any mechanical equipment now owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use is urgently needed in the conduct of the war, and cannot otherwise be provided, the head of the department, agency, or establishment having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, is authorized to sell such property for cash for a price equal to the full replacement value thereof. Any funds realized from the sale of such property shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury and shall be available for replacement and for the restoration, repair, and renovation of any buildings or other property from which it may have been taken.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the final sentence in the committee amendment on the ground that it constitutes an appropriation in a legislative bill reported by a legislative committee.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the committee thought the provisions of the bill as reported were preferable, I concede the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

That whenever during the continuance of the present hostilities the President shall determine that any mechanical equipment now owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use is urgently needed in the conduct of the war, and cannot otherwise be provided, the head of the department, agency, or establishment having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, is authorized to sell such property for cash for a price equal to the full replacement value thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week, in announcing to the House what the program for this week would be, I stated that the Private Calendar would be called tomorrow. I have been asked to request that the calling of the Private Calendar be dispensed with this week in order that general debate on the independent offices bill may proceed for the balance of today and all of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with on tomorrow, Tuesday, but that the Private Calendar may be called some day this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why not set a definite date for the calling of the Private Calendar so that Members interested may know when the bills will be called? Why not make it Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not make my request specific because, as the gentleman will realize, it is rather difficult to foretell when consideration of the independent offices bill will be con-

cluded and the bill disposed of; but I will ask for a definite date for the consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask now unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar on tomorrow, Tuesday, be dispensed with, but that it may be in order to call individual bills on the Private Calendar on Friday, February 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION OF VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 1749, a bill to "amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended."

Mr. BARDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. This bill, let me state to the gentleman from North Carolina, is one which provides for hospitalizing the veterans of this war on the same terms that we hospitalize veterans of the last World War. We are receiving a great many complaints of hardships to veterans of the present war.

Mr. BARDEN. When was the bill introduced?

Mr. RANKIN. The bill was introduced some time ago.

Mr. BARDEN. And was it reported by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. RANKIN. It is on the calendar; it is the last bill on the calendar, No. 21.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman just desires to move it up on the calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. It did not get on the calendar in time to be considered today, without unanimous consent. It lacked only 1 day.

Many of these boys are suffering, some are having to go to jails and private hospitals, and some of them are being sent to their homes without any treatment at all. They ought to be taken care of promptly.

Mr. BARDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that if it is so urgent, somebody should have a copy of the bill? The gentleman knows I am not opposed to hospitalization of veterans. I have been a member of veterans' organizations just as long as the gentleman from Mississippi, and I do not like to be put in the position of making a reservation of objection on a bill that is as apparently as important as this is.

Mr. RANKIN. The only difference is this: This provides for the hospitalization of not only disabled enlisted men but women who are actually in the military service and who are entitled to this hospitalization.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAY. I have a case where an enlisted man while in the service went crazy. His mentality went wrong. He was taken back to my State and under the law of the State of Kentucky if he is sent to an insane asylum or a State hospital it must be at the expense of his estate or some member of his family who is able to pay it. Will this regulation, as

amended, by the pending bill cover a case of that kind, and will he be hospitalized in a veterans' hospital?

Mr. RANKIN. He will be hospitalized in a veterans' hospital.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In view of the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky relative to a young man who suffered a mental disability, may I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this situation: There is evidence that a very large number of young men going into the military service have become mentally disabled and then are discharged with the statement that the disability existed prior to entering the service. There is a much larger number of such disabilities in this war than in the last war. The percentage is greater. These young men may have no chance to go to a veterans' hospital, they certainly receive no compensation, and I have a feeling from evidence submitted that possibly a considerable number of these young men have been mentally disabled because of faulty or defective serum or inoculations, and I think the law should be amended requiring such disabilities to be considered as having arisen in the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks in reference to H. R. 1749, I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of the bill and the report in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

H. R. 1749

A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended, by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "Any officer, enlisted man or woman, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war."

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 1749

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1749), entitled "A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended," having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The bill has for its purpose the granting of medical and hospital treatment, domiciliary care, and burial benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to certain veterans of World War No. 2. The existing law requires that the veteran must have been discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty or must be in receipt of pension for service-connected disability in order to receive treatment or care for disabilities which the man has been unable to prove to have been incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service.

Your committee conducted hearings on H. R. 1185 (78th Cong.), a similar bill, February 2 and 3, 1943. Many cases have been

brought to attention, warranting immediate action of the Congress, where veterans, after being accepted for active service, have by change of environment and due to active service become seriously disabled and in need of treatment. In some instances they have been sent home without necessary care and, not infrequently, in mental cases retained in a jail pending transfer to a State institution. In some cases adequate care is not available. The Federal Government must assume its just obligation to care for these distressing cases, having taken the man into the active service in the first instance.

While the committee have been informed of efforts of the service departments and the Veterans' Administration to institute procedures tending to alleviate the above situation, your committee have determined, on the basis of facts presented to it and which undoubtedly have come to the attention of the Members of Congress generally, that no further delay should be entailed to insure the proper treatment and care of these disabled veterans. Such procedures as are referred to cannot be satisfactory under any circumstances due to the drastic restrictions under the existing law.

By amending paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, the veterans of the present war will be brought within the technical definition of a "veteran of any war" under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. They will thus be entitled to medical and hospital treatment and domiciliary care and burial benefits on a parity with veterans of World War No. 1. While your committee recognize the reasons why these veterans of World War No. 2 have not been included for these benefits as veterans of any war, it is believed that the Congress must remove this inequality and injustice at the earliest practicable date.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2a, rule XIII, House of Representatives, the changes in the present law made by the bill H. R. 1749 are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

"The term 'veteran of any war' shall include the following persons: World War—Any officer, enlisted man, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) who was employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after April 6, 1917, and before November 12, 1918; provided, however, if the person was serving with the United States military forces in Russia the dates herein shall be extended to April 1, 1920; Spanish-American War—Any officer or enlisted man who was employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after April 21, 1898, and before August 13, 1898, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts on or after April 21, 1898, and before August 13, 1898, and including any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States between August 13, 1898, and July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, and who left the continental United States under orders for military or naval service in Guam, Cuba, or Puerto Rico, between such dates; provided, that for the purposes of hospitalization the term 'veteran of any war' shall include persons who served overseas as contract surgeons of the Army on or after April 21, 1898, and before August 13, 1898; Philippine Insurrection—Any officer or enlisted man employed in the active military or naval service of the United States, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts, who actually participated in the Philippine Insurrection on or after August 13, 1898, and before July 5, 1902; provided, however, if the person was serving in the United States military forces engaged in the hostilities in the Moro Province, the ending date shall be July 15, 1903; Boxer Rebellion—Any officer or enlisted man, including those women who

served as Army nurses under contracts, employed in actual participation in the Boxer Rebellion on or after June 20, 1900, and before May 13, 1901: Any officer, enlisted man or woman, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war."

The SPEAKER. The Chair agreed to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to call up this bill, which is on the calendar. The Chair trusts there will be either a green light for the consideration of the bill or objection made to its consideration soon, because it is desired that the House proceed with the other business of the House. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 12, 1943.
HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been tentatively assigned to both the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

In view of my understanding that it will be necessary for me to relinquish membership on one of the above committees I am writing to tender my resignation from the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House.

Sincerely yours,
MAURICE J. SULLIVAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. MCKENZIE] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter, and also that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include certain letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the South San Francisco Packing & Provision Co. with reference to the meat shortage in California which has reached a desperate stage.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with H. R. 1294.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1762, making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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 consideration of the bill H. R. 1762, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of demand for time for debate and speeches, most of which I hope will not pertain particularly to this bill. I am not going to consume a lot of time myself going over the individual departments and items in the bill because I am sure when we get to the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule whatever interest there may be in those agencies will develop and we can go into that, perhaps with more profit.

At the outset I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation of the members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee in the consideration of this bill. We had long hearings, we went into each item painstakingly and carefully. It is a large bill and covers a great many departments, requiring a great deal of time in its consideration both in the committee and on the floor of the House. I want to thank not only my Democratic colleagues who cooperated with me but also the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for their very intelligent, aggressive, and sometimes too persistent attention to the bill.

I may say that we do not often have any very violent differences of opinion in the Independent Offices Subcommittee. I do not believe there are very many items in this bill on which we do not agree. There may be some differences of opinion as to amount, but I do not believe, in fact, that even that will develop.

We have gone through this bill very carefully with the idea of trying to pre-

pare it and bring it here in line with what we believe to be the sentiment not only of this House but of the country. We believe that every dollar should be cut out of Federal expenditures, except those funds which are absolutely necessary in the prosecution of the war. We have approached the consideration of the bill with that in mind.

The Budget estimate for this bill is \$2,627,552,585. That is a lot of money. I call your attention to the statement which I shall put in the RECORD, part of it being in the report on the bill, which will show you that 87.7 percent of the funds in this bill are directly related to the major war effort. Additional funds are in the category of items that you probably could not do anything with in the way of curtailment. For instance, the salary of the President of the United States. Perhaps some people would like to cut out that salary entirely. I do not believe, however, there would be many in favor of that, but perhaps there would be a few. There are also funds for the civil-service retirement fund, for the Canal Zone retirement fund, for the Alaska Railroad, for the operation of public buildings in and outside of the District of Columbia, which refers to public buildings for a number of activities, and funds for the General Accounting Office. Some of those items are for large amounts of money, but we have audited the appropriations very carefully.

You could arbitrarily cut off \$100,000,000 here and there if you wished to do so. I do not believe you could find any logical or legitimate basis on which to do that, however. Of course, we could cut out this \$175,000,000 for the civil-service retirement fund, but even with putting that amount of money in the fund we are still way behind what the Government owes the fund actuarially. So I just point out that while these items are large sums of money they do not offer very much opportunity to those of us who would like to make a drastic curtailment.

The other larger items in the bill which constitute 87.7 percent are such items as the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Public Roads Administration—which is devoting all of its activities now to strategic highways, war access roads, and roads that are approved by the Army and Navy departments—the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Maritime Commission, which has in this bill \$1,289,000,000 for building ships, and the Veterans' Administration, which has nearly \$900,000,000 in this bill. So we have here a bill covering more or less old-line agencies which are on a wartime basis and which account for practically 95 percent of this bill. However, we have gone through the bill carefully and have made cuts in the bill, some of which are drastic to the point, perhaps, of leaving out an entire agency, such as was done in the case of the National Resources Planning Board. We have also made cuts in the Civil Service Commission and other agencies where we thought funds could be cut after a careful analysis.

The bill is \$6,448,206 below the Budget estimate, so those are cuts we have made that we think can be justified. I will insert the statement I have referred to at this point:

Appropriations provided in the bill specifically earmarked for war purposes or on account of war:

Civil Service Commission.....	\$10,000,000
Federal Communications Commission.....	5,590,314
Federal Power Commission.....	519,255
Public Roads Administration.....	88,000,000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	299,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	19,454,500
United States Maritime Commission.....	1,289,780,000
Veterans' Administration.....	887,017,000

Total.....	2,301,485,069
Total percent.....	87.7

In addition, other items not specifically earmarked bring the total for war purposes up to 92 percent.

Other items or parts of items which cannot be reduced are as follows:

Salary of the President.....	\$75,000
Civil-service retirement and disability fund.....	175,104,000
Canal Zone retirement and disability fund.....	1,177,000
Alaska Railroad retirement and disability fund.....	175,000
Operation and maintenance of public buildings in and outside District of Columbia due to war program.....	16,215,600
General Accounting Office (65 percent due to war).....	17,168,650

Total, additional items which cannot be reduced.....	209,915,250
Add items specifically provided for war.....	2,301,485,069

Grand total (95 percent of bill).....	2,511,400,319
---------------------------------------	---------------

Total of bill.....	2,621,104,379
Less items which cannot be reduced.....	2,511,400,319

Total, items in bill which could be reduced.....	109,704,060
Reduction made by committee.....	6,448,206

Total of items considered which could be reduced.....	116,152,266
Percentage of reduction in items available.....	5.5

I want to say this before I refer to some of the individual agencies in the bill. I think the House and the country may feel that we are entering upon a more or less new era in our method and manner of making appropriations. Some of us have fought for years for the reforms we are now putting into effect. It is fair to say that perhaps in other years when appropriations were not nearly so large and not nearly so complicated the Committee on Appropriations would naturally have more time individually and collectively to go into these things carefully item by item, but with a seven- or eight- or ten-billion-dollar budget for ordinary purposes and nearly \$100,000,000,000 for war purposes, the time just does not exist in 24-hour days for any committee or

the personnel of any committee to make the careful analyses and study of individual items that we think should be made. Therefore, we have set up some machinery in the Committee on Appropriations.

Before I discuss that, however, I want to state that I think it is a splendid thing that we have set up a subcommittee, and a very fine subcommittee, to go into this very complicated and very troublesome matter of dealing with personnel who are charged with being disloyal and subversive. I think we are approaching that in a judicial and a legislative manner. We have a splendid subcommittee that is going into those charges carefully and will make recommendations to this House. It will be for the House then to accept or reject the recommendations of that committee. However, when we come upon the floor of the House again, I am happy to say we will not be in the position we were a few days ago when all sorts of charges were hurled around the Chamber. We knew nothing about them; we had no carefully prepared record to go on, and we were put in the position of either voting against some man we did not know anything about or putting a vote on the record that might look as if we were condoning some person unfit to serve the Government. Hereafter we will have the carefully considered report of a committee as a basis for our action.

Returning to my reference to the need for study and analysis of individual items, the Committee on Appropriations is taking on a special staff of experts. We are going to draw them from some of the departments, men who are carefully trained in government procedure, and who will be taken off the pay rolls of the departments from which they are drawn and placed on the pay roll of the House of Representatives.

They will be our agents, and not the agents of a department. They will be under the supervision of highly trained men from one of the investigative departments of the Government and it will be their duty under the instructions of the Appropriations Committee to make surveys and audits and investigations of establishments and departments where we think information can be gotten that will be helpful to the committee. For instance, with this rapidly expanding Government that we have, engaged as it is in global war, raising an army not just for America, but for the world, raising a navy not for one ocean but for all the oceans of the world, suddenly faced with the duty of supplying not only that army and that navy, but the other nations of the earth who are our allies, it is an economic and commercial proposition that staggers the imagination. We find ourselves confronted with a civil pay roll of staggering sums. Two and a half or three million people are on the civil-service rolls in a civilian status in addition to the armed forces. If we begin to consider the matter by comparison, of course, we are shocked. We will say that in the World War we had so and so, and now we have so and so. Gentlemen, that does not mean anything. There is no basis whatever whereby you can reach any conclusion

that is worth anything to you by considering what we are trying to do in this war and comparing it with what we did in the last war. It just does not make sense. You have got to go at it in a different way. We want these experts to go into some of these departments, not particularly the agencies in this bill because we do not have the so-called war agencies in the independent offices bill.

The places where I think there is overstaffing is in some of these departments that have grown up quickly, the so-called mushroom agencies. We will send trained personnel into those departments to make careful audit and check and bring back to the Appropriations Committee definite, authentic information that we can rely on, so that we can tell whether they have too many or too few. Also, if some other agencies need personnel, instead of employing new people, we can go into one of these overstaffed agencies, and take the oversupply there and put them into another place where they are needed.

In addition to the matter of personnel, there is the item of travel. If you go through all of these appropriation bills you will see that item rise into a colossal sum, and of course travel is an important item with all of these agencies, and with the war scattered all over the United States and in foreign countries, it is even difficult for the bureau or the agency itself to keep track of it. We want to know something definite about that. Also, we want a check made of long-distance telephone calls, and also to determine to what extent those calls are made and to what extent they can be substituted by air mail and telegraph. If we are successful in doing what I think we can do, I believe when we come here a little later with appropriation bills we will be better prepared to say to the House and to the country that we know we have culled out of here everything that can be taken out of this bill.

In addition to that, another field of operation for these experts will be in the matter of field offices. I am sure it is the experience of every Congressman, especially if he lives in a community of any size, that he is impressed by the number of field offices in his community. They are there by the score. There is no question that these field offices, regional offices and State offices is another very fertile field for investigation. We believe our trained investigators and auditors can go into that field and come back to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress with helpful and constructive suggestions.

The independent offices appropriations subcommittee, if I may say without being too immodest, has, down through the years, been a pioneer in the field of trying to hold down expenditures and in the unnecessary growth of Government agencies. I remember a good many years ago when I first went on this committee as the newest member and a minority member that our late distinguished lamented friend, Mr. Will Wood, of Indiana, was the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, and that

our late friend from New Hampshire, Mr. Wason, was the chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the independent offices appropriations bill. We set about then to try to do the same things we are doing now. I remember one agency we went into, the old Shipping Board—and gentlemen, let me say that overstaffing and overpaying is not a product of any one particular administration. It has always been in the Government and I can say that somewhat in defense of the administration at the present time.

We had in the independent offices appropriation bill then a bill where salaries were paid as high as \$10,000, \$15,000, \$18,000, and \$35,000—products left over, stuff from the World War. Many of you perhaps will remember when the Chairman of the old Shipping Board received \$35,000 a year, when the manager was paid \$18,000 a year, and the general counsel \$15,000. Some of you may remember the old Farm Board that some of us were instrumental in liquidating. The general counsel for the old Farm Board received \$20,000 a year, and if I remember correctly one gentleman who is now on the Supreme Court of the United States was general counsel for another agency receiving \$20,000 a year and his feelings were much hurt when the independent offices appropriations bill subcommittee put him back to \$10,000. We are not paying any salaries of that kind now in the Government service. And now I am going to venture where angels fear to tread.

I am going to say a kind word for some men who are perhaps thoughtlessly placed in the category of bureaucrats. That is a term that we handle very loosely sometimes. We speak of a bureaucrat and immediately attending what we say, is a great deal of odium. We throw it out in blanket form and it envelops everybody in the Government service. I want to say to you there are men in the Government service who do not reflect a lot of credit on it. There are heads of departments who are not good administrators; who think more about playing politics than they do about serving the United States Government. There are some of them who think perhaps more about building up a large mushroom agency with a lot of political power than they do about the job that Congress has given them to do. But do not overlook the fact, if you please, that there are in the Government service today, in the bureaus and departments, men of high integrity, outstanding administrative ability, who are working for the United States Government at an infinitesimal part of what they would be paid if they were working for private industry. I could mention many of them.

Admiral Land, head of the United States Maritime Commission, with all of the hot spots he has had to sit on in this great shipbuilding program, and having made, as he will admit, some mistakes and blunders, is performing a service, and has performed a service in this war effort second to no man who wears the uniform. If he were employed by pri-

vate industry the salary he could secure would make the small amount of money we are paying him seem infinitesimal.

Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, handling in late years almost a billion dollars a year, has done an administrative job that cannot be excelled in the Government service. The finger of suspicion has never been pointed to the great Veterans' Administration since Gen. Frank T. Hines has administered its affairs.

So I might go on down the line. You might go into the Army and the Navy. In a year and a half we have not performed the industrial miracle that we performed in this country; we have not raised a great army and a great navy and put them in the field; we have not built a great air force of over a million men with bureaucrats and crackpots. There have been some leaders and men of administrative ability, men who are devoting their lives to the work they are doing. I know some of them who are about to be casualties of this war, just as much as men who dropped in battle on Guadalcanal or Buna or in some of these other places.

So let us not make the fatal blunder of pointing the finger at every bureau and every department, but let us rather be discriminating and try to pick out the men who are doing a good job, and when they do a good job, support them and stand behind them. That applies not only to the departmental heads, but it applies all the way down the line, even to the smaller paid employees.

Now, our Appropriations Committee hopes that with this new machinery we are setting up we will be able to bring you much more definite and specific data than we have been able to bring you in the past.

I want to talk a little now, if I may, about some of the items in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

If you care to turn to the report, which is available, you will find on page 4 a statement of the general provisions which are carried in the bill. In some of these instances we have in the past carried certain specific authorizations, limitations, and restrictions in different departments. It has been thought best by the Budget, and the committee thinks it is best, to carry certain general provisions which will apply to all of the departments. You will find them set out in this paragraph at the bottom of page 4.

For instance, there is a general provision authorizing the use of travel funds for expenses of travel from one official station to another. That is particularly necessary because of our decentralization program.

Authorizing the use of funds for the transportation of household goods and effects of employees. We have found that in moving so many agencies out of Washington to other places it has only been fair to take some account of the expense to which employees were put in moving their household goods.

Section 202 relating to the purchase and operation of Government passenger-carrying vehicles.

Section 203 authorizing funds derived from the sale of old cars to be applied as part payment toward the purchase of new cars.

Section 204, authorizing purchases in amounts of \$100 or less without advertising under section 3709 of the act requiring competitive bids.

Section 205 prohibits the use of funds to pay the salary of persons not citizens of the United States, with certain exceptions.

Section 206, relating to the designation of officers or employees to administer oaths.

So much for the general provisions.

We have approved a total of \$2,712,000 for the Bureau of the Budget. This is an actual increase of \$452,000 over the current appropriation. Of this increase, \$246,500 is required to carry for a full year personnel and expenses now provided on a part-year basis. The remainder of the increase, \$205,500, will provide initial funds for the establishment of a field service. This sum will be sufficient to establish four field offices and a small supervisory staff in Washington. We feel that this staff will permit the Bureau to secure information at first hand which would not otherwise be available and that it will increase the effective and efficient service the Bureau is now performing.

I would like to speak a minute about the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission has had a colossal job to perform. Some of us have found things to criticize about it, and I am sure some of that criticism has been justified. But they have had a large job to perform, especially when we have made an effort, in building up these war agencies, to try as far as possible to have them taken from the civil-service rolls, in order to prevent, as far as we could prevent it, the turning of those agencies into purely political patronage. They have had a hard job, and their job is not lightening very much on account of the tremendous turn-over in these departments. This data shows that on an annual basis the placements in 1944 will be about one and one-half million; turn-over in the Government work; people taken out, going into the armed services, moving from one agency to the other on account of being more valuable to one agency than the one in which they were working.

So they have asked for a large sum of money, and we have found that it would be possible to make some reduction in this activity, so we have reduced their regular fund appropriation by \$581,600. That is a pretty heavy cut, but we think they can take it.

In their appropriation for war activities we have made a reduction of \$1,426,552—another pretty heavy cut—but we think the Civil Service Commission has probably passed over the peak of its recruitment program and that it ought to be able now to revamp and revise its procedure in such way as to absorb certain of the cuts we have made.

The bill contains the total estimate as submitted in the Budget for the General Accounting Office, \$26,413,645. This may appear to be a vast sum unless the tremendous task the General Accounting Office has to perform is taken into consideration. For instance, it includes funds for auditing lend-lease and emergency relief, in addition to all other governmental activities. It is estimated that during the fiscal year 1944 this Office will audit accounts and settle claims and do related work on expenditures amounting to \$85,000,000,000, as compared to a total of \$60,000,000,000 during the current fiscal year. The examination and audit of accounts unquestionably has a wholesome effect on the spending agencies, and savings from such auditing are far in excess of the appropriations made for that purpose.

Another place in the bill to which I should like to call your attention is one that shows quite a marked increase, and I think this is something the committee will be interested in. One of the very few items in which there is an increase in personnel is in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The Independent Offices Subcommittee has carried this item in its bill for many years and has been generous in appropriations for research and experimentation in the field of aeronautics. We were told in the hearings by Dr. Lewis, the Executive Director of the N. A. C. A. that they felt that the generosity and sympathetic understanding of the Congress in making adequate appropriations in the field of aeronautic research and experimentation could be credited with our present supremacy in the air in the world conflict. Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the United States fliers in the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps do not have to take their hats off or apologize to any group of fliers in the world.

Our planes, individually and collectively, coming now as they are into mass production, are just the last word in aeronautical perfection. This game of aeronautics however is one thing today and another thing tomorrow; it is a rapidly changing picture, and we are called upon to keep busy and keep working, especially in the field of research, and this is the reason we found it advisable—unanimously, I may say; I do not think there is a discordant note in the whole Appropriations Committee on this—to give the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics the funds they consider adequate to permit them to go ahead with their research and experimentation in this very necessary field of operations.

Another item to which I wish to direct attention is one in which we have made a pretty drastic reduction, the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Securities and Exchange Commission received a Budget recommendation of \$4,798,000 for 1944, which is \$862,000 less than we appropriated last year; and a cut of \$750,000 in the estimates. Some of us think this sum should provide them with sufficient funds to carry on the normal functions of the Commission in this time of war.

Perhaps the chief item in the bill outside of the Veterans' Administration is the United States Maritime Commission. The Budget estimate is \$1,289,780,000. This will be used to liquidate contracts heretofore entered into for ship construction. Let me say that the Deficiency Appropriation Subcommittee met this morning on an item from the Maritime Commission for a contract authorization of \$5,250,000,000 and an appropriation of \$4,000,000,000. These are large sums of money, but the funds carried in the independent offices bill which is presently before you, plus the funds which will shortly be before you in the deficiency bill are the funds which will be used by the Maritime Commission to take care of 2 programs: the programs inaugurated in 1942 of 2,242 ships, of which 554 have already been delivered and the remainder are under construction; and in addition to that a new program of 2,161 ships. This makes a total of something like 4,400 ships under the present program of the Maritime Commission, and the funds carried in this bill plus the funds which will shortly be in here in the deficiency bill will be used to pay for those vessels in progress payments as and when they are delivered from the shipways.

This gives us a very fine, high-powered, high-speed shipbuilding program which I think all of us readily recognize as being one of the most important places in the whole war effort. We are getting these vessels, as you perhaps know, at the rate of more than 100 a month; a little better than 3 vessels every time the sun sets slip down the ways into the water. These are the merchant-carrying vessels, not taking into account the small craft. This in itself is an industrial achievement which pays tribute not only to business management but to the workers of America. Every time the sun sets 3 vessels have slipped into the water to carry the cargoes of this country not only to its troops abroad but to the other nations to whom we are under obligation to assist. This does not indicate that we do not need more ships; we do, and, as Admiral Land said, this expanding effort that we are making is going to call for a maximum of all the shipbuilding resources this country can get; but so far as America is concerned we are on top of the submarine proposition, and with this shipbuilding effort that is now supported as it has always been supported by this Congress, I think we have every reason to look forward to an era where our commerce, our food, our weapons of war, our munitions, and our medicine and surgical supplies will have the necessary bottoms to carry them where they are needed in this great World War.

In his letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, inserted in the independent offices bill hearings, page 1179, the Director of the Budget has pointed out that certain language has been eliminated from various appropriation paragraphs as surplus and unnecessary. It is my understanding that this is the case in connection with appropriations for the Maritime Commission and

that it is not intended to restrict the use of funds made available to the Commission in the pending bill because of such elimination. I have just received a memorandum from Admiral Land on this subject which I would like to insert at this point:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, February 6, 1943.

Memorandum for Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives:

The proposed appropriation language for the United States Maritime Commission for inclusion in the independent offices appropriation bill, 1944 (Budget for the fiscal year 1944, p. 104), has been greatly condensed and simplified in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget. Several items formerly carried in the appropriations for the Maritime Commission (as well as for other agencies) have been eliminated as legally unnecessary or because they will be covered in general language in the Independent Offices or other appropriation bills.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding of the purpose of these changes and omissions and to avoid any possible contention that the omission of specific items not otherwise covered is intended to preclude expenditure of the appropriation for such use, it is suggested that the committee call attention to this situation in its report on the bill, or in any explanatory statement submitted to the House by the Member in charge of the bill during debate. It would avoid unfortunate misunderstanding or controversy if it were clearly indicated that the condensation and the improvement of the appropriation language with respect to the Maritime Commission, involving in some cases deletions of items formerly carried in the appropriation language, is not to be construed as a refusal or failure to make the appropriation available for any such items unless it otherwise clearly appears that the appropriation is not to be available for the item in question.

E. S. LAND, Chairman.

In connection with the Maritime Commission I would like to insert memoranda from the Commission dated February 12, 1943, and February 15, 1943, with reference to acquisition by the Commission of certain privately owned vessels in which the question of the so-called enhancement clause is involved:

FEBRUARY 12, 1943.

Within the last few months the Comptroller General has submitted to Congress three reports of alleged irregularities on the part of the Maritime Commission and rendered a decision pertaining to the meaning and application of the requisition authority contained in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, challenging the interpretation placed on the statute by the War Shipping Administration.

The controversy over the requisition authority (which is the basis of two of the Comptroller's reports) involves the interpretation of the so-called enhancement clause, which was intended to prevent a repetition of the Government's experience with fantastic ship prices in the First World War.

The question in this controversy is not the objective, but how to attain it.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has conducted hearings on the transactions involved in the Comptroller's report on the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and the Waterman Steamship Corporation and has asked the Maritime Commission for its comment on the more recent report pertaining to the purchase of a vessel from the United States Lines, Inc.

The chairman of the committee has expressed his intention to conduct full hearings on the controversy relating to the requisition authority. It is anticipated that these hearings will get under way as soon as Judge BLAND is able to return to his office.

The facts with respect to all of the differences between the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration on the one hand, and the Comptroller General on the other, will therefore be fully developed by the House committee that is responsible for merchant marine legislation.

FEBRUARY 15, 1943.

1. The Waterman Steamship Corporation: Extensive hearings on the transactions involved in the Comptroller General's report have been held by the Merchant Marine Committee. Witnesses for the Waterman Steamship Corporation, representatives of the General Accounting Office, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission were heard. The Merchant Marine Committee has not completed its examination of this record.

2. Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co.: Hearings were also conducted by the Merchant Marine Committee on the matters discussed in the Comptroller General's report. Representatives of the company, the Commission, and the General Accounting Office were heard. The Committee has issued no formal statement with respect to its conclusions.

3. South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation: Hearings were also conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Truman committee of the Senate and reports issued by both committees. The Maritime Commission has taken steps to remedy the conditions that existed at the yard.

4. Requisition authority in section 902: The Chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee has announced his intention of examining fully into the differences of opinion between the Comptroller General and the War Shipping Administration as to the proper meaning and application of the requisition authority contained in section 902.

The decision rendered by the Comptroller General in November 1942 is not concerned with values payable for ships on which construction-differential subsidies have been paid. Such subsidized vessels have been acquired (for title or use) in accordance with the formula prescribed by section 802 of the 1936 act directing valuation upon the basis of the depreciation cost to the owner.

The fantastic prices paid for ships during the First World War are not to be paid again. There is no disagreement about that. The differences of opinion between the General Accounting Office and the War Shipping Administration turn upon questions of law. It is a matter upon which no lawyer would express an opinion without examining both contentions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I reciprocate the sentiments of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. It is always a pleasure for the minority members of this subcommittee to work with the majority members. We appreciate the consideration accorded us at all times.

Mr. Chairman, the people demand the elimination of waste, of inefficiency, and of corruption. They demand that bureaucracy be curbed and that hypocrisy be terminated. They demand that Congress resume its full powers except insofar as their delegation is essential to the

maximum war effort. They demand that loyalty throughout the Federal service be assured.

They key to all these things is congressional control over expenditures. That control was placed in the hands of the Congress by the founders of our Government and in the light of the world's experience. Its retention is vital. To surrender it is to substitute for action by the Congress action by the bureaucrat. This is one of the bitter lessons of the past 10 years.

The problem of reasserting proper control over expenditure is not an easy one. We are confronted by a whole series of Government corporations with a lending capacity of over \$32,600,000,000 wholly outside of the Budget. We are confronted by the President's emergency funds and other blanket authorizations over which the Congress has no detailed control. We are confronted by a Bureau of the Budget which, in my judgment, has not to date obtained satisfactory results and which recently has been subjected to severe criticism. We are confronted by a tremendous ever-increasing force on the rolls of the Federal Government. We are confronted by the fact that many agencies fail to account to the General Accounting Office or challenge its jurisdiction.

These matters must be dealt with if we are to control expenditure. Heretofore, in recent years those desiring control have been in the minority. Efforts to establish it have been swept aside. Today the situation is changed. The control by the Congress can and must be reestablished. Every cent required for victory must be made available. Every cent requested for nonessentials must be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total in new appropriations of over \$2,621,000,000. In addition it carries reappropriations of over \$62,885,000; authorizations for expenditure out of funds otherwise available of over \$31,250,000; and permanent appropriations of over \$1,261,700,000, a grand total of about \$4,000,000,000.

Do not be deceived by the Budget statement indicating that this bill carries \$212,000,000 less than provided for the same agencies in the current fiscal year. The fact is that on a comparable basis there is an increase reflected of over \$643,700,000. The apparent decrease is brought about only by taking as reductions certain items which do not appear in this bill at all, but which may very likely appear in subsequent bills and by also taking as a reduction \$136,100,000 in respect to the T. V. A. when we are in fact called upon to make available out of reappropriations the sum of \$62,858,000.

It is true that the greater part of the increase referred to is reflected in a few items; in the civil-service retirement fund item, in the N. A. C. A. item, in the Public Roads item, in the Maritime Commission item, and in the Veterans' Administration item. It is also true that your committee has made numerous reductions. These restrictions, however,

when added together give a total of only \$6,448,000, which is a reduction on a percentage basis of something like one-quarter of 1 percent of the total carried in this bill, or if you put it on the basis suggested by the chairman and apply the percentage only to that portion of the total which the Budget classifies as for nonwar purposes, it is a reduction of about 3½ percent.

Personally I do not believe that such a reduction is going to be satisfactory to the people generally, faced as they are by increased costs of living, by income tax, Victory taxes, forced savings, and a desire to subscribe to War bonds. I hope that further reductions will be possible before this bill is enacted into law.

The bill covers a tremendous territory. The time available makes it impossible to go into detail. All that can be done is to refer to certain of the more important items and certain of the more important information developed in connection with their consideration.

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

First, I want to say a word about the emergency funds for the President, because while there are no such funds carried in this bill, there is a complete picture of their use to date embodied in the hearings and because requests for further funds will no doubt be made during the course of the present session of Congress.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In connection with the request for additional funds, is it not true that we shall have a very large request for increases in pay-roll funds? These estimates are confined simply to the salaries without application of the increases involved in the pay-increase bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The record shows that there have been made available as emergency funds for the President something over \$631,500,000. Of this total, something over \$392,000,000 has been available for expenditure in the current fiscal year and as of the time of the hearing about \$101,000,000 had yet to be allocated and was therefore available during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1943.

For what purpose were these funds made available? They were made available as the name indicates, for emergency purposes. They were made available for purposes either confidential in character or so urgent in character as to require making funds available without taking the time to come to the Congress.

How have these funds in fact been spent? If you will look at the tables commencing on page 1181 of the hearings, you will see the entire picture.

Item after item in the list of allocations fails to meet either test I have just referred to. Item after item fails to qualify as emergency expenditure. Item after item has been expended which should not have been expended until brought to the Congress for consideration and approval.

The emergency fund, Mr. Chairman, has been misused. It has been used in a manner to deprive the Congress of its proper control over expenditures. It has been misused despite frequent warnings both on the floor of this House and in committee to the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget. In my judgment, no further funds should be made available on the present basis.

THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

A word as to the Bureau of the Budget. There is no agency in the Government in a position to contribute more to the proper control over expenditure than the Bureau of the Budget. In my judgment, the results obtained by this agency to date have not been satisfactory. The recent Budget has been severely criticized as being misleading, as confusing war expenditure with nonwar expenditure, and as failing to give all the facts.

I do not know that it is true, but during the past year on three separate occasions persons who have appeared before the Budget Bureau have given it as their opinion that the Budget Bureau has acted more as counsel for the appropriation desired by the agency in question than as the hard-boiled judge of the merits of the appropriation.

The primary responsibility of the Budget Bureau is, of course, to the Chief Executive and not to the Congress. It may be that an inquiry by the Congress is desirable to ascertain why we have not been obtaining better results.

I call attention in passing to the fact that the request of this agency for 1944 is just about 300 percent in excess of the appropriation for 1941; that the average salary runs as high as \$3,500; that the work to which the Bureau has devoted itself of late includes work on the problem of manpower; work in developing a program for the Food Administration; work in planning for the handling of insurance premiums by the Veterans' Administration and the War Department; work in the field of taxation, rationing, prices, wages, credit, subsidies, and the like, and work in the field of Federal-State fiscal relationships, all of which work seems to me in large measure outside the normal scope of operations of the Bureau, presenting the question if the request of that agency may not well be reduced.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Civil Service Commission testimony will be found at page 820 of the hearings. The recommendation of your committee for the Commission, exclusive of retirement funds, amounts to about \$15,145,000 as compared with \$17,159,000 for the current year.

The record indicates that even at this time there is a net addition each month to the rolls of the Federal Government of as much as 100,000 employees; that we had or the pay rolls as of November 30 last about 2,750,000 employees; and that we may anticipate a total as of the end of the fiscal year of over 3,000,000 employees, a total about three times the size of the total on the Federal pay rolls on November 11, 1918, at the end of World War No. 1.

The following table tells the story:

EXHIBIT 1

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, November 1942

Department or establishment	Inside District of Columbia	Outside District of Columbia	Entire
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Executive staff.....	733	118	851
Maintenance force (White House).....	99		99
WAR ESTABLISHMENTS			
Office for Emergency Management:			
Alien Property Custodian.....	459	586	1,045
War Production Board.....	14,099	6,744	20,843
War Shipping Administration.....	608	942	1,550
All other, Office for Emergency Management.....	8,837	10,264	19,101
Office of Censorship.....	800	11,483	12,283
Office of Price Administration.....	4,928	32,889	37,817
Office of Strategic Services.....	916	186	1,102
Board of Economic Warfare.....	2,571	245	2,816
Selective Service System.....	731	26,640	27,371
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS			
State.....	2,567	5,206	7,773
Treasury.....	24,283	47,123	71,406
War.....	60,887	1,152,201	1,213,088
Justice.....	8,523	21,890	30,383
Post Office.....	6,841	318,910	325,751
Navy.....	48,225	499,561	547,786
Interior.....	5,041	37,800	42,841
Agriculture.....	10,645	64,998	75,643
Commerce.....	12,728	12,817	25,545
Labor.....	2,252	2,869	5,121
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS			
Alley Dwelling Authority.....	241		241
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	5		5
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel.....	42		42
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.....	429	9	438
Board Investigations and Research.....	168		168
Civil Service Commission.....	3,859	3,524	7,383
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	84	485	519
Export-Import Bank.....	50		60
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,104	1,083	2,187
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	267	2,231	2,518
Federal Power Commission.....	535	277	812
Federal Security Agency.....	8,453	56,891	65,349
Federal Trade Commission.....	508	74	582
Federal Works Agency.....	15,191	12,027	27,218
General Accounting Office.....	7,994		7,994
Government Printing Office.....	7,840		7,840
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	1,698	794	2,492
Maritime Commission.....	2,623	4,044	6,667
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	134	2,938	3,072
National Archives.....	430	14	444
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	21		21
National Housing Agency.....	3,828	12,411	16,239
National Labor Relations Board.....	417	478	895
National Mediation Board.....	27	52	79
Panama Canal.....	228	32,459	32,687
Railroad Retirement Board.....	22	1,850	1,872
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	3,798	3,493	7,291
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	14	1,364	1,378
Smithsonian Institution.....	817		817
Tariff Commission.....	339	11	350
Tax Court of the United States.....	131		131
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	9	37,340	37,349
Veterans' Administration.....	6,164	38,691	44,855
Total.....	284,158	2,465,943	2,750,101

There is abundant testimony that agency after agency is over-staffed to the point of inefficiency and impaired morale, at a time when the Nation is crying for

manpower for the war effort. Senator BYRD, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures, in an address in Boston recently gave it as his "firm and conscientious belief" that "one-third of those now engaged in clerical work could be dismissed to the advantage of the service and for the promotion of the war effort."

The President in a memorandum of December 12, referring to the 48-hour week, stated:

Obviously, this will permit reduction in personnel in some agencies and eliminate the necessity of filling vacancies in others.

Again, in his Budget message the President said:

Pay increases should be met largely by reducing the total number of employees proportionate to the increase in the workweek.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman recall any agency which offered to take care of the pay increases in that way?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I recall the Interstate Commerce Commission's stating that certain vacancies had not been filled in the current year and that they hoped to be able to get along without filling them in the next year, but I think the answer, generally speaking, to the question raised by the gentleman from South Dakota is in the negative.

Mr. CASE. In other words, these agencies are not going to follow the recommendation of the President?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I see little evidence of plans to that effect in the testimony before our committee.

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

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

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman expect to come to a discussion of the appropriation made for the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am going to come to that a little later, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. In connection with the manpower problem, will the gentleman agree with me that one of the very serious factors in that problem is the waste of manpower, particularly in our Government agencies?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree entirely with the gentleman. That is the point I am trying to emphasize in this connection. It has been said that "waste of manpower is a crime in peace and a greater crime in war." I think the Ramspeck investigating committee has a tremendous responsibility and a tremendous opportunity to contribute to economy, efficiency, and the manpower needs of the country.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office testimony will be found at page 257 of the hearings. This, of course, is another agency which is in a position to con-

tribute tremendously to the control of expenditure. The request of \$26,413,000 compares with the appropriation for the current year of about \$20,000,000. I believe, however, that the increase is justified. There is an enormous increase in the work confronting this agency. It is estimated that there will be \$85,000,000 of expenditures to be audited in the fiscal year 1944, and that vouchers will be three times the number of those audited in 1942 and twice those audited in 1943. If this amount is allowed, the expense of auditing will amount to only approximately 32 cents per thousand dollars.

I call your attention to the fact that the record indicates that some 32 agencies of Government fail to account to the General Accounting Office today; that nine others account, but account on a partial basis only; that relations with the Commodity Credit Corporation and with the Navy Department are unsatisfactory; and as I understand it several agencies of this Government challenge the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General.

EXHIBIT 2

AGENCIES INCLUDING CORPORATIONS WHICH DO NOT RENDER ACCOUNTS, INCLUDING SOME WHICH ARE EXEMPT BY LAW FROM RENDERING ACCOUNTS, TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

1. American President Lines, Ltd. (U. S. Maritime Commission).
2. Central Bank for Cooperatives.
3. Dairy Products Marketing Association, Inc.
4. Defense Homes Corporation.
5. Defense Plant Corporation.
6. Defense Supplies Corporation.
7. Disaster Loan Corporation.
8. District Banks for Cooperatives (12).
9. Federal Home Loan Banks (12).
10. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
11. Federal intermediate credit banks (12).
12. Federal land banks (12).
13. Federal National Mortgage Association.
14. Federal Reserve System (Federal Reserve Board).
15. Federal savings and loan associations.
16. State-chartered savings and loan associations (Home Owners' Loan Corporation).

17. Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation.
18. Inland Waterways Corporation.
19. Metals Reserve Company.
20. Panama Railroad Company.
21. Production credit corporations (12).
22. Production credit associations.
23. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
24. Rubber Reserve Company.
25. The RFC Mortgage Company.
26. The Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.
27. United States Spruce Production Corporation.
28. War Finance Corporation.
29. Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corporation.
30. Smaller War Plants Corporation.
31. United States Commercial Company.
32. War Damage Corporation.

CERTAIN AGENCIES INCLUDING CORPORATIONS WHICH RENDER ONLY PARTIAL ACCOUNTS TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, OR ACCOUNTS WHICH ARE NOT ENTIRELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH PRESCRIBED PROCEDURES

1. Commodity Credit Corporation.
2. District of Columbia.
3. Electric Home and Farm Authority (in liquidation).
4. Export-Import Bank of Washington.
5. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
6. Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.
7. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
8. Surplus Marketing Administration.
9. Virgin Islands Company.

Steps must be taken to remedy this situation. Control over expenditures is impossible in the absence of proper accounting.

I call attention also to three statements on behalf of the agency, the first showing unvouchered expenditures, the second showing the list of pending investigations of the United States Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration matters, the third, indicating that over \$7,000,000 of illegally spent W. P. A. money down in Louisiana discovered in the course of the investigation of the W. P. A. several years ago, is yet to be allowed.

EXHIBIT 3

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNVOUCHERED EXPENDITURES AND FOR OBJECTS OF A CONFIDENTIAL NATURE

Unvouchered expenditures in amounts authorized by the President to be reported in gross sums so authorized not itemized:

Agency	Authority	Amount
Emergency Fund for the President.....	First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public, 247, 77th Cong., as continued by Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 630, 77th Cong.	\$2,500,000

Expenditures for objects of a confidential nature, in which case the certificate of the expending agency as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher:

Agency	Authority	Amount
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 644, 77th Cong.	\$20,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service.....	do.....	25,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	First Supplemental National Defense Act, 1943, Public, 678, 77th Cong.	50,000
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....	First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.	500,000
Office of War Information.....	Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 763, 77th Cong.	500,000
Emergency Fund for the President.....	Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public, 353, 77th Cong.	10,000,000
Do.....	First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 678, 77th Cong.	25,000,000
Do.....	Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public, 763, 77th Cong.	25,000,000

Appropriations and allocations by agencies

Agency	Unvouch- ered ex- penditures- allocations	Objects of confidential nature		Total
		Appropri- ations	Alloca- tions	
Executive Office of the President.....	\$5,000			\$5,000
Office for Emergency Management.....	5,000			5,000
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....		\$500,000		500,000
Coordinator of Information.....	2,000,000		\$3,500,000	5,500,000
Board of Economic Warfare.....	102,400		10,000,000	10,102,400
Office of Strategic Services.....			28,000,000	28,000,000
Office of War Information.....		500,000	50,000	550,000
Navy Department (Chief of Naval Operations).....	50,000		500,000	550,000
War Department.....			922,666	922,666
State Department.....			5,050,000	5,050,000
Justice Department:				
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....		70,000	1,902,000	1,972,000
Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization Services.....		25,000		25,000
Public Buildings Administration.....	65,000			65,000
Federal Security Agency.....			50,000	50,000
Total.....	2,227,400	1,095,000	49,974,666	53,297,066

EXHIBIT 4

ACQUISITIONS OF TITLE TO AND CHARTERS OF VESSELS FOR WAR EMERGENCY PURPOSES, AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE EFFECTED ON VESSELS CHARTERED FOR SUCH USE

Investigations in connection with the acquisition, charter, and insurance of vessels by the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration are under way at present, but no definite conclusions have been reached. The transactions now under investigation involve the following steamship owners:

Vessel acquisitions: American President Lines, United States Lines, American Mail Line, Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., Southern Pacific Co. (Morgan Line), Matson Navigation Co., New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.

Vessel charters and war-risk insurance: Hawaiian Steamship Co., American Export Lines, American Foreign Steamship Co., American President Lines, Atlas Trading Corporation, Boyd, Wier & Sewell, Inc., Calmar Steamship Corporation, Isthmian Steamship Co., Lykes Bros. Steamship Corporation, Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., Matson Navigation Co., McCormack Steamship Co., States Steamship Co., Pacific Atlantic Steamship Co., Norwegian Shipping & Trade Mission, Shepard Steamship Co., Union Sulphur Co., United States Lines Co., Waterman Steamship Agency, Ltd., Weyerhaeuser Steamship Co.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Federal communications testimony appears on page 1212 of the hearings. The recommendation of your committee is \$7,609,000, as compared with the appropriations for the current year of \$7,386,000. The recommendation reflects a reduction in the Budget estimate of over \$479,000.

It is difficult to escape the conviction that there is a good deal of duplication of effort between the F. C. C. on the one hand and the Army and the Navy on the other. The Army, I understand, has thousands of people in its radio intelligence companies. The Navy also has its own set-up. The F. C. C. admits that both services advised at one time that they did not require what the F. C. C. was furnishing them. The Bureau of the Budget, in its testimony, recognizes the conflict.

This agency shows a tremendous number of promotions in the past year or so, 1,806, to be exact, at an increase of \$145,100. Details were furnished the committee with reference to the Legal Division and the Foreign Broadcast In-

telligence Service. I shall not encumber the RECORD with those details. I may say in passing, however, that the number of promotions was not only enormous, but that in many instances the same individual has been given more than one promotion in the same year. Among other examples is one individual receiving \$3,400 increase, or 105 percent, within a period of 8 months, another receiving \$1,400, or a 75-percent increase, in 6 months, and another receiving \$2,200, a 110-percent increase, in 16 months. There are many other examples that I could cite.

The record also indicates a request by this agency for deferments from the draft to the number of 442. Of this number, there have been granted 391, in respect to which Chairman Fly expresses the hope that the deferments may be for the duration. All of these deferments may, in fact, be justified. It may be stated, however, that neither the description of the positions held, nor the salaries paid, nor the fact that many of them joined the force after Pearl Harbor, lends force to this conclusion in the first instance.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. With reference to the deferments of this agency, does the gentleman mean deferments from going into the armed forces?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. COX. It is common gossip all over town that there is a higher percentage of draft dodgers in the Communications Commission than in any other department of the Government. If the gentleman will indulge me further, I am very much surprised to note the success of Mr. Fly in obtaining this large appropriation carried in this item. Apparently he is the witness that appeared in behalf of the Commission, on whose testimony the committee bases its finding. The Commission is divided, and that division differing with Mr. Fly says that the essential work of the Commission can be carried on and carried on effectively with a large reduction of personnel and a large reduction in appropriations. To be exact, it is contended by

those in the know that with \$2,000,000 the work of the Commission can be carried on. Mr. Fly, who heads the Commission, had no knowledge of communications, other than experience that he obtained as a switchboard operator before he was placed in the chairmanship. At the present time we find the Army and the Navy subordinated to him, and if the committee had found it possible to have consulted the Army and the Navy, disclosures would have been made to it that Mr. Fly is a terrible handicap to them in his effort to dominate completely the secret communications of the Army and the Navy.

Others in the know have said to me that the larger part of the appropriations that are made for this Commission are wasted; that you might as well shovel the money out of the window as to expend it in the manner in which the Commission does expend it. In view of the investigation that is going on, the item ought to be stricken from the bill altogether, and later the Congress will be able to make an appropriation that is proper.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I was about to answer the gentleman by saying that the suggestion he makes was in fact made in the subcommittee, to the effect that inasmuch as an investigation has been authorized by the House to go into the activities of this Commission, it might be just as well to delete this item wholly and allow it to be considered later as a deficiency item. The money, of course, will not be required until the first of the fiscal year, July 1.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman that the circumstance demands that the entire item be deleted until later on.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The same logic would apply to the War Production Board, and to the Army or the Navy, and to any other agency of the Government that is under fire by anybody. That is, put them out of business, convict them, and then afterward, if they are able to prove that they are innocent, give them enough money to carry on. I submit right here in the midst of the colloquy between my two friends that that is not a logical approach to the problem. I feel confident that the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission in the able hands of my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] will be thoroughgoing.

We may rest assured that long before July 1, when this bill will become law, those gentlemen will apprise Congress of everything they can find that would justify putting the Federal Communications and Mr. Fly out of business. In the meantime it is an agency that Congress has set up to do business and has delegated to it important war functions. The monitoring work of the Federal Communications Commission is very important. However we may feel about individuals in it, let no Member of this House be under any misapprehension

that they are performing a very vital and critical service in the war effort. Somebody has to perform that service.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that I certainly do not want to place myself in the position of failing to accord this agency every consideration to which it is entitled. It does not seem to me, however, that the deletion of this item has anything to do with the findings which may be made in the course of the investigation. Of course, the Commission must have the money that is necessary on July 1, but it does not need any part of these funds until that time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not recall any evidence before our subcommittee that the Federal Communications Commission was a handicap to either the Army or the Navy. Does the gentleman recall any such testimony?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] interrogated the representatives of the agency along that line, and I think substantiated the statement I have made.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am referring to the statement contained in a question asked the gentleman as to whether or not they were a handicap to both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. A duplication.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. "Handicap" was the word used.

Mr. COX. I used the word "handicap" and I used it advisedly, and if the gentleman will take the pains and manifest sufficient concern in the public interest to call upon the Army and the Navy he will find that the statement is justified.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] that as soon as I can get to a telephone I shall certainly make inquiry of the responsible heads of the Army and the Navy, and if any of those gentlemen say that the Federal Communications Commission is a detriment to the war effort, I will take advantage of my seniority in the proceedings to move to delete the item myself. Now will the gentleman join me in saying that if the Army and the Navy say they are performing a useful war service, he will give them a chance to have a fair trial before he executes them?

Mr. COX. I am not trying to execute anybody.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just take their money away from them?

Mr. COX. No; I am not. I am insisting that in view of existing circumstances the appropriation should not be made available at the time. I can tell the gentleman something that would interest him.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In spite of the demands throughout the country for econ-

omy, it would appear that most of these agencies are attempting to expand their functions under the guise of defense and war activities. In that respect, will the gentleman explain the item of \$206,160 for a War Problems Division under the Law Department, and explain why that is being created? Is there not some existing agency which already has jurisdiction over such activities?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That matter was given consideration by the committee in reducing the request \$479,000 below the budget.

I shall not dwell further upon this item, in view of the fact that an investigating committee has been set up to consider the activities of this Commission in detail.

I may mention in passing, however, first, that the record indicates continued approval of the transfer of stations or control of stations for considerations far in excess of the value of the physical assets transferred, with all the danger we have seen in other fields in the capitalization of Government franchises.

Second, that the serious charges said to have been made in connection with former Commissioner Pickard and others have apparently been whitewashed to the satisfaction of the Commission and the Department of Justice in the absence of further evidence.

Third, that 3 of those included in the list of 38 recently published by the Dies committee are to be found on the pay rolls of this agency.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

I want to say a word about the Federal Works Agency and the testimony appearing at page 347 of the hearings. This Agency consists of the Office of the Administrator, and under his general supervision the Public Buildings Administration, the Public Roads Administration, the Public Works Administration, and the Work Projects Administration. The over-all request made is for \$168,666,000, as compared with the current appropriation of \$140,496,000, most of the increase being due to road construction.

What I want to emphasize to the committee is the fact that W. P. A. is folding up. We are assured it will be put out of its misery before June 30, with the recapture of at least \$80,000,000 already appropriated.

P. W. A. is also folding up. Only \$27,000 of reappropriations is requested, and we are assured that P. W. A. will be wound up in the course of the fiscal year 1944.

This leaves therefore for supervision by the Administrator only the Public Buildings Administration and the Public Roads Administration, and a little supervision in connection with war public works. The Agency requested \$386,000, as compared with \$350,000 in the current year. This figure added to \$245,000 coming from constituent agencies would make available almost \$632,000, as compared with \$594,000 in the present year.

There are 15 people on the pay rolls drawing salaries between \$6,400 and \$12,000. There are 192 on the rolls, all told, with an average salary of \$3,200.

The increase in this appropriation seems entirely without justification, in view of the decrease in the over-all work, and I am inclined to think that the committee recommendation in this instance can and should be further reduced.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The testimony of the National Housing Agency, appears at page 931 of the hearings. The Agency requests authorizations totaling \$31,250,000 compared with \$42,523,000 for the current year; and appropriations for annual contributions amounting to \$11,350,000 as compared with \$13,000,000 in the current fiscal year.

This Agency reflects an attempt to bring order out of chaos in the housing field. You will recall that a year ago there were some 16 different agencies or units operating in the field of defense housing. The situation was so chaotic that even today the Bureau of the Budget cannot furnish the number of employees or the dollars spent by the predecessor organizations. All housing is supposed to be under this set-up now except Army and Navy construction on military and naval reservations and the Farm Security Agency's rural program which for some reason has not been brought under the Agency.

The N. H. A. consists of the office of an administrator and three principal subdivisions.

The first subdivision is the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, including the Home Loan Bank Board organization with 3,800 members and assets of \$5,600,000,000; the Federal Loan Insurance Corporation with 2,300 institutions and assets of \$3,500,000,000; and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation with 800,000 accounts aggregating \$1,600,000,000.

The second subdivision is the Federal Housing Administration which has issued insurance aggregating \$6,300,000,000, a total of \$3,800,000,000 being outstanding.

The third subdivision is the Federal Public Housing Administration which is the catch-all for the various constructing agencies I have referred to and which has an over-all building program of about \$5,778,000,000, of which \$3,200,000,000 is private housing and the rest public housing.

I call attention to the fact that the administrator plans to maintain five regional offices during the next fiscal year at a cost of \$665,575 despite the fact that there are four other sets of field offices in this agency. If this item cannot be reached in this bill it seems to me that it should be eliminated in the consideration of other housing appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. Chairman, before closing I want to refer to two other agencies or more if time permits. The first is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation which is a part of the national housing agency just referred to.

The power of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to refinance distressed home mortgages terminated way back on June 12, 1936. Its functions today are those of loan servicing and property management. Of the million loans made, aggregating about \$3,000,000,000, 251,000 have been extended for periods of from 15 to 25 years. Today there are outstanding something like 800,000 loans aggregating \$1,675,000,000. There are on hand 41,629 pieces of property.

I call attention to this fact in respect to property sold: On property with a book value of \$738,000,000 Uncle Sam has taken a loss to date amounting to \$227,000,000. There are still on hand properties with a book value of some \$266,000,000 which, if sold with similar success would probably net Uncle Sam a further loss of not less than eighty million dollars.

We have put up something over \$250,000,000 for the administrative expenditures for this agency. We are asked to put up \$10,000,000 more for the fiscal year of 1944, and we are assured by Mr. Fahey that this sum of \$10,000,000 is, in his opinion, bedrock for the agency.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the time has come to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I understand that the private mortgage institutions of this country stand ready to take over the assets of the Corporation. I believe that the loss Uncle Sam will sustain will be greater the longer we put it off. I am fearful that if we do not take some step to bring about liquidation at this time we shall find 25 years from now that this Corporation, like the War Housing Corporation and the War Finance Corporation today, will still have to be liquidated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In just a minute.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has a carefully prepared amendment in this connection. I believe he is on sound ground, and I hope the House will give him its support.

Only 2 days ago I received a letter from a cooperative bank, not in my district but from the State of Massachusetts, which expresses my ideas in this connection so largely that for the benefit of the House I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point:

EXHIBIT 5

GRAFTON COOPERATIVE BANK,
Grafton, Mass., February 8, 1943.

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand the House subcommittee, of which you are a member, is considering appropriation requests for the several corporations of the Government of which one is the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I trust in considering the appropriation for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that you consider the possibility of the Corporation closing out its business according to a bill coming before the House, known as H. R. 1283. It would seem to me very appropriate at this time to close out the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the following reasons:

1. There are ample funds in the hands of mortgage institutions seeking investment in mortgages and the Corporation can liquidate by the sale of its mortgages and other assets at this time in a good market and upon the most favorable basis.

2. Mortgage institutions will negotiate for and purchase the mortgages and home purchase contracts at this time with the greatest confidence because current payments are at their highest level and real estate values are stable and increasing. These things were not true 5 years ago and are not likely to be true in the future when mortgage institutions can secure an outlet for their funds by the making of good mortgages on new homes.

3. The sale of such assets at this time will enable the Corporation to retire its outstanding bonds which the Government has guaranteed and thereby relieve the Government credit of a large contingent liability.

4. The sale of these assets at this time will contribute to the solution of the manpower problem by releasing nearly 4,000 employees of the Corporation. Such sale will also release office space which is much needed in the war program.

5. Such sale will also release a substantial volume of typewriters, adding machines, and other office equipment which is needed in the war program. Existing mortgage institutions which are ready, willing, and able to buy such assets are confronted with decreasing mortgage portfolios, and can buy such assets and administer them without increasing their personnel, space, or equipment.

6. The Corporation is confronted with the necessity at some time of selling its assets in bulk or in blocks because the administration of the declining unpaid balances upon its mortgages will eventually be too expensive to be justifiable. The present mortgage market offers the Corporation its best opportunity to sell at good prices and thereby avoid excessive losses. It is believed that the assets of the Corporation can be sold at this time for an amount approximating its obligations. If it proceeds to a slow liquidation over a total of 25 to 30 years from its organization it is evident that the losses will be much greater.

7. The Congress expressed its intention as to the prompt liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation when its purposes were accomplished in section 5 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, by providing: "The Board shall proceed to liquidate the Corporation when its purposes have been accomplished and shall pay any surplus or accumulated funds into the Treasury of the United States." The purposes of the Corporation were long since accomplished. It has made no loans since 1936. No steps have been taken toward its liquidation as contemplated by law.

I trust that you and your committee will arrange to reduce the appropriation of this Corporation sufficient so that it will be necessary to liquidate this Corporation within the shortest possible time and in that way avoid carrying on this department of Government and save taxes to the people of this country. I do not believe that this Government should be in business. To my mind it is the Government's business to make laws governing business.

I trust you will give your full support to this idea.

Yours very truly,

H. A. SIMMONS, Treasurer.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my genial colleague from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Before the subcommittee it was stated that if we liquidate now close to 300,000 people will lose their homes, that it will cost the taxpayers of this country between four and

five hundreds of millions of dollars, and at the same time the very building and loan associations that we bailed out the gentleman wants to rescue now and turn over to them 50 percent. The other 50 percent who are slightly in arrears will lose their homes. Does the gentleman consider this to be the proper thing to do at this time? There is no question but what they will lose their homes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just to show how much sound and fury there really is in that contention, let me say that when Mr. Fahey testified before the committee, his testimony was that altogether—if you will examine the table—93.6 percent of all these home loans are current to within 3 months. That would leave only 6½ percent of the total number of vendee homes, namely, 811,000. There would be 48,000 in arrears. The country is so filled with money today, every finance company, every thrift institution, every insurance company, every bank is so loaded with money that they are very anxious indeed to have these mortgages and in consequence you can take all of them over on a current basis virtually. If I do not miss my guess, we could actually get a premium on the great bulk of these at the present time, whereas if we do not perform this operation now, and if we wait until after hostilities have terminated and you get a debacle in the market, then we will have 811,000 homes, the average age of which is 26 years old at the present time, competing with hundreds of thousands of homes built under a post-war plan. Then we are really going to hold the sack.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The very building and loan associations referred to we bailed out. There were foreclosures of a thousand a day when that bill was passed. He realizes that. Now he wants to return to that organization that charged the people from 6 to 12 percent interest in this business. They have a lobbyist here getting \$25,000 a year, with a suite at the Mayflower, sending out pamphlets asking that that be done so we will return those secured mortgages and homes and let the other 272,000 people lose their homes. You know that, and so does the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield to me further so that a fair and accurate picture is presented to the Members, may I say that the fact of the matter is that the scale-down on the value of these properties when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation took them over was in excess of \$200,000,000. That is point No. 1. Secondly, when you talk about bailing out finance and thrift institutions, let me advise the gentleman from New York that every State law in the land contains a provision relative to those institutions that are State chartered whereby they are governed by State laws, and while I cannot tell what the exact provision is in a good many States, I know in my own

State the law provides that when an account is 6 months in arrears it is mandatory for a thrift institution to foreclose for the very good reason they are cooperative ventures and the only money with which they have to work is the money that is saved by the laboring men, the average family, and placed in there on share account. So the State law protects them and compels these foreclosures in most cases. When you talk about bailing out, we might just as well have the whole story and show how these institutions had to operate under the pressure of the State statutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. The gentleman from New York will have ample time to debate the amendment when offered.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

I want to say something more about the United States Maritime Commission before I conclude. The United States Maritime Commission testimony will be found at page 660 of the hearings. The request is for \$1,289,000,000, as compared with the current appropriation of \$980,000,000. Of the total, there is provided for administrative expenses \$23,000,000 as compared with \$16,625,000 in the current year. The personnel increase amounts to 1,959, mostly for the Purchase and Supply Division, Finance Division, the Technical Division and the four regional offices. The War Shipping Administration appropriation is not included in this bill but will be presented to the House as a separate matter.

Since July 1, 1940, contract authorizations for ship construction have amounted to \$5,976,000,000. There is pending before the deficiency committee now a further contract authorization request of \$5,520,000,000, giving a total of \$11,226,000,000, if allowed, in contract authorizations for ship construction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations to date aggregate \$3,685,000,000 in respect to which there is an unexpended balance of \$2,091,000,000. The request here is for \$1,289,000,000, and the request pending before the deficiency committee is for \$4,000,000,000. If both requests are granted, there will be a total of \$7,300,000,000 to be expended in the next 18 months as compared with a total of \$1,600,000,000 expended in the last 30 months. This seems a tremendous total, but we are assured that the rate of \$400,000,000 a month in expenditure was actually reached in November last and that the total requested or allowed by the Budget is some \$900,000,000 less than the request.

The item in this bill is for administrative expenditures and for application in the construction of 2,242 ships under contract as of October 31 last. The item in the bill pending before the deficiency committee is in respect to 2,161 additional ships, bringing the total up to 4,403 ships over all.

The members will find in detail the four construction programs of the agency

on page 661 of the hearings. Also testimony as to the goal in terms of dead-weight tonnage of construction for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944. Also a statement as to the increase in construction of ships all the way from 50 ships in 1933 up to 1,000 in 1943.

Coming from a shipyard district as I do, I know the magnificent contribution that the workers in this industry have been making to the war effort. They have made a record which has never been approached in the world's history, and I know they can be counted upon for even greater results.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another side to this question in respect to which the Congress has an inescapable responsibility. Serious charges have been made. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has some of these charges now under investigation. My able colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will go into these matters in some detail. I do not wish to cover the ground which he will cover. I would be remiss in my duty, however, if I did not refer briefly to certain matters developed in the course of the hearings.

It has been charged, Mr. Chairman, that exorbitant prices have been paid for ships purchased; that section 902 of the Maritime Act eliminating any enhancement in value due to the emergency has been violated; that sums in excess of three times the proper value of ships purchased have in fact been paid.

It has been charged that excessive charter hire agreements have been entered into. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] recently put in the RECORD an example, I believe, of 11 ships having a value of \$786,000 which in a period of about 1 year earned over \$3,300,000.

It has been charged that excessive insurance has been allowed and paid on ships, sometimes amounting to several times the value of the ship. I call attention in this connection to the letter from the Chairman of the Commission to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], on page 721 of the hearings, with respect to the *President Coolidge*. This letter indicates an insurance of 200 percent of the value of the vessel if the construction subsidy is not first deducted. It indicates an insurance to the extent of 700 percent of the value of that ship if the amount of ship construction subsidy be first deducted.

I have requested in this connection three separate tables from the Commission, seeking a complete picture since July 1, 1940.

In respect to prices, I have asked for the name of each ship purchased, the name of the seller, the date of purchase, the age of the ship, the original cost of construction, and the price paid.

In regard to charter hire, I have requested the name of each ship, the company, the date of the charter-hire agreement, the age of the ship, the original construction cost, and the earnings, if any, under the agreement.

With respect to insurance, I have requested the name of each ship, the company, the date insured, the age of the

ship, the original construction cost, the insurance placed, and the insurance paid.

These tables, Mr. Chairman, to date have not been furnished.

It has also been charged that excess profits due the Government have not been collected. I have requested the Commission to furnish me with a statement showing the amount collected and the amount accrued. This information has not yet been furnished. It is admitted on the record, however, that all that is due has not been collected. It would also appear that the failure to cancel operating subsidies has served to make collection impossible and resulted in tax exemptions probably running into many millions of dollars.

The report of the Comptroller General in regard to the Waterman Steamship Co. transaction, with an apparent excess payment of \$2,800,000, is public information and before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The report of the Comptroller General in regard to the Tampa Steamship Co. transaction, indicating an excess payment of \$1,900,000, is in a similar category.

The report of the Comptroller General in reference to the sale of the steamship *President Roosevelt*, indicating an excess payment of over \$421,000, has recently been sent to the Congress.

The other investigations which the Comptroller General now has in hand will be found listed at page 269 of the committee hearings.

The situation at the South Portland yard, indicating fees to the extent of \$5,000,000 on an initial investment of \$250,000, has been the subject of an investigation by a congressional committee.

The situation in the Savannah yard was recently aired in the public press.

I think the committee will wish to read the letter from Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, to Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, and the reply of the Chairman of the Commission, appearing at page 752 of the committee hearings.

I realize fully, Mr. Chairman, the vital importance of ship construction in the war effort. I have already paid my tribute to the splendid work accomplished in this field. I report the matters just referred to as a matter of duty.

The charges made must be investigated. They must be proved, explained, or disproved. Personally, as one vitally interested in the merchant marine, I should be glad if they can be disproved. I hope they will be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The truth must be ascertained. It is vital if the welfare of the merchant marine on its present basis is not to be jeopardized.

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

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the gentlemen can tell the Committee what led to the action of the subcommittee in striking the whole appropriation of the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am afraid I do not have time to go into the matter at very great length. I think, however,

I can say for the committee that it was felt that the work done by this agency was very largely limited to that of correlating or duplicating the work undertaken by other agencies of the Federal Government or to assisting the States and localities in respect to problems belonging to State and local units.

While I think the committee appreciates fully the importance of proper planning, I think they did not feel that the continuance of an agency with some 350 people and an annual budget of \$1,400,000 to correlate the work of other agencies and to advise the States how to do their own jobs was warranted in view of the conditions facing the country at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was no information, however, that what work the National Resources Planning Board is doing is not a proper work and a valuable contribution to the Nation? In other words, it was a question of there being a duplication of procedure? I hope the committee did not feel that the necessity for national planning does not exist any more and that, therefore, you are going to cut out all appropriations for the agencies that may be doing this type of work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following comments on other agencies included in this bill:

EXHIBIT 6

THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

The National Resources Planning Board testimony will be found on page 50 of the hearings. This agency requests \$1,400,000, as compared with \$774,000 appropriated and \$243,000 allocated from the President's Emergency Fund during the current year. It requests an increase in personnel from 252 to 350.

I have never been impressed by the work of this agency. Much of it has been devoted to the correlation or duplication of the work of other agencies. Much of it has been devoted to assisting the States and localities in fields which should be taken care of by the States. Forty-four States now have their own set-ups.

A break-down of the work of the agency under seven headings will be found on page 57 of the hearings. These include general overhead; economic and industrial trends; public-works programs, both Federal and State; security and services, dealing with such matters as health, nutrition, youth, and education; functional programs, dealing with water and land plans; urban conservation and development; area studies, assisting States and localities; and post-war agenda and reserve.

A very large part of the work in prospect is work which falls primarily within the jurisdiction of other agencies or the States.

The Board states "Our immediate responsibility is to correlate post-war plans." It further states it is important "to make clear the things we are fighting for" and "to give assurance not only to our people but to other people that the four freedoms will be made realities everywhere in the world."

It further states: "In one sense the appropriation for planning might be regarded as insurance. The post-war plans which the Board prepares may never have to be used."

I believe in planning. I believe also that every agency that is worth its salt is planning. I am not impressed with the need of a Board of 350 people, costing \$1,400,000 a

year, to correlate the plans of other agencies and to tell the States how to solve their problems.

Frank Kent is authority for the statement that the Executive Office staff in World War No. 1 numbered 48 at a cost of \$164,520 as compared with the Executive office staff of today numbering 906 at a cost of \$2,999,460, or an increase of about 1,800 percent.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The testimony from the Securities and Exchange Commission will be found on page 308 of the hearings. This agency administers seven acts under three of its divisions. The Public Utility Division administers the Public Utility Holding Company Act. It requests \$720,000, the same amount as was appropriated for the current year. Sixty-eight percent of the registration work has been completed and substantial progress made in respect to the rest.

The Trading and Exchange Division administers the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Advisers' Act of 1940. This division is requesting \$352,890 as compared with \$382,890 in the current year, a reduction of 7½ percent. The record indicates a decline in investigations of 60 percent, a decline in filings of 50 percent, and a substantial decline in broker-dealer applications and reports.

The Corporate Financial Division administers the Securities Act of 1933, the Trust Indenture Act, the Investment Company Act, and chapter 10 of the National Bankruptcy Act. For this division is requested \$1,010,840, as compared with \$1,023,840, a decrease of 2 percent. The record indicates a decrease in filings under the Securities Act of 30 percent and a decrease in reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act of 45 percent.

It indicates also a general reduction of activities in the financial world reflected in tables relating to loans, exchange memberships, number of tickers and electrical boards, and daily average sales on national securities exchanges.

The committee reduction of \$750,000 would seem to be fully justified.

TARIFF COMMISSION

The testimony of the Tariff Commission will be found on page 280 of the hearings. The committee recommendation of \$760,000 compares with the sum of \$868,200 available in the current year and is \$103,000 below the Budget estimate. When added, however, to the sum of \$282,625 to be received from other agencies, the total to be made available amounts to \$1,042,025, as large a sum I think, as has ever been available to this agency. The record indicates that except for a little work done on trade agreements and a little work under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the work of the Commission has been primarily work for other agencies, such as the Bureau of Economic Warfare, Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board. The real basis for this request appears to be the desire to preserve a staff expert in tariff matters until after the conclusion of the war. The question presents itself whether or not this agency should be continued under the circumstances for the duration.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The testimony of the Tennessee Valley Authority will be found on page 456 of the hearings. Much of the data presented is regarded as restricted by the Office of War Information. The record indicates 24 dams built or under construction at an ultimate cost of \$687,700,000. It indicates sufficient power for all foreseeable demands at least until the end of the fiscal year 1944. It includes statistics as to completion dates for dams, steam plants, transmission facilities, the fertilizer program, related property operations, and development program.

No new projects and no new appropriations are contemplated. The agency asks the use of \$62,000,000 of its own revenues and \$62,800,000 of reappropriations, a total of \$124,800,000 to meet estimated expenditure of \$107,300,000. The balance of \$17,500,000 is requested as a reserve fund on the theory that projects which have been deferred by War Production Board may be released during the coming fiscal year. It should be noted in this connection that money has been provided for preliminary studies and for the design of plants for future construction wholly apart from the \$17,500,000 reserve fund.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The testimony of the Veterans' Administration will be found on page 209 of the hearings. The total requested amounts to \$887,017,000 as compared with \$601,195,088 in the current year, an increase of almost \$286,000,000. The request reflects an increase in personnel from 7,932 to 8,350 departmental and from 33,206 to 38,833 in the field, a total increase of 1,045.

A break-down of the request into seven items appears on page 211 of the hearings. Ninety-seven percent of the increase is in respect to three items, namely, Army and Navy pensions, \$48,000,000 military and naval insurance, \$8,600,000; and national service life insurance, \$222,230,000. The record indicates under national service life insurance as of January 1, 1943, 6,000,000 policies, aggregating \$38,000,000,000.

The increase in personnel is for work in respect to national service life insurance, for increased costs of supplies, materials, and hospitalization, for additional beds and for travel.

The record indicates as of June 30, 1942, 62,453 hospital beds, 18,771 domiciliary beds, a total of 81,224 beds. It indicates as of June 30, 1944, 63,776 hospital beds, 18,849 domiciliary beds, a total of 82,625 beds. The over-all program of the Veterans' Administration is 100,000 beds, the speed of completion depending upon priorities. The Veterans' Administration program in connection with the Army and Navy program now under way calling for 103,000 beds is believed to be adequate for any foreseeable demand.

The work of placing veterans of World War No. 1 in employment has continued with marked success. The total payments in behalf of the veterans of all wars since 1790 have amounted to \$15,106,893,986.81.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TARVER).

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, on February 10, the President transmitted to Congress an estimate of \$100,000,000 for the agricultural appropriation bill for the next fiscal year to provide for the making of so-called incentive payments, "to encourage an increased acreage of Irish and sweet potatoes, dried beans, dried peas, soybeans, peanuts, grain, sorghums, flax, and certain vegetables."

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of which I serve as chairman, departing from its usual custom of not announcing action upon any Budget estimate until after the bill is reported, has today by a majority vote disapproved this estimate and announced that fact to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the country. The announced purpose of this action was to advise the Secretary and the farmers of the country that so far as the subcommittee is concerned the amounts projected for incentive payments will not be appropriated by Congress, and to make this announcement in time so that

a different plan may be devised and put in operation for increasing the production of these essential crops. It is felt by a majority of the committee that the announcement of the program has been so recently made that farmers have not yet incurred any expense in making plans to cooperate in it, the program having been announced under date of January 27, 1943, and that the Secretary of Agriculture who is also Food Administrator and the farmers of the United States should be promptly advised that the funds for the incentive payment program will probably not be made available.

The matter is one of such tremendous and far-reaching importance that I feel it is incumbent upon me as chairman of this subcommittee to outline to the House my own feeling with regard to it. Since my views are not in all respects in accord with these of a majority of the subcommittee, I approach the discussion with some reluctance, but at the same time I feel that it is a subject which should be thoroughly discussed and thoroughly understood. I shall certainly not speak in criticism of anybody who entertains contrary opinions. I am concerned only with laying the facts as I understand them before the House.

I feel that the action of the subcommittee has been occasioned by a considerable number of reasons, which I believe I must appropriately leave in large part for expression by those who have been responsible for the action taken. So far as the merits of the proposal are concerned, if this House were here and now empowered to determine it definitely, and to substitute a different method of increasing production of these essential crops, I should be in accord with most of the reasons advanced. I do not, however, consider that to be the case.

The act of October 2, 1942, amending the Emergency Price Control Act, provides—

That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes.

That is the direction given by Congress in an act approved by the President as to how increases of production of agricultural commodities needed for war purposes shall be brought about. It is a legislative mandate which in my judgment should have been followed. I do not conceive, however, that it was within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to follow it. It could only have been done by the Office of Price Administration under the direction of the President.

Had that power been exercised by the Office of Price Administration, there is no question but that the Secretary of Agriculture would have had authority of law to establish so-called support prices which would have furnished all necessary incentive for additional production, thus

giving to the producers of these commodities the prices to which they are entitled, not from the Treasury of the United States as a subsidy, but in the market place. That, in my humble judgment, is what should have been done.

The danger of inflation at this time in my opinion does not come because of threatened increases in farm commodity prices. The American farmer is not profiteering. The inflation danger comes largely from huge and unconscionable profits in war industry, and from wages in war industry entirely out of proportion to agricultural prices.

There is a further very important problem connected with the whole question involved. It is whether or not a saner and more satisfactory approach to the goal of increasing agricultural production would not have been through proper steps to increase the supply of farm labor, through deferment of necessary labor from military service, and furloughing for agricultural work essential farmers already in the service; whether provision of additional farm implements and machinery, adequate supplies of fertilizers, and other steps of that sort might not have been tried to stimulate agricultural production. Personally, I do not believe that the American farmer today needs any monetary subsidy or incentive to cause him to produce for his country in this time of emergency to the very limit of his capacity. I believe that all his Government has to do is to tell him what it wants him to do, and see to it that he gets the means to do it with. I do believe, however, that he ought not to be made the goat of this continued movement toward inflated prices, which is tending to increase by leaps and bounds the cost of the products of industry, including of course the things the farmer has to buy, and at the same time is endeavoring to so restrict the farmer's income as to allow everybody else to profit at his expense.

I cannot discuss all of these questions now. I say I think the powers that be should have followed the mandate of Congress in attempting to increase production of essential agricultural products. They should have raised the prices of those products in the manner provided by law. They did not do it. They are now refusing to do it. Members of Congress and great farm organizations are incensed because of that failure. They feel that the authority of Congress has been flouted, that the law has been ignored, and that it is incumbent on Congress to protect its authority and see to it that its mandates are observed.

Under ordinary circumstances, I would be in full accord with that feeling. But we have here no ordinary circumstances. We are advised by the Food Administrator, charged with the duty of maintaining the national food production to a level sufficient for the needs of our armed forces and our allies as well as of our civilian population that the increased production of the essential crops named in the Budget estimate is absolutely necessary. More than that, we are advised that all of this sought-for increase in production in these several crops above what would

otherwise be production levels is intended for the use of our armed forces and of our allies. The Food Administrator, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the President have all approved this plan, this \$100,000,000 extra for incentive payments. I do not like the plan. You, perhaps, do not like the plan. We feel that the laws enacted by Congress have been flouted. Shall we now, in order to maintain the dignity and authority of Congress, enter a contest with the administrative branch of the Government to see whose will shall control, who shall be boss, and, whether we are right or wrong, run the risk of decreasing below needed levels supplies of essential foods to the boys in our armed forces and to our allies?

You can take that responsibility if you want to. I refuse to have any part of it.

I call your attention to this fact: The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1935, section 16, United States Code, title 16, section 590p, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to create obligations for benefits under the act not to exceed \$500,000,000. He has to create those obligations before the beginning of a crop year. The law contemplated that he should do so. If he waited each year until the agricultural appropriation bill is approved in midsummer, it would be too late. He has incurred obligations for the crop year before the beginning of the year and before the money has been appropriated by Congress for every one of the 7 years since the act was passed. Now, he has undertaken under that authority to pledge the credit of the Government for this additional \$100,000,000 for the coming crop year. It was only a few days ago, but it has been done. Farmers may not have done much in endeavoring to meet his offer, but thousands of them may have, and doubtless have, made some plans, incurred some expense, and would have their plans thrown out of gear by the withdrawal of his offer.

Who has authority to direct him to withdraw it? Nobody except Congress with the approval of the President. Congress undoubtedly did not contemplate in passing the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act that the power given him in section 16 would be used for such a purpose; it directed in the Emergency Price Control Act as amended that he use a different method for increasing essential agricultural production for war purposes; but it never repealed the authority given him in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and he is at least within the letter if not the spirit of that act.

I repeat, who can direct him to withdraw his \$100,000,000 offer to the farmers of the country? The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has no such authority; even the full Committee on Appropriations would have no such right. The House of Representatives by itself alone cannot do it and will not even have the opportunity until the agricultural-appropriations bill comes before the House, perhaps a couple of months from now. You cannot even have a vote on it now to see how the majority feel.

In the meantime the news goes out to the farmers of the country that the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has disapproved the estimate for the \$100,000,000. That will destroy the incentive-production program. No farmer would feel safe in incurring added expense to cooperate in the program when uncertainty exists as to whether the Government will be able to keep its contract.

Then, you say, let the administration do this thing in the manner directed by Congress—that is, by providing adequate price increases for these commodities to spur production. Perhaps it will be the administration's fault if it does not. Perhaps, however, the administration will say that not a subcommittee, but the two Houses of Congress, must determine whether this money will be appropriated, and that the Secretary had legal authority to bind the Government up to \$500,000,000, and therefore invite the farmers of the country to proceed on the basis of the Secretary's offer. Certainly the program would be a flop; certainly the goal of increased production would not be achieved; and while the Congress and the administration settle the question of each other's prerogatives, a war need is not filled, American soldiers and sailors and their allies go without necessary food, and the day of victory in this world-wide struggle is to some extent postponed. Yes; it might even be that failure to furnish these extra foodstuffs would make the difference between victory and defeat.

There may be men who want to take that responsibility. I want none of it. Law or no law, congressional dignity or lack of it, I am going to wash my hands of any responsibility for throwing any sort of a monkey wrench into the war machinery. I voted to approve this Budget estimate. If further opportunity is offered me to support it again, I will do that. I hope that the administration, in view of the situation which has arisen, will withdraw it and resort to the methods provided by the Emergency Price Control Act to accomplish the same ends, but if it does not, I shall not participate in any contest with administrative authorities which could only result, no matter who is right or who is wrong, in adding to the danger of our war effort, to that of the men who are carrying on in that effort on sea and on land throughout the world, and in their failing to receive, no matter through whose fault, the kind of backing to which they are entitled.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is not the gentleman aware that all leading farm organizations have recently taken action over a joint statement in opposition to these incentive payments as being necessary to stimulate expanded food production.

Mr. TARVER. I am aware that representatives of two farm organizations appeared before our subcommittee on Friday of last week and expressed opposition to the making of incentive payments, in lieu of increasing prices. I was unable to secure from the representatives

of those farm organizations, a clear and definite statement of what their attitude would be toward incentive payments, if the movement for increasing prices should not be successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Virginia to yield me 1 minute.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague on the committee was on his feet and I thought perhaps he would like to ask a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I listened to the gentleman from Georgia with interest, and he made a fine statement of the case except I think he overemphasized the question of the conflict between the executive and congressional branches of the Government as distinguished from some other considerations in the minds of the subcommittee, when that subcommittee took action this morning. The gentleman will bear me out, I think, that the committee was of opinion that it was embarking on a subsidy program in the first place, and secondly, that there was no assurance that it would work.

Mr. TARVER. And let me say that \$200,000,000 of the \$400,000,000 first estimated for the 1944 Budget, for the soil conservation and domestic allotment program serves the identical purposes to be served by this \$100,000,000. This \$100,000,000 is merely on top of that. In other words, \$200,000,000 of \$400,000,000 in the original Budget estimate is to make payments to the identical types of farmers to whom it is proposed to pay this additional amount, and if this is a subsidy, that is a subsidy, and yet nobody has ever suggested the elimination of the \$200,000,000 from the original Budget. While that \$200,000,000 is allocated to producers of the five basic crops payment is conditional on their producing the same types of crops designated in this supplemental estimate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And let me say that the vote of the subcommittee this morning on the request of the Secretary of Agriculture for \$100,000,000 was rejected by a vote of 5 to 1, those voting in the affirmative being the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], Mr. LAMBERTSON, myself, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. WENE, and my colleague from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] voted in the negative.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, I correct the gentleman by stating that the majority was 6 to 1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is correct. I forgot to mention that Mr. SHEPPARD was not there at the time.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, yes; he was. All of the subcommittee voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then it was 6 to 1, and that 6 was made up of 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I believe it is

fitting that any Member of this House or of the other Chamber to criticize severely, and criticize up to the hilt, the activities of any officials or any members of any executive bureaus with whom they emphatically disagree. I do, however, feel that it is quite unfair and unsuitable for Members to endeavor, by way of venting their personal spleen, to cut off appropriations because of their disagreement with individual members of the departments and agencies. I do not think it is proper to cut off the appropriations for those agencies and departments for any such reason. That is an unfair method of dealing, and as a humble Member of this Congress I certainly will fight against any efforts of that sort.

I want to spend a bit of time today on Joseph L. Weiner, Office of Civilian Supply Director of the War Production Board. In his official capacity as such, his vote is essential in connection with the cutting down of the source of supplies of many industries and services. In connection with the wood pulp and paper-products industry numerous drastic orders have recently been issued, some of them without rhyme or reason and without appropriate consultations with the heads of the industry, or the consuming public which is also concerned. A group of Members of this House asked about an attempted 40-percent cut in the raw materials used in the manufacture of newsprint paper.

Members of the Paper and Pulp Division, I am informed, among them Messrs. Sterling, Wakeman, Gay, Snow, and Chandler have been reasonable and eminently fair in the matter and other matters. My contact with a number of these men have been most agreeable and satisfying. Indeed I found them most pleasant and cooperative. They wish to confer with the industry's groups and want their point of view. They do not want to ride roughshod over anyone. They object to this 40-percent cut, but Joseph Weiner is or was obdurate and adamant. He would not think of any modification. The 40-percent cut would materially affect, if not put out of business, hundreds of small newspapers of this country. Now more than ever, newspapers are essential in this country for obvious reasons. Jefferson once said, "If I were given a choice of government without newspapers and newspapers without government, I would choose the latter."

Efforts are now being made to cut out paper and paper products gradually not drastically—as the needs appear. As to the material for the manufacture of newsprint papers, up to a maximum of 10 percent is all that is necessary at this juncture and Weiner will have to agree—or else. He will have to agree on other matters—or else.

Let me give you another side light upon the aims and aspirations of this gentleman, who, apparently, does not know his backside from a hole in the ground. He actually tried by a "Weiner ukase" to return us to prohibition by the back door.

This man Weiner has the gall, the cheek, in the face of the fact that we

repudiated prohibition not so many moons ago, to recommend cutting down legalized liquor to the extent of 99 percent, leaving only the smallest modicum, 1 percent, for medicinal purposes. I endeavored to take up the matter with Mr. Weiner himself, and get his report, but I was not able to get Mr. Weiner on the telephone. He was "in conference" whenever I phoned. That excuse will not wash with me. He did not show enough courtesy to call back. Finally his secretary told me that the report was not for publication. Yet, extracts were found in all of the newspapers, and if the newspapers could get portions of the report the entire report should be at our disposal. I was told by someone in his office that the newspapers had no right to the portions of the report. That sounds fishy or that office was negligent in letting a confidential report leak out. Anyway, the press did a public service in reporting the portions of the report it got hold of. We have, by our protests, nipped in the bud a damnable attempt again to "dry" the country.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. This same Joseph Weiner, is the man who is depriving agriculture of its farm machinery down to a very small percentage of what it should have. I do not believe that he knows a hay tedder from a corn sheller.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman's opinion is probably better than mine. But the gentleman should keep after him. He has no right to be in that position of power. He has already shown his unfitness. I do not, however, say that we should cut off the appropriations for the War Production Board because of the derelictions of one man in that Board, as some people would have us do.

I have been all through prohibition from the start, and in order to show, for example, with what ease liquor was obtainable during the prohibition era, right here in Washington, I brought into this chamber and placed on this table 12 bottles of liquor, back in 1926, three bottles of alleged "Scotch," 3 bottles of apparent "bourbon," and 3 bottles of presumed "rye" that I had purchased that very morning in drug stores and from bootleggers in Washington. I had violated the law. Most everybody did. It was the fashion. No one cared a hoot for the eighteenth amendment or the Volstead Act.

Gentlemen, it is very strange to relate that before my speech was over, the bottles had disappeared, indicating that although members even in this chamber had voted "dry," they also, like the whole Nation, were drinking "wet." They coveted and took the bottles from this table. I never got them back. I did not want them. I would not have touched the stuff. I had too much respect for my "tummy."

This new dry proposal, more fantastic than any thus far advanced by even the most fanatical prohibitionist agitator, clearly calls for further explanation from Mr. Joseph L. Weiner, director of that governmental bureau. Of course, the

Weiner report itself has not yet been fully published. We have only a newspaper story with no identification as to the authority for it, so that the American people have no means of knowing exactly what the report says fully on this subject nor any explanation as to the reasoning behind such an absurd recommendation. We only know Weiner sponsored it.

Viewed from an economic standpoint, and as a war conservation measure, the proposal is manifestly ridiculous. According to the newspaper accounts, Weiner believes that with respect to the alcoholic beverages we should cut out distilled spirits and permit the production and sale of beer and wine up to two-thirds of 1941 consumption. Let us take a look at the facts.

First. The distilling industry is now completely converted to war production of alcohol for use by the armed forces and in manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Second. The country has on hand 3 to 3½ years' supply of distilled spirits already manufactured.

Third. The continued sale of this product will return approximately \$1,000,000,000 in revenue to the Federal Government and State treasuries each year. This revenue is vital to the individual States of the Union whose need of revenue is greater than ever before with the loss of income from automobile license, gasoline, and other taxes.

Fourth. Out of every dollar spent for distilled spirits, from 66 to 68 cents goes to the support of Government.

Fifth. The beer and wine industries employ over 40,000 persons in production alone and sales of these products are much more lightly taxed than distilled spirits, yielding the Federal Government somewhat less than half a billion dollars a year. Moreover, what is more important, there is only about 90 days' supply of beer in the country at any time.

In other words, Mr. Weiner is suggesting that the country should continue to devote manpower and materials to the production of one type of alcoholic beverage, which still has to be made, and which yields the Government a relatively smaller amount of revenue, and eliminate the sale of another type of alcoholic beverage which is already produced, ready for sale and which yields enormous revenue both to the Federal Government and to the sorely-pressed State governments.

The proposal is even more dangerous when viewed from the social side. If adopted, it would inevitably return the country, to a very considerable extent, to the evils of the prohibition era. Mr. Weiner is probably mentally too young to understand that part of the picture. He was probably in his mental diapers when this country went through the terrible crimes of prohibition, with its hip-pocket flask, bay-rum cocktails, bootleg scotch, and the racketeering, banditry, and gangsterism which went along with them.

What background has Weiner to understand civilian tastes and demands for liquor? Even the Army refused to make

the country dry—it is feared for the morale of soldier and civilian alike, but Weiner would bludgeon the Nation into prohibition. Who abides with him? What groups held his pen as he wrote? It is worth investigating. Perhaps we should tell him that no more whisky can be made—all distilleries have been commandeered for the making of alcohol in order to produce smokeless powder and synthetic rubber for war use. All distillers and dealers have already voluntarily rationed supplies. The stretching of the limited stocks under reasonable control by the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. would satisfy the Nation and would, I am sure, be agreeable to the administration and particularly to James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization.

This is prohibition by stealth—through the back door—despite the fact that the country fought overwhelmingly for and won the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

The American people want none of this kind of ridiculous regimentation. It is unnecessary, unsound, and uneconomic.

I went back to my old files and I found some interesting newspaper clippings of what happened during that awful period called prohibition.

Here is a clipping from Aurora, Ill., of March 26, 1929:

State dry agents today stormed the home of Joseph DeKing, 40, after bombarding it with gas bombs, killing Mrs. DeKing, 35, and clubbed her husband into unconsciousness.

Their terror-stricken son, Gerald, 9, seized a revolver and shot one of the raiders in the leg.

Another clipping from New York, my own city, of December 28, 1921:

Three men and a woman died yesterday from the effects of wood alcohol which they drank during the Christmas holidays under the impression they were drinking gin and whisky. Two of the men were brothers. * * * The drinks did not affect one of the brothers until yesterday about noon, when he became suddenly ill and began to lose his sight. He feared that he had drunk wood alcohol and went at once to the hospital. He became steadily worse in spite of everything the physicians could do, and at 6 o'clock was blind. He went into convulsions soon afterward and died in great pain about 10 o'clock.

I commend to Weiner a reading of these records.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I could tell you more about those dreadful years under the prohibition era. The noisome scent of bathtub gin still quivers our nostrils. The headlines are still fresh in our memory, as follows: "Beer baron slain," "Senator shot by dry agents," "Booze convoy hijacked," "Coeds in rum orgy."

The Lord deliver us from another era of prohibition. I once said on this floor the return of prohibition would be just like a dog returning to his vomit. That is strong but fitting language. That is the only way I can adequately describe it, because prohibition was that vile.

Now, this man Weiner, when he found that we were getting after him, sort of apologized and said as follows:

There is no indication whatever that we shall at any time in the discernible future get down to rock bottom and be compelled to distribute liquor on a bedrock basis. On the contrary, there is on hand today sufficient liquor to provide normal consumption for several years. It should be added that the entire bedrock economy report submitted to the Director of Economic Stabilization by the Office of Civilian Supply was a study and not a recommendation.

When he was caught with his "pants down" he calls a recommendation a mere study, but anyone who has any knowledge of prohibition, who lived through it or would take the trouble to read about prohibition, would neither make a study nor a recommendation that we should be regimented into prohibition again, particularly after we had in this House and in the other Chamber passed a repeal which was ratified by the necessary number of States. The Nation does not want any more of prohibition and we do not want any more ukases, edicts, orders, studies, or recommendations coming from this man Weiner. Of course, nothing is going to come of that report now after we have scotched him, as it were, as far as Jimmy Byrnes is concerned. He is too practical, too sensible. He knows the temper of the people. As Congressman, Senator, judge, and right-hand man of the President, he will not be fooled by any such asinine study or report.

The report, however, is going to have a bad effect in another direction, in that it is going to be used by all the dry organizations all over the country as proof positive that we must have this prohibition regimentation again. This man has created a tremendous amount of havoc because of what he has said. The dries will quote him up hill and down dale.

Last Saturday and last Monday in New York, and probably in other States and other places, there was a veritable run on all liquor stores, after the publication of this Weiner report. All liquor stores were cleaned out of liquor because of the dumb statement made by this man.

I repeat to the gentlemen who have grievances against him, come here and air those grievances to the end that he will be put back where he came from—my own city of New York, I am unhappy to state. He comes from New York and was formerly in the office of corporation counsel of the city of New York under the LaGuardia administration. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican. But at any rate he has no place in the War Production Board personnel.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. CLEVENGER. It might interest the gentleman to know that I have this morning received from one county farm bureau a list of 14,700 acres of very rich land that will not be in crop production this year, probably for two reasons: First,

the lack of manpower, and, second, the lack of machinery. Your city of New York is vitally interested in that, because after all, milk does not run out of a faucet.

Mr. CELLER. I am very much interested and I will be glad to cooperate with the gentleman to bring about proper relief.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering the second of the so-called departmental bills. After many weeks of diligent and painstaking work, the Appropriations Committee, by and through the approval and recommendation of the very able subcommittee, has submitted for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House this bill, which I understand provides for contemplated expenditures by the various governmental agencies provided for in the bill, the approximate sum of \$2,621,104,379.

I concede, of course, that the Members of the Congress who comprise the Appropriations Committee, and more particularly those of the subcommittee, who have heard the evidence adduced at the hearings, are in a much better position to pass upon the merits of the bill and the individual items which make up the whole of the sum total than are we, who have not been privileged to hear the testimony or read the very voluminous record of the hearings. Each of us, however, has his own individual responsibility to the particular people he represents, not only in his own respective congressional district and State, but the Nation as well.

I am personally fond of every Member on either side of the aisle who makes up this splendid subcommittee. I do not challenge their sincerity of purpose, their good intentions, or the fact that they may honestly feel that they have used the pruning knife to its full capacity. On the other hand, I am not unmindful of the fact that in our respective committees we are sometimes oversold by those with whom we so often come in contact and who are directly interested in the bureau, department, or agency for which we are appropriating or legislating either for or against; and I doubt whether there has ever been an appropriation bill reported that could not stand further drastic reductions. That is especially true in this particular period of our country's history, so far as nondefense expenditures are concerned.

This Congress has a solemn obligation to the people of this country to trim, and trim to the core, and to cut, and cut to the quick, all expenditures that are not absolutely essential to the winning of the war. I do not pretend to be a fiscal expert or to know all the answers to governmental economics. I doubt whether anyone else does. I do recall that in 1932 it was stated and proposed as a sound governmental principle that a government, like a family, could not long keep on spending in excess of its income with-

out being bankrupt and going upon the rocks. Of course, no one in authority since that time has advocated any such doctrine since that campaign, although it seems to me to be fundamental.

In view of the unprecedented demands that are being made of our people in order to finance this war, I do want to point out a few facts which disturb me and which speak for themselves, and which certainly stress the absolute importance of cutting out of every appropriation bill everything that is not absolutely essential for the successful prosecution of the war.

Some of the things which I shall say and some of the comparisons that I want to call to your attention, I may say are not made without some trepidation upon my part, for I realize that any statement that might be made which someone might construe to mean that Uncle Sam is still your favorite, and in making comparisons of our own expenditures in connection with the war with those of our allies, may bring down the wrath of the gods upon our heads and that some vociferous, self-styled guardian of American freedom or self-appointed spokesman of American policies is likely to label us as an isolationist or a tool of Hitler and claim that we are not interested in winning the war because we dare call attention to these war expenditures.

I am sure, however, that the vast majority of the people in this country have well caught on to that class of self-styled gentry and are quite certain that those of us whose sons are fighting on the far-flung fields of battle and who subscribe to the various war chests, are the folk who are not only eager and anxious to win the war as speedily and effectively as possible and get our boys back home, but are likewise anxious that they have, if possible, a solvent Government, and some semblance of the sort of American ideas and ideals to return to when they get back over here.

The New York Times under date of January 12, contained an article setting out the war budgets for 1943, which are as follows:

United States.....	\$100,000,000,000
England.....	21,000,000,000
Russia.....	15,000,000,000
Canada.....	4,000,000,000
Germany.....	34,000,000,000
Italy.....	8,000,000,000
Japan.....	7,000,000,000

According to those figures, the total war budget for 1943 of England, Russia, Canada, Germany, Italy, and Japan, approximates \$89,000,000,000, while our own war budget is \$100,000,000,000. In other words, our war budget contemplates our expending for the war effort about \$11,000,000,000 more than our principal allies—England, Russia, and Canada—plus the budget of all the Axis Powers.

After noting this bit of interesting information concerning the war budget for 1943, I thought it would also be interesting to make some comparisons of the expenditures in dollars and cents of our own Government which has been in the war a comparatively short time, with

those of our allies and the Axis Powers; so I asked the Legislative Reference Division of the Library of Congress for information about the war budgets of our allies for the entire period from 1932 to 1943, inclusive. I also requested that I be furnished the information as to not only what our allies had expended during that 10-year period, but also as to the entire expenditures of the Axis Powers during that same period.

The Legislative Reference Service directed my attention to the Foreign Commerce Weekly under date of February 6, 1943, and also to the Federal Reserve Bulletin for January 1943. For the information of those who may not have had the privilege of making these comparisons, I include herein as a part of my remarks, the information as set out in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, in a very interesting article by Mr. Leon S. Wellstone, Division of Commercial and Economic Information, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:

COST TO UNITED STATES

Leading in the cost of military expenditures, though late to enter the war against Hitler—December 11, 1941—is the United States. During the fiscal year 1940-41 these expenditures amounted to \$6,700,000,000; in 1941-42 they were \$28,300,000,000; for the fiscal year ending the coming July they are estimated at \$77,300,000,000; while for the fiscal year 1942-43 the President, in his recent address before the new Congress, estimates such outlays at \$97,000,000,000.

Taking only the expenditures already used or now appropriated, we arrive at the total of \$112,300,000 for the last 3 years.

UNITED KINGDOM

The military expenditures by the United Kingdom since the advent of the Nazis in Germany are given (in pounds sterling) in the following table:

Defense and war services, Apr. 1 to Mar. 31

1932-33	£102,990,000
1933-34	107,872,000
1934-35	113,870,000
1935-36	136,949,000
1936-37	186,072,000
1937-38	262,117,000
1938-39	382,456,000
1939-40	1,141,451,000
1940-41	3,220,000,000
1941-42	4,085,000,000
1942-43 (estimate)	4,500,000,000

¹ £241,201,000 total defense votes; £408,500,000 votes of credits; £491,750,000 amounts met from issues under Defense Loans Acts.

This makes a total of £14,239,000,000.

The yearly average exchange rate of the pound sterling during the foregoing periods has been as follows:

1932	\$3.50
1933	4.23
1934	5.03
1935	4.90
1936	4.97
1937	4.94
1938	4.88
1939	4.43
1940	4.035
1941	4.035
1942	4.035

¹ Official rate.

Translating the United Kingdom expenditures into dollars, we find a total for the period of \$58,200,000,000.

This makes a grand total of \$112,300,000,000 plus \$57,700,000,000, or \$170,000,000,000.

CANADIAN EXPENDITURES

Canada expenditures on national defense between 1939 and 1943 (fiscal year in Canada ends Mar. 31) were as follows:

1939	\$34,000,000
1940	127,000,000
1941	778,000,000
1942	1,351,000,000
1943	3,000,000,000

The figure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1943, is conservative and may have already been increased.

The total expenditures in the years cited amount to \$5,290,000,000 (Canadian), or approximately \$4,814,000,000 (United States) at the rate of 91 cents per Canadian dollar.

This increases the grand total from \$170,500,000,000 to about \$175,300,000,000.

SOVIET UNION

The military expenditures by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics since the advent of Hitler have been as follows, in rubles (the estimate for 1942 is not yet available):

<i>Rubles</i>	
1932	1,500,000,000
1934	1,700,000,000
1935	6,500,000,000
1936	14,800,000,000
1937	20,000,000,000
1938	27,000,000,000
1939	41,000,000,000
1940	57,000,000,000
1941	71,000,000,000

This makes a total of 240,000,000,000 rubles during the 9 years. Owing to the unreality of the foreign-exchange value of the Soviet ruble, it is, at best, difficult to translate it into dollars. But it will not probably be far wrong, in terms of the value of industrial production involved, to equate the 240,000,000,000 rubles to about \$96,000,000,000, at an average rate of 40 cents per ruble.

The figure brings the grand total to \$271,300,000,000.

FRANCE

The expenditures for national defense by the Republic of France from 1933 to the time of the armistice on June 17-18, 1940, were as follows, in francs:

<i>Francs</i>	
1933	12,618,000,000
1934	11,157,000,000
1935	10,270,000,000
1936	14,112,000,000
1937	21,730,000,000
1938	30,300,000,000
1939	113,672,000,000
1940 (estimate)	249,000,000,000
1933-39	213,859,000,000
1933-July 1, 1940 ¹	338,359,000,000

¹ In making this computation half of the total figure for 1940 has been used to obtain the figure for the whole period; the 1940 figure is therefore a very rough estimate.

This makes a total from 1933 to July 1, 1941, of 338,000,000,000 francs. The rate of exchange during those years follows:

<i>Cents</i>	
1933	5.0
1934	6.6
1935	6.6
1936	6.1
1937	4.0
1938	2.9
1939	2.5
1940	2.1

Converting the franc into dollars, we find the total expenditures of France amounting to about \$10,000,000,000.

This brings the grand total up to \$271,300,000,000 plus \$10,000,000,000, or \$281,300,000,000.

THREE BRITISH DOMINIONS

The war expenditures of Australia in recent years were as follows:

1939-40	£56,000,000
1940-41	171,000,000
1941-42	320,000,000

This makes a total of £547,000,000. At the rate of exchange of the Australian pound, \$3.22 to the dollar, the sum amounts to \$1,760,000,000.

The war expenditures of New Zealand follow:

1939-40	£7,000,000
1940-41	32,000,000
1941-42	60,000,000

This makes a total of £99,000,000, or \$319,000,000.

The war expenditures of the Union of South Africa were as follows:

1939-40	£4,000,000
1940-41	60,000,000
1941-42	72,000,000

This makes a total of £136,000,000, or (the South African pound being \$3.98) \$541,000,000.

Bringing together the war expenditures of Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa and adding them to the total makes a grand total of about \$284,000,000.

POLAND

Poland, first victim of the overt Hitler war, had these military expenditures, in zlotys:

<i>Zlotys</i>	
1933-34	2,230,000,000
1934-35	2,300,000,000
1935-36	2,340,000,000
1936-37	2,210,000,000
1937-38	2,400,000,000
1938-39	2,500,000,000

This amounts to 14,000,000,000 zlotys for the period, or (as the zloty was worth about 19 cents to the dollar) \$2,660,000,000.

In addition to the above expenditures for military purposes, Poland had a number of extraordinary budgets from which funds were appropriated for war ends, so that the estimate of \$2,660,000,000 is conservative.

The grand total now, therefore, is \$284,000,000 plus \$2,660,000,000, or about \$286,700,000,000.

THE NETHERLANDS

The fiscal year in the Netherlands is the same as the calendar year. Defense expenditures in guilders and the extraordinary credits were as follows:

	Ordinary	Capital services
1933 (provisional results)	87,600,000	300,000
1934 (estimates)	87,900,000	200,000
1935 (estimates)	87,700,000	300,000
1936 (estimates)	87,648,000	323,000
1937 (probable results)	87,632,000	2,726,000
1938 (probable results)	117,798,000	38,943,000
1939 (legally established)	134,775,000	98,839,000
1940 (proposed)	147,797,000	84,232,000
Total	838,748,000	225,863,000

In September 1938 (when the terrible menace of Hitler had become crystal clear) an extraordinary credit of 100,000,000 guilders was voted for the call to arms and another credit of 100,000,000 guilders for a supplementary budget.

On September 6, 1939, an extraordinary credit of 60,000,000 guilders was approved for the Ministry of Economic Affairs for the purchase of foodstuffs, raw materials for industries, and similar necessities in case of threatened war.

In October 1939 there were allocated 116,549,410 guilders from the book profit arising

from the revaluation of the gold stock of the Bank of the Netherlands—for extraordinary expenditures.

On February 19, 1940, a bill provided 40,239,219 guilders to supplement the defense budget of 1939. Of this amount 1,548,719 guilders were allocated to the ordinary service budget and the remainder, 39,690,500 guilders, to the capital service budget.

This makes a total of 1,481,000,000 guilders or, at an average exchange rate of 60 cents, \$889,000,000—bringing the grand total to \$287,600,000,000.

BELGIUM

The defense expenditures of Belgium, just before Hitler overran it, were as follows, in francs:

	Ordinary	Extraordinary
1933.....	894,386,000	29,248,000
1934.....	862,281,000	Not available
1935.....	766,586,000	Not available
1936.....	903,508,000	427,450,000
1937.....	981,000,000	550,243,000
1938.....	1,122,000,000	480,000,000
1939 ¹	1,271,000,000	5,000,000,000
1940.....	1,329,000,000	2 5,200,000,000

¹ Actual mobilization expenditures September-December 1939 amounted to more than 3,000,000,000 francs.

² 4,810,000,000 francs for mobilization; 450,000,000 for antiaircraft defense.

This makes a total of about 20,000,000,000 francs, or about \$3,400,000,000 at an average exchange rate of 17 cents per franc, bringing the total to \$291,000,000,000.

NORWAY

The following were the national defense expenditures of Norway, in crowns, as the northern kingdom saw the Hitler threat becoming ever more ominous:

	Crowns
1936-37.....	45,800,000
1937-38.....	52,700,000
1938-39.....	53,600,000
1939-40.....	235,000,000

This makes a total of 387,000,000 crowns or, at the rate of 24 cents per crown, \$93,000,000, bringing the grand total to \$291,100,000,000.

YUGOSLAVIA AND GREECE

Military expenditures of Yugoslavia since 1938 (largely attributable to fear of the looming power of Hitler) have been as follows:

	Dinars
1938-39.....	2,770,000,000
1939-40.....	2,930,000,000
1940-41.....	3,870,000,000

As the dinar during the above period was worth about 2.3 cents, the amount in United States currency is \$220,000,000.

The military expenditures of Greece, justly apprehensive of Axis incursions, follow:

	Drachmas
1937-38.....	5,000,000,000
1938-39.....	3,300,000,000
1939-40.....	3,600,000,000
1940-41.....	6,500,000,000

This makes a total of 18,400,000,000 drachmas, or about \$165,000,000, the drachma during this period being worth about nine-tenths of a cent.

The war expenditures of Yugoslavia and Greece together bring the grand total to \$291,500,000,000.

To this must be added about \$1,500,000,000 of military expenditures by Czechoslovakia during 1933-39, bringing the grand total to \$293,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, thus it will be seen that while we have been in the war for little over a year we have expended almost as much as all the combined expenditures of our allies.

Now, let no one misunderstand the point I am trying to make. God knows the dollars-and-cents cost of this war is a minor consideration compared with the cost of human suffering, privations, death, and destitution that the war has wrought, and, of course, if it takes every dollar of wealth that this country has accumulated since its beginning to bring this war to a successful conclusion, we shall spend it and spend it gladly.

Let no one claim by these comparisons that I am attempting in any way to evaluate or underestimate the efforts of valiant and courageous Russia or any other of our allies in the sacrifices they have made, and are continuing to make. Ours are to date infinitesimal when compared to theirs.

What I am trying to make crystal clear is that we have got to quit spending for nonwar essentials. Personally, I think it would be possible to cut the so-called civilian pay roll in practically every department of this Government 25 to 33 1/3 percent. I think we could and should consolidate or do away entirely with hundreds of boards, bureaus, and agencies which overlap, compete with each other, and are not needed.

We all know the acute situation with respect to manpower, not only in the Army but on the farms and in the factories. Notwithstanding all of this, we see the Civil Service Commission advertising every day attractive jobs, stressing the overtime-pay features of such jobs. Only this morning there came to my desk two very interesting bulletins from the Civil Service Commission—one of them advertising for social scientists, with salaries ranging from \$2,600 to \$6,500 per year.

Let me call your attention briefly to this document. In black-faced type it sets out:

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS NEEDED, \$2,600 TO \$6,500 A YEAR (PLUS OVERTIME)

For civilian war service as head historical specialist, \$6,500 a year; principal historical specialist, \$5,600 a year; senior historical specialist, \$4,600 a year; historical specialist, \$3,800 a year; associate historical specialist, \$3,200 a year; assistant historical specialist, \$2,600 a year.

Now the duties of these various specialists are likewise very interesting, and I quote:

I. DUTIES

The positions to be filled from this examination involve archival and administrative records work and the preparation of studies and reports on administrative and operational subjects. Activities include collecting, selecting, analyzing, and classifying documents and records of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. More specifically, the duties are to develop or assist in the development of plans for determining which documents and records are significant and worthy of preservation for future reference; to prepare or assist in the preparation of plans for the preservation of selected materials; to write or supervise the writing of a chronological account of the background, origins, authorizations, administrative structures, developments, activities, and other events of possible historical significance of a particular agency; or to record and describe noteworthy interagency rela-

tionships and the manner in which officials solved difficult administrative and operational problems.

And here is another one:

CROP PRODUCTION SPECIALISTS NEEDED \$2,600 TO \$8,000 A YEAR (PLUS OVERTIME)

For a standard workweek of 48 hours (which includes 8 hours overtime) the present rate of compensation for overtime increase the above annual salary about 21 percent of that part of the basic salary listed above not in excess of \$2,900 a year, provided that such increase shall not make the aggregate compensation more than \$5,000 a year.

For positions of chief crop production specialist, \$8,000 a year; head crop production specialist, \$6,500 a year; principal crop production specialist, \$5,600 a year; senior crop production specialist, \$4,600 a year; crop production specialist, \$3,800 a year; associate crop production specialist, \$3,200 a year; assistant crop production specialist, \$2,600 a year.

Let me quote further from this very interesting document:

I. DUTIES

The duties of appointees will be to develop and administer programs in connection with the establishment and operation of research stations or establishment of plantations growing rubber or oil-producing plants. Research stations and plantations will be located principally in the South and Central American countries. Somewhat similar duties will be performed by appointees having experience with other tropical plants. These duties will involve making surveys of the country to determine the selection of proper sites, soils, and other essential factors, as well as development and maintenance of research stations and demonstration rubber or oil-producing plantations situated for the most part in remote and primitive areas. The degree of responsibility involved will depend upon the grade of position to which appointment is made.

And this is at a time when our boys overseas and our allies and civilian population might go hungry for lack of ordinary farm hands.

Mr. Chairman, I realize these are indeed small matters compared with the billions we are expending—but there must be a stopping point somewhere. My people are alarmed—they constantly inquire of me, "What is the limit?" They ask me just how far can we go in our spending? Is there a limit even for war purposes?

These are some of the questions they are asking me. As for my part, I shall vote not only to reduce the items in this bill which I think can be eliminated without hurting the effort of our Army and our Navy, and shall continue to do so as the other bills come before the Congress from time to time.

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

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

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman in the course of his remarks stated that some of these agencies overlapped in their activities, duplicated their efforts. Will the gentleman give us a list of some that overlap so we will know where cuts can be made?

Mr. RIZLEY. I shall be very happy to answer the question. We have the Farm Credit Association, we have the R. A. A. C., we have the Farm Security

Administration, all presumably making loans to distressed farmers and actually competing with each other. They should be consolidated and some of them eliminated entirely.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We can agree with what the gentleman says, but, of course, none of the agencies he mentions are in this bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. I appreciate that. However, the H. O. L. C. and some others are in this bill. We should eliminate them now and the others you mention when the bill comes here for consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman might have included a half-dozen other agencies that are handling farm credit. The gentleman also knows that there are certain groups within the administration that want to set up a Government bank in every community to handle all of the credit for agriculture and take it away from other private institutions that might be able to handle it.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am fully aware of that.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman state what are the duties of some of these people to whom he has referred?

Mr. RIZLEY. Gladly. I am including in my remarks the full statement of the Civil Service Commission as to the purported duties.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLEVINGER. Does the gentleman remember that on the 3d of February I put in the names of seven different agencies training manpower that overlapped?

Mr. RIZLEY. I recall that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Have they put out a call for psychiatrists?

Mr. RIZLEY. That may well come along soon.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the independent offices appropriations bill covers the widest range of Government activities of any of the regular appropriation bills. I have often thought that a new Member of the House could learn more about the activities of the Federal Government by studying the hearings on this bill than those for any other appropriation bill. Between 30 and 50 agencies are ordinarily covered in

the independent offices bill. The bill before us has 34.

The easy thing to do these days is to condemn unnecessary expenditures. I have done it. The easiest thing to do is to assert that there is a vast field for economy in operating on the nonessential, nondefense expenditures of the Government. All of us want to do what we can. At first blush many people reading the report of the committee or reading this bill would assume that certainly a bill which runs to over \$2,000,000,000 should afford a vast field for economy. I am not entirely satisfied with the bill as reported. There are many items in the bill where some members of the subcommittee suggested far greater cuts than are evidenced in the figures reported.

There is some give-and-take in this bill, as there is in most bills. The net result was more savings than there would have been if each member of the subcommittee had insisted on his own particular version of what the cuts should be. The committee would like to have brought in a much larger total saving. I know that. But we labored against a difficult problem. Of the \$2,300,000,000 in this bill, nearly 90 percent is for agencies that it is practically impossible to do much about in the midst of a war. I refer to the items for the Veterans' Administration and the Maritime Commission. The Veterans' Administration appropriation alone accounts for \$887,000,000. The Maritime Commission, which is the agency that builds the ships which we need today and will need in increasing number, accounts for over \$1,250,000,000. In other words, out of the \$2,300,000,000 in this bill considerably more than \$2,000,000,000 of it is accounted for in those two agencies alone.

The subcommittee, as the hearings show, was particularly concerned over possible overlapping of agencies. Reference has been made earlier this afternoon to interrogations I directed toward the Federal Communications Commission. It developed that the Federal Communications Commission is making examinations for the Army and Navy in the licensing of certain inspectors and operators. It was difficult to get the Federal Communications Commission to admit that was a duplication of service because they said that the Army and the Navy wanted this done and asked them to do it. At that I said: "Well, it may assist them, but it still may be a duplication of the facilities they have," and the reply was, "But we only do it for the War Department, and if we do it for them they in turn do not duplicate that examination." Then I commented, "But they may have the personnel to do it," and their answer, "They might, yes, sir."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the gentleman ever heard one of the employees of an administrative agency of the Government admit that their work was in duplication of that of some other agency? I should like to have the refreshing ex-

perience sometime of actually hearing somebody admit that.

Mr. CASE. Never in principle. The incident cited was about as close to it as we have come. So practical problems are involved in cutting this bill. Let us take up the Veterans' Administration for a moment. The testimony before us was that many of the hospitals are understaffed. It is difficult now to get proper personnel, doctors and nurses, to staff the veterans' hospitals as they would be normally staffed. The competition is keen by reason of wages. It is also keen because many of the nurses and the doctors would much prefer to be wearing a uniform and be on the front line today than to be in these hospitals. General Hines in fact suggested to us that it might be worthy of study by the Congress to give the Veterans' Administration the authority to set up a limited pay schedule for people doing limited duty, in order to take over some of the duties that are being slighted, perhaps, at this time.

Every member, I know, desires to have proper hospital care for every boy who comes back from the front and needs hospitalization. Not one member is urging a cut in hospital facilities. We want them ready when the Army and Navy release the boys. We cannot wait until they come. The committee was assured that the Veterans' Administration will be ready—is ready—in fact. There are about 5,000 vacant beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals at this time. General Hines testified that they have a total of about 81,000 beds, and are building to a goal of 100,000 beds which, it is believed, will be sufficient, taken in conjunction with the Army and Navy's own hospitals.

This afternoon, after the consideration of the Consent Calendar, consideration was sought of a bill which would have had the effect of admitting to the hospitals a class of veterans of the present war who are not eligible under present law. It had not been on the Calendar the required number of days, however, and will be called later. In the meantime, I hope that those of you who are interested in the problem of hospitalization will read the testimony of General Hines and the interrogations by the gentleman from New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and other Members as well as myself on the hospitalization of men who are being discharged for physical disabilities allegedly not incurred in line of duty and existing prior to service.

On pages 243 and 244 you will find that General Hines agreed that the burden of proof ought to be on the Government where men are taken from civil life into the Army or Navy, kept there for 6 months, or a year in some cases, and then turned loose with the statement that they are being discharged for physical disability incurred prior to their induction or enlistment in the service.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] pointed out that if these men had stayed in civil life it is possible they would not have had this breakdown, General Hines, agreeing, said that you could take many strong men and put them through the rather intensive training and it would cause some of them

to break. Existing law, however, does not provide for their hospitalization unless the Veterans' Administration conducts a study and makes a finding contrary to that already announced by the Army or Navy.

It was the feeling of the subcommittee that there is a definite responsibility on the part of the Government for these men, but under existing law, if the Army or the Navy discharges them and says the disability was not incurred in line of duty and existed prior to service, they are not entitled to hospitalization. I think the Committee would be glad to see that corrected by proper legislation. In the Seventy-seventh Congress we passed a bill in the House designed to take care of this situation; it died in another body. I have introduced a special bill to cover tubercular and neuro-psychiatric cases, H. R. 1453. It should be passed without delay and without a dissenting vote. A broader bill, H. R. 1749, was passed over this afternoon because it had not been on the Consent Calendar long enough and perhaps because it is so comprehensive that many Members wanted a chance to study it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Can the gentleman tell me, inasmuch as I have not had a chance to study the hearings thoroughly, in what classification are these 5,000 empty beds? Are they NP or general medical?

Mr. CASE. They are largely general medical and domiciliary. Some of them may be NP. I cannot give the exact break-down.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was there any testimony or discussion as to any study the Bureau may be making at this time as to the need for beds after this war, or during this war, for that matter?

Mr. CASE. Yes; there is considerable testimony on that in the hearings and I urge all Members to read it. I may say that in the Veterans' Administration item carried in the bill there are funds to add 160 NP beds at Knoxville, Iowa, and 160 NP beds at Lexington, Ky. There are also some other construction items designed to work toward the 100,000 goal that I have mentioned.

I made reference to the Maritime Commission. That is a most difficult agency to cut in any large figure under present circumstances. Statements will be made before the committee and should be made that the members of the subcommittee have grave doubt as to some of the practices of the Maritime Commission at the present time. I think we were particularly startled by the valuations that have been allowed for certain ships purchased. However, as to the basic job the Maritime Commission is doing, the providing of ships, the committee, rightfully, I think, felt that it could not do very much in reducing the amount of the Budget estimate.

It is absolutely futile to talk about building tanks and planes, and training

men, and furnishing lend-lease supplies, and so forth, if we are not going to produce the ships to get them across the water where they are needed.

In the consideration of this problem of transportation, as I have heard it discussed during sessions of the House in this session, a great deal of attention has been given to the subject of air transportation, until the feeling has developed, I think, that instead of building ships we perhaps ought to be building air transports, big cargo ships. My feeling is that we should do both—each for the job that belongs to it.

There is a definite field for air transport, but testimony which has come to my attention not only on this subcommittee but in the subcommittee on War Department appropriations convinces me that there is a lot of generalized thinking on the subject of air transportation which does not consider the actual facts in the case.

Some time ago members of the War Department committee had a discussion with General Somervell, commanding Services of Supply, at which he made some general statements about the tonnage that is involved. He made the statement that in some of the theaters of operation it would take more ships to maintain a supply of gasoline and other things necessary to maintain air transportation than it would to carry the cargo in the first place. I wanted to be sure of that statement and the facts on it so I addressed a letter to him the other day and in his absence received a reply from General Styer, his executive officer, commanding, during his absence, in which General Styer stated:

General analysis—Airplane versus seagoing vessels

SUMMARY

SHIPMENT BY WATER TRANSPORT

Routes	Cargo tons per month	Water route miles (statute)	Number of cargo vessels (C-1)	Fuel tons required per month	Crew personnel required
United States to Australia.....	100,000	7,575	54	16,640	3,780
United States to United Kingdom.....	100,000	3,610	34	7,930	2,380
United States to Alaska.....	100,000	1,415	16	3,110	1,120
United States to Suez.....	100,000	14,100	96	30,950	6,710

SHIPMENT BY AIR TRANSPORT

Routes	Air-route miles (statute)	Number of cargo planes (C-46A)	Fuel tons required per month	Crew personnel required	Number of tanker vessels required to transport aircraft fuel	Number of cargo ships required to maintain planes and personnel
United States to Australia.....	7,565	6,550	1,012,000	78,500	228	69
United States to United Kingdom.....	3,879	1,900	295,500	22,500	52	20
United States to Alaska.....	1,505	563	195,500	4,150	9	2
United States to Suez.....	10,016	5,885	837,300	58,370	85	59

I trust the Members will study this little table. It is brief, but it gives the picture very quickly, and for illustrative purposes at this time let me mention the Australian situation again. To transport 100,000 tons to Australia by water transport would take a crew personnel of 3,780. The crew personnel for air transport would be 78,500. The fuel tons required per month would be 1,012,000 for air transport, as against 16,000 fuel tons

I am enclosing a brief summary indicating an analysis of shipping requirements by plane and by cargo ships to four different areas.

It will be apparent from this summary that for large-scale operations to any distant area, the planes and their personnel will require so many tankers and cargo ships to supply them that these alone are greatly in excess of the ships which could carry the cargo in the first place.

Then he called attention to the fact that the commercial air lines realize this, and sent a copy of an address delivered by W. A. Patterson, president of the United Airlines, before the National Industrial Conference Board at New York last November, saying: "His remarks closely follow our thoughts." Referring to the problem of refueling for an air transport supply system to Australia of a given number of tons, in this address Mr. Patterson said:

Nearly 15,000,000 gallons of gasoline, weighing over 45,000 tons, would have to be transported to intermediate points and to Australia every 2 months by oceangoing tankers. Three such tankers would be required for this purpose so that actually 144 airplanes plus 3 tankers would be required to do the job that could be accomplished by one oceangoing freighter in the first place.

I submit in the light of testimony like that it is essential to be building ships.

The summary to which General Styer referred compares the items involved in water transportation or air transportation of 100,000 cargo tons per month from the United States to four theaters of operations. The figures are so important to clear thinking on this matter that I am placing them in the RECORD at this point under permission granted by the House.

for water transport, which would be carried by the transport itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I trust that Members will look at the figures given in this table because they are

authentic, and bear mightily on the problem of air versus water transportation for a sustained operation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why does the gentleman think that a mistake is made in the added amount of fuel that must be used in air transport rather than a water transport? It vitally affects us on the east coast. Does the gentleman think it is maladministration?

Mr. CASE. I do not quite get the connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman stated that it would take more for air transportation than for water transportation.

Mr. CASE. I do not know that a mistake has been made. The Army is using water transportation, except for transportation of critical repair parts and matters of emergency.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other words, the gentleman thinks that boats should be supplied.

Mr. CASE. Yes. For basic transportation, there must be water transportation for any large operation.

There are two other subjects to which I direct attention briefly. One is the subject of foreign service pay adjustment.

Some Members of Congress will be misled, I fear, by the figures in this bill, as they will by the figures in other bills on the items allowed for salaries. In this bill it shows up in two ways.

We have an item here for foreign pay adjustment of \$385,000. That is the amount of money that we are appropriating to make our dollar come up to the dollar of the country in which some civilian employees of the Government are operating. I listened with interest to the statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] the other day about the importance of having faith in the security of United States currency. He made an inspiring speech but actually the thing that makes the dollar good throughout the world is the amount of gold behind it. The proof of that is that here we are appropriating \$385,000 to bring our dollar up to par in certain countries, and this applies to the civilian employees alone. We were not given any estimate for the amount that must be appropriated to take care of pay adjustment for the officers and men of the armed forces. What I am saying is that in addition to the 10 percent allowed an officer and the 20 percent allowed an enlisted man for foreign service, an appropriation will be asked of this Congress to make up the difference between our dollar and a gold dollar for the amount of pay that is paid men while on duty in foreign countries.

There is another way in which this bill and other bills at the present time are not revealing as to the full pay bill of the country. They do not include estimates for the amount of money that must be appropriated to take care of the pay increases granted in the bill passed last December. Under that bill it will be recalled a 10-percent increase was ordered on fixed salaries up to \$2,900, and time

and a half pay was ordered for every hour above 40 hours where payment is on an hourly basis. Time and a half above 40 hours on a 48-hour week means that for that additional 8 hours you pay for 12 hours of time. That 12 hours is 30 percent of 40.

So, to find out the true Federal pay bill, today, you want to add about 30 percent. Your error will be only for the portion of salaries over \$2,900. That will be true up to the expiration of this temporary raise of pay which I believe is the last of April.

There is pending before the Congress legislation designed to establish a permanent pay increase, and I hope these facts will be kept in mind when that comes before us. Remember, we are going to have estimates come in deficiency bills to add to the pay appropriations in this bill and in all other bills thus far presented by approximately 30 percent. There has been an increase in time of 20 percent at least. The President, as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, in approving the pay bill, recommended that the agencies seek to absorb much of this additional cost by cutting down personnel, pointing that they were receiving an increase in personnel.

They will receive approximately 20 percent additional time if the agency is working on a 40-hour basis. On a 44-hour basis they will get 4 additional hours, which would be one-eleventh, or approximately 9 percent. If the experience of our committee is any criterion, however, few of the agencies are making any effort to follow the President's suggestion. All of them but one, I think, told us there would be a supplementary request to meet the deficiency caused by the increase in the pay scales.

Members of the House find it easy to talk about cutting these bills, but I hope they will remember that the responsibility for increases rests upon every Member of the House when he votes for or permits pay increase bills to go through on the Consent Calendar.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, since the pending bill makes provision for the continued operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I deem it to be in order at this time to give to the House some figures which I believe should be of the greatest interest to the people of the United States.

The figures covering power operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority vindicate the wisdom of Congress in 1933 in establishing T. V. A. as a Government corporation with wide powers and discretion to carry on a comprehensive conservation program.

While the figures relate to the financial success of the T. V. A. in the generation, transmission, and sale of electric power to consumers in six States in the Southeast, I do not want to leave the impression that this is a story of financial success only. The Nation is reaping dividends in many other ways from the investment in the Tennessee Valley.

Some of the dividends are in the form of fighting and bombing planes now in action on fronts all over the world, constructed of aluminum which might never have been manufactured in the present proportions except for T. V. A.; some of the dividends are in the form of water transport on a new navigation channel, relieving the wartime load on other forms of transportation; some are in greater quantities of food produced on soils enriched by phosphorus; others are in munitions ingredients produced for the armed forces.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established in 1933, and it is now rounding out a decade of service. During that decade, in addition to its many other activities, the Authority has built up one of the largest power systems in the country, producing nearly half as much power as the entire United States in World War No. 1. Based on the water resources of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, this system has brought the benefits of low-cost power to half a million consumers.

The Federal investment has paid not only in terms of economic betterment but financially as well. From June 11, 1933, when power operations of T. V. A. commenced, up through December 31, 1942, T. V. A.'s gross power revenues have amounted to a total of \$89,393,000. After provision for all power expenses, there remained \$44,000,000 representing funds paid into the United States Treasury and reappropriated by Congress. Of this amount \$21,683,000 consisted of provisions for depreciation and amortization of acquisition adjustments and \$22,319,000 of net income. Thus the Authority has paid back to the people of the United States more than 14½ percent of the \$300,883,000 invested in T. V. A. power facilities at the close of 1942.

Moreover, much of the decade of T. V. A. operations was necessarily devoted to building up the system and the market, and most of the revenues required to make this showing have been received in the last 3½ years; thus, gross power revenues received since July 1, 1939, total \$77,154,000.

It has sometimes been charged that power operations of the Authority have been successful only because a part of the investment in the system of multipurpose dams had been allocated to navigation and flood control. The figures dispose of that contention. The navigation and flood-control investments can stand on their own feet; the benefits that are being achieved are sufficient justification. But it is interesting to note that the \$44,000,000 in depreciation funds and net income so far returned to the Government from the power program is sufficient to absorb the net expenses of the flood-control and navigation programs, totaling \$4,603,000 before depreciation charges, and to pay back to the Treasury almost 9½ percent of the \$416,063,000 investment in all three programs.

The Authority at present is operating 16 generating stations, including both hydro and steam, and is producing and selling power at the rate of nearly 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually;

and this output, due to the continually increasing demands of war, will soon be greater than ever. It is selling power to 83 municipal and 45 cooperative electric systems which have invested more than \$100,000,000 in electric facilities. Through these systems T. V. A. power reaches more than half a million residential, rural, commercial, and industrial customers who save—those who had electric service prior to T. V. A.—more than \$9,500,000 annually, as compared to their former rates. Home users of electricity use more than 1,500 kilowatt-hours a year on the average, or 50 percent more than the average for the Nation; and they pay about 2 cents per kilowatt-hour on the average, or about 45 percent less than the 3.7-cent-per-kilowatt-hour average for the Nation. And selling power at rates substantially below the national level, the municipalities and cooperatives purchasing power wholesale from the Authority are showing substantial net incomes annually on their over-all, combined operations.

The results, I believe, establish the T. V. A. as an efficient, flexible, going business organization. Its development as such an organization has its roots in its charter as a Government corporation, the T. V. A. Act, which, in the words of President Roosevelt in 1933, established it as an agency "clothed with the power of government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise."

In other words, the T. V. A. was set up—so far as its power operations were concerned—on a business basis, in a position to adapt itself quickly to altered circumstances, make expenditures as needed to preserve its reliability of service, and to meet extraordinary conditions as they arose in the course of serving with electricity an area as large as England. One of the most important considerations in this connection is the fact that the Authority has had full use of its power revenues to meet its current expenses, a freedom which is recognized as essential to any business enterprise, public or private.

One of the best measures of business efficiency is the ability to meet unexpected or emergency situations in stride, and the T. V. A. provides several examples. I touched on one of these examples earlier when I mentioned that planes are now in action over north Africa, Europe, and the South Pacific, which might not now be in the air if it had not been for the ability of T. V. A. to supply electricity for the manufacture of aluminum. This is true of other war materials also.

Everyone will recall that during 1941 power demands were mounting because the national defense program then was getting into full swing. More aluminum, more planes, more of everything was being demanded. And at the same time, one of the worst droughts of all time descended upon the Southeast, cutting down the power production of hydro projects throughout the area. One of the hardest hit private hydro systems was that serving one of the largest aluminum mills in the country in the Southeast area.

Privately owned public-utility systems were likewise hard hit. Into this breach stepped T. V. A., an agency of the Federal Government. I do not mean to say that the T. V. A. promptly produced all the electricity that was needed out of its own plants. It did, due to the conservative estimates of its power engineers, have a considerable reserve which it could, and did, utilize to keep aluminum plants, producers of ships' boilers, and many other defense plants in full production.

But, beyond that, it was able to act as a balance wheel, a clearing house for power, which was able to integrate the power resources of a tremendous region that extended far outside of the Southeast. It happens that many of the surrounding utility systems generate their power largely by steam, as contrasted to hydroelectric generation and this enables them to facilitate the most efficient use of the total power-generating resources over a large area. When the load falls off on a steam system, plants must reduce their output because there is no use for the power they can produce. T. V. A., however, was able to take the power produced during the so-called off-peak hours, at night and over week ends, and use it on its own system; at the same time, it reduced generation at its own hydro plants, saving the water—and hence the energy—that otherwise would have been used. To do this, interconnections with utilities were used to the limit, new interconnections were established, power was interchanged from system to system, and power was purchased.

And by these means the T. V. A. was able over the period of a year to supply an average of 140,000 kilowatts of continuous power to a single large aluminum plant over and above the amounts it was obligated under its long-term contracts to supply. It was able not only to provide power to keep the existing plant running at capacity, but to supply power for new plants and plant expansions. By skillful operation, by assisting in making the most of every available source of power, by taking advantage of every opportunity, the Authority was able to assume a key role in supplying wartime industrial power during a period of crisis.

The industrial demand for power to produce war goods continues to rise. In the fiscal year 1941, T. V. A. sold 1,809,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power to large industries; in the following year, 2,410,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, 1,926,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Industrial demands on the municipal and cooperative systems likewise are on the increase. In the fiscal year 1941 such agencies sold 1,215,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and in the 12 months ending last November, 1,544,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Further drastic increases are in the offing, and T. V. A. is preparing to meet them on schedule by construction of new plants and storage reservoirs on schedules unheard of a few years ago.

Here is a record of achievement on the part of a Government agency of which every American can feel proud. Not

only are we getting the power and more power that we need to produce the war materials to whip the Axis, but we are getting it on a business basis from an agency that is not only paying its own way but in fact is making substantial returns to the Federal Treasury. T. V. A. was set up with the essential freedom of initiative of a private business enterprise and, from any angle, the results have fully justified that course.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, one very vital problem that continues to receive a super abundance of lip service and a negligible amount of action is the farm-labor problem. Unless something is done soon by Government authorities who are empowered to act, this country and our allies face a critically serious shortage of food. So much has been said on this subject that most of us are getting tired of hearing about it, but the fact remains that the situation is desperate, little has been done about it, and we must have an ample supply of food to win this war.

This subject is of immediate interest to representatives from every agricultural State in the country. The State of California, in which my district is located, is the producer of a larger variety of farm crops than any other State and consequently encounters a greater variety of farm manpower problems. However, the farm labor shortage question is serious no matter where it is found and a sound solution is necessary for the welfare of farmers throughout the Nation.

In discussing farming and farm labor requirements it is well to remember that there are a lot of farmers in the country who are engaged in growing many farm products other than the so-called basic commodities. Fruits and vegetables, poultry, dairy products and many other food items are all a part of our modern diet and highly essential from a standpoint of nutrition and health. We cannot live properly on a diet of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco. We have got to have our vitamins.

Last fall the Secretary of Agriculture issued a statement to the country in which he outlined 1943 production goals for winter and spring vegetable crops. The Secretary stated that—

The goals are designed to bring about increases in production of vegetables of most value in the wartime diet and are aimed toward substantial shifts away from less essential crops.

Particular emphasis has been placed on the value of certain vegetable crops. A substantial percentage of increase is requested for some while others are to be produced at approximately the 1942

levels. The Department release then went on to point out—

That at least a part of the land which ordinarily would be used for producing such crops as cantaloupes, cucumbers, cauliflower, eggplant, watermelons, bleached celery, head lettuce, green peppers, asparagus, and artichokes, should now be shifted to crops more essential to the wartime diet.

The Department further said that measures would be taken to assist farmers who are engaged in producing the so-called essential crops to obtain transportation, labor, fertilizer, containers and other production supplies. However, no such assurance is given to the producers of the crops which have been designated as less essential. In fact, the Department stated it could not assist with the production or marketing of the less essential winter vegetable crops.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers in the United States are patriotic enough to get squarely behind any sound and carefully thought out program that will guarantee maximum production of necessary foodstuffs. However, they need more specific information than has been made available so far and they need it immediately. The planting season for numerous winter and spring crops is already well under way in certain sections of the country.

If the Secretary of Agriculture is prepared to state what percentage of increase is required for certain crops he should also inform the farmers as to the percentage of decrease that is demanded in others. The farmer is no mind reader and he knows from long experience that the Department of Agriculture is notoriously slow in announcing various phases of its annual farm program. If we are to avoid a very serious shortage of food products, this is one time when the Department cannot afford to be too late with too little—information.

Definite steps toward the procurement of an adequate supply of farm labor for 1943 is one assurance that the farmers must have if they are to come anywhere near meeting production goals. Regardless of what claims are made by Government experts, who are supposed to know, I can say, from personal observation and experience, that there was a definite shortage of agricultural labor in California in 1942. This was due primarily to an inexcusable lack of foresight and planning on the part of the various Government departments most directly concerned.

Many of you will recall that when the President returned from his swing through the western United States he mentioned the fact that certain crops had been saved only because businessmen had closed their establishments and gone into the fields to help with the harvest. Mr. Chairman, that happened not once but many times in the district I represent. If it had not been for the patriotic efforts of men and women from every walk of life, for the school children, and even the voluntary efforts of men in the Army and Navy, I hesitate to think of the amount of vital foodstuffs that would have gone to waste.

Are we to be faced with a similar situation during the coming year, or will the Government get busy and make ob-

tainable a sufficient supply of labor at a wage that will permit the farmer to harvest his crops at a reasonable profit? If ever stabilization of wages was needed, it is on the farm front. Farm producers simply cannot compete with the wages paid by defense industries and remain in business. It will undoubtedly surprise many of you to learn that farm workers in California have been demanding and have received wages that run as high as a dollar an hour—and that is no fairy tale; it is an absolute fact.

Members of the California congressional delegation have been working on the farm labor shortage problem for well over a year. I find in my file correspondence with various supposedly interested Government agencies dating back to November 1941. In response to a flood of desperate communications from farmers and farm organizations who realized what was coming, some of us began urging the proper Federal departments to take the preliminary steps that would be necessary in order to import Mexican farm workers.

We met with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the United States Employment Service, as well as the Lend-Lease Administration and the War and Navy Departments, all of whom are, or at least should be, interested in insuring an orderly harvest of food crops for our civilian population and our armed forces and our allies.

What happened? Well, frankly, not much, for a long time. I guess most of the officials we talked to come from Missouri. They certainly had to be shown. They would not take the advice of Members of Congress from farm districts or from farm organizations who know what they are talking about. They investigated for months, and a lot of the investigating must have been done by persons who did not know their business.

In order to point out just exactly what I mean, Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent I intend to insert a letter which I received from John J. Corson, Director of the United States Employment Service, in October 1942. It follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., October 22, 1942.
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: This is in reply to your letter of October 14 requesting information on the steps that have been taken to date to insure an adequate supply of Mexican labor for 1942 and 1943 and further requesting information as to when the importation of Mexican labor was first taken under consideration and the successive steps that were followed before the Mexicans were brought across the border.

In regard to your first question as to the steps taken to date to insure an adequate supply of Mexican labor for 1942 and 1943 the United States Employment Service has certified to an importation of 3,000 Mexicans for California for the 1942 season. These workers have been primarily employed in the sugar-beet industry and it is contemplated that they will be used in other agricultural pursuits as soon as this activity is completed. If work is available it is our intention to renew their contracts in order that they may be fully employed as long as there is need for their services. If it be-

comes necessary to import additional Mexican workers for the 1943 season and funds are available to take care of required expenses such as transportation, a further certification will be made for additional workers. As you know the Mexican Government has reserved the right to designate numbers of workers that may be recruited in Mexico and areas in which they may be obtained. The 1943 program for use of Mexican workers will be predicated upon need, availability of workers in Mexico, and availability of funds with which to finance any necessary importation of workers.

In response to your second question I am very happy to review for you the successive steps that were followed before the first Mexicans were brought into California.

1. On May 15 the United States Employment Service certified to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to an immediate need for the importation of 3,000 Mexicans into California.

2. Prior to allowing this importation various governmental agencies indicated that there was a need for development of standards to prevent the recurrence of conditions which prevailed as a result of Mexicans being brought into the United States during the last World War. Accordingly a committee was established by the War Manpower Commission composed of representatives from War Manpower Commission, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, Department of Labor, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Employment Service, and others.

3. Standards thus developed were submitted through the State Department to the Mexican Government with a proposal that available Mexican workers be allowed to come into the United States for agricultural employment.

4. Before action was taken on the above request representatives of the Department of Agriculture contacted Mexican officials in Mexico City and signed an agreement containing certain definite specifications relative to the importation and use of Mexican workers. Included in this agreement were regulations governing the employment of these workers, conditions of employment, and guarantees.

5. After this agreement was completed the United States Employment Service certified to the Department of Justice that the available domestic labor supply had been exhausted and that there was need for the importation of 1,500 Mexican workers to assist in the harvesting of the sugar-beet crop in California.

6. On September 23 the United States Employment Service again certified as to the need for an additional 1,500 Mexican workers for California.

7. The first group of these workers arrived in California on September 29. The Farm Security Administration reports that all of the 3,000 workers for which certification was made have now arrived in California and are employed in the sugar-beet harvest.

The United States Employment Service early last summer recognized the possible need for additional agricultural workers in California to supplement the number available in this country. We have, as a consequence, worked diligently to recruit all men and women in this country who were available for this work. As it has become apparent that this supply would not suffice we have certified to the need for Mexican workers. While there has been less labor available than in previous years when a surplus of manpower was characteristic of the times, we have as yet encountered no evidence that would indicate that essential crops cannot be harvested if all available manpower and womanpower is used to its fullest capacity.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. CORSON, Director.

Mr. Chairman, now let us just look briefly at what this letter discloses. In response to my first inquiry Mr. Corson says, among other things, that—

The 1943 program for use of Mexican workers will be predicated upon need, availability of workers in Mexico, and availability of funds with which to finance any necessary importation of workers.

Well, the need is great, there is no evidence that workers are not available in large numbers in Mexico and certainly Congress will grant the necessary funds. Let us have some action from the Government agencies whose job it is to handle the program.

In response to my second question Mr. Corson outlines the successive steps that were followed before the first Mexicans were imported in 1942.

First. The need for importing Mexican workers was first certified on May 15, 1942, almost 6 months after members of the California delegation first requested this type of assistance.

Second, third, and fourth. All of these preliminary steps could have been taken early in 1942 instead of letting them go until the need was acute.

Fifth. A belated certification of 1,500 workers after crops had already spoiled in some areas because of a labor shortage.

Sixth. More of the same.

Seventh. Note particularly that the first group of workers arrived on September 29, 1942—over 4 months after their need had been certified and almost 10 months after some of the California congressional delegation had gone to work on the matter. Talk about procrastination and delay—this is the sort of thing that drives the American farmer to distraction.

Mr. Chairman, we are constantly being told by supposedly well informed Government officials that there was no serious loss of food crops because of a farm labor shortage in 1942. Such statements are not supported by the facts. Following are some estimates of crop losses in California as compiled by the California Farm Bureau Federation. These figures are beyond the normal discard of unmarketable products.

Apricots, 3,000 dry tons, or 15 percent loss; peaches, 20,000 fresh tons, or 5 percent loss; tomatoes, 200,000 tons, or 25 percent loss; peas, 25 percent loss; asparagus, 3,700 acres, or 20 percent of crop; cherries, 30 percent loss; sugar beets, 7,000 to 9,000 acres lost in spring, due to lack of labor and 10 percent loss in harvest; dairy, 5 percent loss over 1941 despite attempted 10 percent increase in production—slaughter of dairy cows 46 percent above normal; vegetables, approximately 10 percent loss in both planting and harvesting; cotton, at least 20 percent loss.

Those are just a few of the losses, in one State. I wonder what the actual totals are for the entire Nation. How can anyone tell us that such losses have not had a serious effect on the supply of food commodities to our civilian population and our armed forces?

We are now entering on what may well be the most critical war year this coun-

try has ever faced. Our farmers have been asked to raise more food than they have ever produced before. What assurance can we give them that their crops will be harvested after they are planted? Do we continue to muddle our way through or can we expect some forthright and constructive action on the part of our Federal administrators?

Here's a suggested program:

First. Guarantee every farmer a price for his produce that will give him cost of production at least. Many farmers produced their crops at an absolute loss last year.

Second. Stabilize farm wages. Agriculture cannot successfully compete with war industries.

Third. Assure our farm producers that they will be able to obtain at least a minimum supply of farm machinery for planting, growing, and harvesting their crops.

Fourth. Guarantee the farmer enough rubber and gasoline to carry out his production program and in the name of common sense relieve him of the burden of filling out such a vast number of complicated forms and applications.

Fifth. Insure an adequate supply of trained and qualified workers for the canning, processing, packing, and storage plants that must handle and prepare the farmers' produce for market. What useful purpose is served in growing and harvesting crops if they are lost before they reach the final consumer because of a lack of manpower or facilities somewhere along the line?

Sixth. Give careful consideration to the following farm labor program which has been suggested by the California Farm Bureau Federation:

(a) Deferment from draft of all trained farm workers.

(b) Complete reorganization of Farm Placement Service in order to eliminate as much as possible all competition between individuals within an industry and also competition between industries for men and women.

(c) Development of a housing program that will allow for a maximum utilization of present facilities on a farm, which can be converted for essential housing, and development of a project for making movable or permanent housing of new construction type available.

(d) Development of a coordinated transportation program to enable workers to be at locations of need during periods of peak labor load.

(e) Creation of program that will keep each worker producing on a minimum of 6 days per week. Farm labor is now working less than 4 days per week per person.

(f) Creation of coordinated program for placing volunteer labor groups, such as members of the Y. M. C. A. school groups, women's volunteer groups, business and other groups.

(g) Placing the production of food necessary for war purposes on a patriotic basis, so that a desire is created within each individual to produce to his maximum ability.

(h) Definite recruitment program to obtain labor in other areas of the United States.

(i) Importation of Mexican labor, preferably those trained in and obtained from agricultural areas in Mexico.

(j) Authorization of Farm Placement Service to transport workers from other States, within the State and from Mexico.

(k) Adjustment of laws within States that forbid recruitment of labor from outside of the State in order to allow maximum utilization of all labor where needed.

We can have an increase in farm crops this year, only if the above facts are not neglected.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I was very much interested in your statement of sugar-beet production. I just came from my district and I find that they have cut the tonnage allowance to about \$1.50 a ton in the Ohio area. The farmers tell me they cannot produce them for that amount, and will not plant them; so we will be short of sugar. The best figures I could find show that even with a favorable growing year we cannot expect more than 85 percent of the production of last year in essential food crops. The unofficial estimate is that a million dollars' worth of soy beans in my district was lost this year.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I would say in response to the gentleman from Ohio that I will be tremendously surprised if we are able to produce 85 percent of last year's food crops. I have mentioned the situation as it affects our own State, because I am more familiar with it. Had it not been for an equable growing season and a fine season for harvesting, our losses would have been much larger than the figures I quoted earlier in my remarks.

Mr. CLEVINGER. The county agent writes me this morning that there are 47 fertile farms without an operator. There are 15 to 35 acres on many fertile farms without production. In my mail there are three instances where the last operator has been drafted from his farm for military service.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think all of us are getting the same type of complaint from every district in the United States.

Mr. CLEVINGER. We want to win, but if we denude these farms, who is going to feed the boys over there?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. We cannot win unless we are able to feed our armed forces.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I would feed them on nightingales' tongues if that is what they want and we could get them, but I want them at least to have beans, bacon, and beef.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In addition to the facts you have given, have we not had two or three extremely favorable growing years?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All the farmers in your district know that that cannot continue. Therefore we are facing probably an unfavorable year, which has not been taken into consideration by the Department.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Those matters certainly are not being taken into consideration by the Department, because nothing concrete has been proposed to insure us that we will have enough labor to harvest our crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, one of the great bottlenecks in the defense effort at this time is the efforts of a lot of these civilian agencies to do things that do not need to be done and which do not contribute to the war effort.

The other day I called attention to a magazine known as Victory. They have already printed 450,000 copies of it, according to a press release, and they are going to print 540,000 more in various languages for distribution as propaganda in foreign countries. This is a ridiculous magazine, made up almost entirely of propaganda—propaganda of a local, domestic, political character here in this country. It is something that should not be printed by any governmental agency. It is absolutely ridiculous for us to print a book weighing 13 ounces and send it across the water at a time when the boys cannot be sent their local papers or cigarettes or anything of that kind, and at a time when I have a communication here from the War Ballot Commission in New York stating that the War Department proposed that the ballots be sent in bulk to prevent divulging of any military information concerning the whereabouts of soldiers:

This met with our hearty approval and we prepared the ballots and booklets required under the law only to be met with the refusal to ship the ballots. The excuse given us was that it would take up shipping space needed for war purposes. In our answer we called attention to the fact that these bulk shipments would be going to diversified posts and camps and the amounts of ballots shipped to any one would be small in number, with the possible exception of those in England and France.

But they would not send them. Those ballots were not anything like the 402 tons that the 2 editions of this magazine, with all its cheap political propaganda, weighed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Do I identify the magazine as the one on the table printed in three or four colors?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman is in error when he says three or four colors; there are a good many more than that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Whose picture appears there?

Mr. TABER. That is part of the fourth-term propaganda.

Mr. GIFFORD. Read what he promises.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has he not a message for us?

Mr. TABER—

Liberty under God.

That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt promises the United States of America to insure for the future of all mankind on the foundation of the "four freedoms" of speech, of worship, from want, and from fear. This future will be built and forever maintained.

But he says nothing whatever about giving the freedom or the right of a man to work, or the right of a man to go out and make something of himself as generations of Americans have loved to do for years and years.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the message, the one the gentleman just read, which compensated for the cigarettes it displaced in the shipments.

Mr. TABER. I am glad there is somebody who feels that this outfit has a proper apology for existence. The gentleman feels that these neutral countries can be satisfied with propaganda. That is something I should hate to espouse.

Mr. KNUTSON. It should be very popular over in China.

Mr. TABER. Where they are getting nothing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; well, yes.

Mr. TABER. Except bald statements.

Mr. CASE. As the gentleman was reading that statement I thought I saw a full page picture of the Vice President.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman did.

Mr. CASE. I think on the opposite side there is a message from him. Will the gentleman read that also?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; I naturally expect so. There is his picture, and this picture is in different colors from the other picture. That is one of the documents. You know this is the same outfit which last fall was going to teach some 30,000,000 pulp writers—what they are I do not know—how to write love stories, this O. W. I.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Were any copies of this magazine printed for the Mohammedans?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. CLEVINGER. There are some 300,000,000 of them in that area.

Mr. TABER. I should not be surprised to learn that they were.

Then they put out another magazine known as Negroes and the War. This magazine is something like 50 pages in size and most of it is devoted to political propaganda and to building up certain Negroes who have taken an active part in New Deal propaganda. Six pages out of the 50 are devoted to the Negro himself and his effort in the war. This is rather a large order. I expect this individual copy of this magazine must weigh at least 10 ounces, and I understand it is going to be given general distribution.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is that going to be sent abroad, too, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; I should not be surprised; at any rate, it will be distributed under penalty mail if it is distributed in this country and will tend to protect the deficit of the Post Office Department.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. This is butchering time on the American farms, the time when they butcher hogs and cattle and process them. Is there a recipe in there on how to make "globaloney"?

Mr. TABER. That has been made already.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, that has been made?

Mr. TABER. That has been made. What is the use of telling how to make it after it has been made?

There is a peculiar thing about these books that come from this organization. They issue a press release—I have it here—stating that they have printed 450,000 copies in English and that they are going to run 450,000 in different languages to send to Europe, but the next day the head of the organization comes out in the newspapers and states that they are printing only 230,000. This press release that I have here is dated February 4. So, within 2 or 3 days they are as far apart as the four winds on the number they are going to print.

I have called attention to this as one of the organizations that is providing bottlenecks. I understand they have secured a great number of deferments from the draft for these young fellows who are doing the writing for them. They have to be protected. It is such an important activity that that is necessary. I understand, though, that the War Department is not satisfied.

I have in my office a magazine known as Battle Neck, gotten out by the Bureau of Ordnance, and in that thing there is not a single article that would tend to help in any way the production of war material. A letter has been sent out by the Chief of Ordnance telling the contractors of the War Department that they ought to subscribe to that magazine.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Many of these people have felt that they had to subscribe to the magazine, but there is absolutely nothing in it. "Battle Neck" is another "bottleneck."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Referring back to this question involving the magazine Victory, my attention has been called today to a project that they have under way down there to publish a daily newspaper here in Washington to be sent out all over the country, another propaganda sheet. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. TABER. No; but I intend to do what I can to see that they do not get any more money for it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Whereas the War Production Board claims it has the responsibility for curtailing newsprint use to civilians, nevertheless they blandly

tell us that they have no authority to curtail the Office of War Information use or that of any other Government department.

Mr. TABER. It is about time that somebody had some authority. I think this House has the authority and I hope that the House will exercise it when it gets down to things.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman write the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures and ask him to look into this matter? I think it would get sympathetic attention.

Mr. TABER. I think that should be done. I would hope, though, that he might read the Record.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement. I wish he would show, however, that the items he complains of are not in this present bill.

Mr. TABER. Oh, they are not in this bill, but general debate is not confined to this bill here. I admit that I am going outside the pale of this bill, but these things are so outstanding in their absurdity and ridiculousness that I feel the attention of the Congress ought to be called to them.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman get my point? Will he write a letter requesting the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures to look into this matter?

Mr. TABER. Surely.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is the orderly procedure.

Mr. TABER. Surely, I will do that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Then it will get sympathetic attention, will it?

Mr. TABER. I hope so. Such things never have, but I would hope it might.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. One of my fellow Members has just called my attention to a copy of this Victory magazine. I notice on page 18 a picture of both the President and his wife at their country home estate in my district. It also includes the little dog, Falla. He is there, too. Is this to be sent abroad? Are a million copies of it to be sent abroad?

Mr. TABER. I understand it was all sent abroad. What they would do with 450,000 copies abroad I do not know, in these neutral countries especially.

Mr. FISH. Naturally I am only too glad that my district have this publicity and inasmuch as this charming picture was taken in my district, I am wondering just where these appropriations come from to send this out. I would like to report it back to my own constituents.

Mr. TABER. The appropriation was for the Office for Emergency Management, as I remember it, with an allocation to the Office of War Information.

It was thought at the time that we reduced the appropriation we were going to eliminate propaganda involving things in this country and confine it entirely to suitable propaganda in connection with the war effort, not to gorgeous, high-costing documents such as this.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman means to say that the money for this propaganda comes out of the taxpayers' pockets?

Mr. TABER. Certainly it comes out of the taxpayers; so does the money for this propaganda come out of the taxpayers.

Mr. FISH. What can the Congress do to put an end to this New Deal propaganda?

Mr. TABER. The only way we can put an end to it is to refuse to give them any more money.

Mr. FISH. Can we get a vote or that later?

Mr. TABER. Not on this bill. We will get a vote later on though.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman mentioned another magazine entitled "The Negro and the War" and he specifically said, which is correct, that out of 36 pages only the last 6 pages referred to the war.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Does this propaganda also come out of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know how many of these magazines are sent out to the colored people of America?

Mr. TABER. I have not the slightest idea, but I intend to find out before I get through.

Mr. FISH. This is an entirely different magazine.

Mr. TABER. This is one for circulation in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. This is an entirely different method of propaganda. The other magazine, Victory, went abroad, but this is circulated to the colored people in America.

Mr. TABER. That is right. This is pure propaganda.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know how many thousands or millions of these are being sent out?

Mr. TABER. I understand a very large number are being sent out, but I have no definite information as to the number.

Mr. FISH. I hope to speak tomorrow on this magazine, because I regard it as an insult to all the colored people. The very first sentence reads as follows:

Some Negro Americans say that it makes no difference who wins the war.

To my mind, that is a reflection on the Americanism and the patriotism of all Americans of colored blood.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman and I know that the colored people of America are among the most patriotic of any group. I do not think any writer has any business to put out such a statement as that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I say that the interesting colloquy between my two friends suggests the fact that the publication and the speech we are to hear tomorrow look as if we are going to have a contest as to who can do the most propagandizing of the Negro?

Mr. TABER. That may be, but it ought not to be done on false representations by a department with public money.

Mr. FISH. And it ought not to be done by any attacks on the patriotism or loyalty or Americanism of the Negro.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. FISH. To me that is the stupidest kind of propaganda.

Mr. TABER. I am hopeful that something may be done to stop a lot of this propaganda and stop a lot of the things that are hampering and impeding the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I say in furtherance of what the gentleman from New York has just said in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] that I have today introduced a resolution calling for an exhaustive inquiry into the whole question of the printing situation in this country, within the Government as well as without the Government.

O. P. A. IS THE ROAD TO DESPOTISM

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, the people whom I have the honor to represent here are ordinary average Americans of every race and creed. They understand plain facts and simple truths. It is in their language that I want to place before the House the danger of slavery and despotism that faces America today—not from without but from within.

American boys are dying all over the world today, in every land and on every sea, in the name of freedom. But if that freedom is lost at home their sacrifice will have been in vain. They will have been betrayed by their own people, behind their backs. No tragedy could be greater for both.

We hear today a great outpouring of words and flowery phrases about freedom. But I believe this House is seeking the facts, as opposed to the delusions of grandeur associated with the setting up of milk routes in the Fiji Islands. The facts are that never in the history of America have our citizens found their daily lives so restricted by their Government as today. There are a lot of wordy excuses for these commands and edicts eliminating liberty of action. And for every restriction that is decreed, there is a soothing alibi.

The administration, through the O. P. A., is conducting a great experiment in price fixing, with the noble objective of preventing inflation. The O. P. A.

cannot prevent inflation, because rising prices are the result and not the cause of inflation. Rising prices are a brake against inflation, because they inform the people that the economic machinery is out of gear. You cannot prevent the passage of time by stopping your watch, and neither can you stop the course of inflation by fixing prices. The effect is about the same as disconnecting the speedometer on your car as you start down a steep hill. If you would watch the disconnected speedometer and not use the brakes, you would have a smash-up. Price-fixing schemes which ignore the natural economic laws will inevitably lead to a similar crack-up.

In a problem of this magnitude I would rather have my path lighted by the lamp of experience than by the clever logic of bright-witted new dealers, whose every economic experiment for 10 long years, a full decade, has been a failure. The O. P. A. is a reasonable facsimile of the former holder of the price-fixing championship of the world—the Law of the Maximum in France during the French Revolution. Let me give you a summary of that law and what happened.

First, the price of each article of necessity was fixed at one and one-third its price in 1790. Second, all freight costs were added at a fixed rate per league. Third, 5 percent was added for the profit of the wholesaler. Fourth, 10 percent was added for the profit of the retailer. Nothing could look more reasonable, and great was the jubilation in France. What happened?

The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity of food, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets—ration cards—were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate requirements.

I could go on at length to describe the results of the law of the maximum. Let me summarize by advising you that it did not keep prices down. It imposed strict penalties, even death, but it simply resulted in the wholesale demoralization of society. Why? Because it attempted to evade and thwart the law of supply and demand.

But you say our case is different because we are at war. It was said in France that price-fixing penalties were made necessary by the war then going on. They had the same sickness, and they were given the same patent medicine.

The administration will not face this problem honestly. Double talk solves nothing. A few days ago Mr. Byrnes explained a 48-hour week order, terming it a measure to prevent inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth, indicates an editorial of the New York Times, dated February 11, 1943. The Times said, and I quote:

And far from preventing inflation, it (the 48-hour week order) is the most inflationary

single positive step that the administration has yet taken.

Confusing and tricking the American people during their hour of trial is a tragic misuse of power.

The American people are told they must now prepare for huge casualties of our youth. Their diet of blood and tears must not be paralleled by a domestic menu composed of alibis, lullabies, and hushabies. Truth and frankness are vitamins necessary to freedom.

The great disaster of France's O. P. A. was not economic, although that calamity was tragic enough. The greatest loss was the moral and spiritual chaos that resulted from these "crackpot" schemes. Speculation, black markets, gambling, and dishonesty were rampant. Corruption, greed, and cheating of all kinds resulted, and the people lost faith in the honesty of one another and of the Government as well.

Mr. Chairman, that is the history of the O. P. A. of an earlier day. Today it is apparent we are moving down that same road. I say it is time for this House, the elected guardians of the sacred liberties of the American people, to overhaul this instrument of oppression.

If price control is necessary to a limited extent, and I am sure that it is, let it be revamped immediately along the lines that worked during the First World War, with improvements based upon that experience. That is common sense.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one brand of slavery. There is not first-degree slavery or second-degree slavery—Japanese slavery or German slavery, American slavery or foreign slavery—there is just one deadly word "slavery." Our boys on the fighting fronts are eliminating the danger of slavery from without; it is up to this Congress now to eliminate it from within. Lenin said the surest way to overturn the existing basis of society was to debauch the currency. That has been going on in America now for 10 years. Under rationing and price fixing, money will not necessarily buy what you desire. Either I work for a money reward that can be used to buy the things I want, or I work with a whip over my back. Persistently freezing labor and fixing prices will lead to slave labor. No new combination of words or phrases can change this simple truth.

Mr. Chairman, the decisive battle for freedom in this generation will be won or lost in America. It will be won or lost in this Congress. It can only be won, Mr. Chairman, by a Congress that will immediately slash Government expenditures by the billions and courageously levy new taxes by the billions. If there were another road whereby we could save our honor and our liberty, I would gladly explore it, but there is none. There is no road to liberty and happiness but obedience to natural laws, including the law of supply and demand, and there is no way to secure God's blessing for America except adherence to His laws. I plead with the Members of this Congress—the last great hope of our bleeding Christian civilization—to meet this challenge courageously.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK] having assumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, 1944, H. R. 1762, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein a letter from the Social Security Board.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] be permitted to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter she received today from Mrs. Helena Hill Weed, daughter of the late Congressman Ebenezer I. Hill, of Norwalk, Conn., containing certain excerpts and observations relative to Susan B. Anthony, who was memorialized on this floor today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain tables and extracts from the hearings and a letter I received in reference to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Haven Journal-Courier, and that he further be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address he delivered over the New Haven station, WELL.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a brief table to which I referred as coming from the War Department.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on Russell H. Conwell, founder of Temple University, the one hundredth anniversary of whose birth is being celebrated in Philadelphia today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a concurrent resolution passed by the Utah State Legislature.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a most timely editorial entitled "Strange Panaceas," which appeared in the Clinton Daily Item, of Clinton, Mass., on Thursday evening, February 11, and which was written by the distinguished and talented editor of that highly esteemed publication, Hon. Orra L. Stone.

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

There was no objection.

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

LET US REMEMBER WE ARE AT WAR; AND BE MINDFUL OF WHO ARE OUR ENEMIES AND WHO ARE OUR FRIENDS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a self-appointed attorney for and advocate of the men and boys of America, Great Britain, Russia, China, and all other of our allies, who are fighting today for our freedom.

I have been much impressed in the last few days because of my renewed recollection of the great man Abraham Lincoln, all of whose reproduced photographs indicate an intensive sadness. We need not be astonished at that, when we remember that it is probably truly said that those of his own household were divided against him. I turn to appeal for unity. One has said, and truly so, that united we stand, divided we fall.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to try to bring to our remembrance that we, the American people, with our noble allies, are yet called on to defend and protect liberty and freedom in the world, and to ask that we be impressed with the continuing enormity of our task. It makes one shudder to take account of the disruptions, disorganizations, hard-

ships, and losses that we and our allies have been compelled to suffer on account of the meanness of two nations and the lack of stamina and character of another. Of course, I refer to Nazi Germany and Japan and to Mussolini Italy.

I am thinking of those people who would like to think of nations and peoples as societies of friends—devoted to the doctrine of the good neighbor; not grasping and selfish but liberal and fair. About the time we had begun to hope that people would regard each other as brothers, that security of feeling and helpfulness of hope were ruthlessly attacked by Germany and Japan.

Germany, through Hitler and the military caste of that country, has lost her soul. They became a force of nature and also the superachievement of man, the hero. Under nazi-ism to them there is no longer God. They are wild and fearless—fearless after a fashion; ruthless and cruel, grasping and unkind, covetous and mean. So must and surely will be anyone whose God is not the Lord.

God is love and apart from God there is no love. Where love does not abound, hate will abound.

Listen to Hitler:

For liberation something more is necessary than an economic policy, something more than industry; if a people is to become free, it needs power, it needs pride and will power, defiance, hate, hate, and once again I say hate.

Over against this we find:

If the truth shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.

For God and righteousness and truth the German folk has been substituted. The German folk is bound by no law. It does not even like the truth. It is force, self-egotistical superiority, hate for everything it is not pleased to call German; yea, German nazi-ism. Hitler boasted that he was, in his youth, a bad little boy. To him the woods, the meadows, and the fields were battlefields where the ever-present conflicts were fought out. Along with the doctrine of man, the hero, force and hate had come. A long time ago the Kaiser had said "Me und Got"; Hitler came to say, "Not God but me. I am your fuehrer, your leader. I am worthy; I am that I am." Hitler abandoned all concept of right. It matters not to him whether even the sons of German people live or die, except as their living and fighting may contribute the more to the realization of his unholy ambitions; not the least of which is to kill and destroy.

In this unholy manner of life, however, he cannot be alone. The Nazi military and military-minded castes of Germany must surely furnish him a deal of support, making possible the ruthless conduct of wars he has carried on against those who had never indicated a gesture other than of general good will toward Germany and all other nations.

The Nazi program is one of world possession, without regard to right. Deification of the mind, force, ruthlessness, and hate have been substituted for all else. These became plans and processes

and sole means by which an unjust end was to be attained. And thus we have Germany waging undeclared wars and wars declared without reason or right. A veritable campaign of death and destruction, subjugation and starvation. In this campaign another nation took partnership and stealthily began active participation in this murder by attacking the United States while their deceitful overtures of peaceful understandings were being considered. In this act there was brought to light, or, better said, perhaps, again brought to light the hypocrisy, the treachery, and the meanness of that nation. I have long wondered how long the good people of Germany and Japan, if any, will continue to allow their sons to die upon battlefields to satisfy the thirst for blood and unholy conquest of Hitler and his militaristic gangs and those of Japan in like manner disposed and without any concept of justice or mercy or truth. Italy has joined them. Probably through a lack of manhood than otherwise. Mussolini must be regarded as in truth a puppet of Germany and even now of Japan.

It has been apparent and continues so that these powers, especially Germany and Japan, set about to divide and conquer, possess and enslave the rest of the world.

This they have proposed to do by resort to trickery, untruth, deception of all kinds, and by resort to destruction of the peoples of other countries, including, if you please, definitely the United States of America.

The only mistaken prediction I have made is that this war of conquest would have ere now reached our own shores with a fury and effect that would have alarmed us by now in its proportions. Our allies, Great Britain, China, and Russia, have prevented this, aided by the material help we have been wise enough to give them.

The war is not, however, over. We shall win, but the solemn and serious question remains: How long will it be?

How many of our sons shall we have to lose before it is won and won, as it must be, in unconditional surrender of those countries which have constituted themselves and remain our awful enemies?

I am making a plea for unity at home. Every division among us results in the loss of lives; the lives of our own men and boys, and the lives of our noble allies who are fighting with such bravery and determination to beat back the hounds of hell, who, themselves, have lost their souls and devote themselves to hate and unholy aims and the murdering of all who, loving liberty and freedom, must oppose them.

There is too much carping; too much disunity; too much complaining; too much of intensifying of the relatively minor things and too little realization of the most important—the early winning of this war that involves everything to us and to the world.

I make mention of my opposition to the Dies committee. I have nothing personally against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I do not know him except as one may know another

by observation of his speech and conduct. My intense opposition to his activities has been solely my firm conviction that all he has done, as chairman of the Dies committee, has been to interfere with our fight against Hitler and Japan, which means our fight for country and home. The publicity of complaint offered and indulged in against men in departments of our Government on account of his accusations against them of having been connected with, or being connected with, what he so often calls Communist fronts, positions sometimes well taken and more often resulting in accusations against loyal citizens, has tended to divide. I would have been glad had he devoted some of his time and spent some of the people's money in investigating Nazi spies and spies of Japanese enemies.

I have not been always pleased with activities of departments of the Government, or with what is so often referred to as bureaus, but I have suffered more in apprehension for the welfare of our fighting men and boys from the disposition of men to be dissatisfied with everything and satisfied with nothing, than I have on account of any mistakes made by those who were, perhaps, trying to do the best they could in hard circumstances.

I have admiration and a feeling of the deepest gratitude for our allies; the British people, Russia, China, the Fighting French, and those who have turned and those who, I knew, would turn themselves to battle for the freedom and rights of men; and as well every country and every people who have joined us by actual war and by announcement and preparation in this battle for freedom and the right. How can we do or allow anything that would tend to divide men engaged in such a noble enterprise?

Would we, for the sake of personal or political advantage, engage in a course or do things that tend to interfere with our war effort or program? I warn you that to do so will react and the boys and men who do come home will call you to account.

Let us think of the men and the boys of our own and, yes, of every one of our allies who are baring their breasts to enemy bullets, not knowing whether they shall live or die, but willingly doing this that men may be free and free as the truth makes us free.

Is Secretary Knox right when he says:

History is repeating itself. The present administration has been subjected to the same familiar charges of 80 years ago. Partisan advantage still seeks to obstruct the larger purposes and critics still clamor that, because of the exactions of war, the common man will be deprived of liberty.

Am I more anxious about my returning to Washington from the 1944 election than I am for the well-being of our men in arms? Let each of us put first things first, and let our daily inquiry of ourselves be, What is good for our fighting men and our cause?

How can I best contribute to the great task before us? I would not advocate inattention to any of the needs of our people; I would not counsel supineness in the acceptance always of things as

they are. If we may, as Congressmen, study to show ourselves approved in our own work and at the same time, by patient consideration, point out to others needs to be considered, all right. But let us not give our time to carping criticisms of others, as a habit, lest, perchance, we should fail in the duty assigned to us.

I invite suggestions as to my own course, and these are often, if not always, helpful; but I have never received any aid from a chronic complainer.

This is a time for cooperation, not division. Our cause is a common one; it is just. Let us, each of us, whatever our situation or position may be, do our full part to the end that men may be free, that our victory may be complete, and that this complete victory may come on the earliest possible day, with the least loss of life that can be. I am not willing to do or to neglect anything that may cause the loss of one mother's son.

I know it is only necessary that we be reminded of the solemnity of our tasks and the import of that in which we are engaged.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 16, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, February 17, 1943, for consideration of unfinished business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

173. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed general provision for the Office for Emergency Management and drafts of proposed provisions for the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the Office of Defense Transportation, constituent agencies thereof (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

174. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943 and 1944 in the amount of \$525,000 (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

175. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1943, to remain available until December 31, 1943, in the amount of \$65,075,000 (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

176. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John in Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

177. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the fourth report upon the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

178. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting a report of the operations of Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission for the period of its existence from June 5, 1942, to the present date; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

179. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

180. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to \$250,000,000 contract authorization (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

181. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$3,269,430 (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$337,000 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. RAMSPECK: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1671. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Small Business. House Resolution 18. Resolution dealing with wartime problems of southern industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Ford, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1818. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the deduction of certain credits from assessments due the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by certain insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 1819. A bill to extend certain provisions of law relating to overtime compen-

sation to employees in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1820. A bill to provide for the advancement in rank of certain commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 1821. A bill to suspend the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 14 (a) and section 14 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act to issue rules relating to the solicitation of proxies, consents, and authorizations during the period of war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 1822. A bill to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to give credit for active duty performed by enlisted men subsequent to transfer to the Fleet Reserve, in computing their retainer or retired pay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 1823. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1824 (by request). A bill to establish more equitable procedure governing the determination of service connection of diseases or injuries alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in the present global war, campaign, or expedition; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1825 (by request). A bill to amend Public Law No. 242 of the Sixty-eighth Congress as amended so as to extend monetary benefits to veterans of the present global war and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1826 (by request). A bill to provide for presumption of soundness at enlistment after 6 months' active service in the armed forces during the present global war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1827 (by request). A bill to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die while in the armed forces of the United States during the present global war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1828 (by request). A bill to grant burial allowances in cases of certain deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who served in a recognized campaign, expedition, insurrection, or occupation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1829 (by request). A bill to provide dental service for veterans of the present global war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1830 (by request). A bill to authorize payment of compensation or pension for partial service-connected disability, plus such percentage of the amount of pension payable for his permanent total disability, nonservice connected, as is equal to the difference between 100 percent and the degree of his service-connected disability; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1831. A bill providing for a delegate to the United States Congress from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 1832. A bill granting to post offices of the third class an allowance for additional clerk hire during the period of annual and sick leave of the postmaster; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 1857. A bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and sur-

geons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. Res. 113. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate problems relating to production of war essential, critical, and strategic minerals and metals; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. Res. 114. Resolution to create a special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 115. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation with respect to plans contemplated for the curtailment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 116. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for the expenses of studies and examinations under House Resolution 69; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 117. Resolution suggesting the need for developing a plan for furnishing food and supplies to the stricken and hungry peoples of Belgium and other countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 118. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 801, a bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 1833. A bill to provide for the reappointment of Maj. Harry A. Musham, retired, to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of M. F. Diller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Henry Tschudy and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Manuel G. Souza and Manuel Souza, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Lucia Humble; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1839. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. Studley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1840. A bill to amend the military record of Walter Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1841. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clare D. Fielding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of certain trial examiners of the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 1843. A bill granting a pension to Ella Noe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHILEIN:

H. R. 1844. A bill granting a pension to Katherine R. Salmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of Frank Franklin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Richard Zielinski and his parents; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 1848. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Vaclav Rasin; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1849. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Alex Ranieri against the United States for the amount of such actual losses, damages, or compensation as shall appear to be due him; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Soterios G. Stamoulis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of Kresimir Matijevic; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of Rozalja Golba (nee Piotrowska), alias Joanne Piotrowska; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1853. A bill for the relief of John Boska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Ethel Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Alois Hlad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Pasko and Ksavery Frances Pasko (nee Fyalowna); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

118. By Mr. BURDICK: Senate Concurrent Resolution F of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

119. By Mr. BURGIN: Joint resolution of the North Carolina General Assembly, urging the Federal authorities to apply price ceilings to the flue-cured tobacco crop by a method which will not destroy the auction system of selling tobacco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

120. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution No. 12403 of the Oakland City Council, Oakland, Calif., requesting the Federal Government to adopt regulations to insure the immediate distribution of meat for civilian use within the limits of the quota fixed by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

121. Also, senate joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, urging the enactment of House bill 7667, by Representatives LEA and WELCH, providing that all Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge pay tolls for the duration of the present emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

122. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

123. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

124. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 27 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

125. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

126. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24 of the State Legislature of California; to

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

127. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

128. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

129. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 20 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

130. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

131. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 of the State Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

133. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Theodore Dague, James F. Halberstadt, Ben McCullough, B. P. Johnson, Nevin Miller, and 100 other citizens of Adams County, Ind., representing the United States Constitutional League, urging Congress to retrieve all powers which have been unconstitutionally assumed by the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. Also, memorial of E. A. Nuttle, J. H. Kieler, and 200 other citizens of Allen County, Ind., representing the United States Constitutional League, urging Congress to retrieve all powers which have been unconstitutionally assumed by the executive branch of the Government, to the end that we may again resume government of the people, by the people, and for the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. By Mr. HALE: Two petitions of the United States Savings and Loan League, in behalf of its nearly 4,000 member savings and loan associations located in all parts of the country, tendering its assistance and cooperation to facilitate a more speedy liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, thereby accomplishing the purposes of its original creation, and reducing further the nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

136. By Mr. HOCH: Petition of the Berks County Cooperative Association, Pennsylvania, repudiating the so-called farm bloc as spokesman for farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

137. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Harold Addis and 26 other farmers of Rockford, Mich., and vicinity for the elimination of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency program as an unnecessary waste of public funds and a hindrance to the production of adequate food supply for our armed forces, the Allies, and our own Nation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

138. By Mr. TOWE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, urging and petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to preserve and safeguard the shad fishing industry in the Hudson River; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thou, O Lord God of hosts, at the beginning of another day we ask Thy gracious guidance. We trust that we shall not begrudge our best even in the humblest tasks, responding in sympathy to all opportunities for service.

We pray Thee to set our minds on worthy objects, keeping them filled with pure thoughts, and be in us the power that makes for righteousness.

Heavenly Father, gather within the folds of Thyself the business, the life, and the very soul of our Nation; thrust from it every hindering thing, distrust and greed, and let Thy mercy be upon us as our trust is in Thee. We pray that our temporal prosperity may be measured by our spiritual vision, standing on those great substantial verities which will carry us through all dangers. It is thus that summer comes to the roots of the soul and makes it bud to a noble opening, given fruitage by the river of life, rich with the promise of an abundant harvest. Oh, let Thy blessed presence disturb us with the joy of elevated thoughts and with a sense of Thy sublimity; then will the light of the rising sun show forth the glory of a morn in a world where all is changing, but God; and Thine shall be the praise, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 1446. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 12. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes," as amended, by authorizing loans for mineral development purposes in time of war;

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Charles F. Kegel;

S. 171. An act for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke;

S. 173. An act for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann;

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney;

S. 184. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908-1909;

S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers;

S. 221. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918, relating to protection of life and property in waters endangered by activities of the Army;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 301. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon naval reservations;

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothwell, United States Marine Corps;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Master Gunner Sgt. Eugene M. Martin, United States Marine Corps;

S. 306. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel for personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941;

S. 319. An act 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;

S. 381. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker;

S. 405. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler;

S. 408. An act to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute an additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes;

S. 418. An act for the relief of Howard M. Sandus;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 493. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez;

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States;

S. 517. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 518. An act for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin;

S. 621. An act 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; and

S. 641. An act to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers.

JAMES F. SCANLON

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary to which I would like to call the attention of the House. The Honorable Swagar Shirley, who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, 25 years ago today brought to Washington Jim Scanlon. Mr. Scanlon from that date to this has been a devoted employee serving with the Appropriations Committee. He has been highly intelligent, ever loyal and faithful. He has a personality which has brought sunshine into the work of that committee every day he has been there. He makes friends easily, and he keeps them indefinitely.

I am sure that I speak for everyone from my home city, Louisville, Ky., as well as the membership of this House in