

subdivisions and governmental agencies for the revenue derived from the taxes upon the real property so acquired by the Federal Government, which action endorses House bill 1305, by Congressman STOCKMAN, providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, we praise Thee in the name of Him who is high above the pride of this mortal state. Give us vision that will shame present realities, believing that it is better to trust Thee than to fret our hearts in brooding desire. In prosperity let us be glad; and in mocking adversity then, too, we would consider and give Thee thanks.

We pray that the sufferings of war may make for the redemption of this world, cherishing the vision and living by the light of the prophets afar. O hear the unspoken prayers, the quivering faith that in silence and loneliness look up to Thee. Remind us that in the catalog of wrongdoing, ingratitude is the broad highway of offense. Bless us with the mercy of grateful hearts, owning that we are debtors to the millions unknown, to the lowly workers in the murky mists of poverty and obscurity, to all who feel the drudgery of unromantic toil, as well as to the greatest of mankind. Dear Lord, these all are beckoning and reaching for our hands, challenging us to press with new vigor toward that freedom for which the years have been struggling; reveal to us Thy will, and may we love to follow it. In the name of the Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from this morning's Washington Post on the unanimous report of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the bill to extend the Lend-Lease Act for another year.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. REED of New York, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. MAGNUSON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the Honorable William S. Bennett, a former Member of this House from the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the original Agricultural Credit Corporation and to include therein a short statement from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of the business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### INCOME-TAX PAYMENT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the wrath of the American people is going to be on this Congress for its failure to enact some form of pay-as-you-go tax legislation prior to March 15. The tax burden will be so heavy for everyone that they will be justified in criticizing the failure of the Government to provide a way in which these taxes could be paid monthly. It is regrettable that the majority leadership did not make pay-as-you-go tax a part of their program early in the Seventy-eighth Congress. I want to read to you portions of a letter from one of the leading bankers of the State of Nebraska:

My experience has been such that possibly I gave a little more thought to the future than the average man. I only mention this because I think I can take care of myself and can budget my taxes. My association with various individuals is intimate enough so that I know a great many people have not the funds to even make a first quarterly payment on their 1942 income tax. Individuals generally are shocked when they appreciate the amount of their tax liabilities. I would even go so far as to say that I know instances where people have been made physically ill when they first got this information as regards the taxes.

We should have some sort of tax legislation which will permit the collection of taxes monthly. It will raise a greater sum for the Treasury, and I believe it is the only method that can be employed, by which substantial amounts can be extracted from the public. I am a believer in high taxes—I believe by their payment they will prevent inflation and reduce the sale of Government obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that some sort of pay-as-you-go tax plan be rushed through this Congress without further delay.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my own remarks on two subjects, in one to include a letter, and in the other to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### THE PRESIDENT'S SONS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to hear the services of any man wearing the uniform of the country criticized, whether he be a son of the President of the United States or a recently naturalized citizen.

In 1917 a great American, an ex-President named Roosevelt, had four sons in the service. We heard then: "The Roosevelt boys all have commissions." But, before that war ended, three of those four had been wounded and one had given his life in an airplane crash. In the half minute remaining I want to tell you a true story about Quentin Roosevelt. Quentin Roosevelt wore thick eyeglasses. How he got in the air service was something of a mystery. He completed his training at Issoudun, France. The rest of his class was ordered to the front, but his name was not on the list. He went to his commanding officer to find out why and was told that because of his defective vision they expected to keep him in the rear.

During the next week he went to the office of the Chief of the Air Service in France and, by using some influence, he received his orders to go to the front. In less than 1 week at the front Quentin Roosevelt gave his life to his country.

I hope that criticism of the services of any man in the service of his country will cease. Let us show respect toward the President and his patriotic sons. They are doing their duty, and I, for one, respect them.

Let us stop petty sniping and get together—that this war may be won as speedily as possible.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a clipping from the Daily Corinthian of Corinth, Miss.

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

There was no objection.

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

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an excerpt from the Christian Science Monitor.

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

There was no objection.

# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and in another instance to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the News Sentinel of Fort Wayne, Ind.

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

There was no objection.

# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. 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 Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on factory management and maintenance.

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

There was no objection.

# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

## BUREAUCRATS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I heard my friend the gentleman from Ohio just now talk about bureaucrats. I have heard others on both sides of the

Chamber talk about them, especially on the Republican side.

I would like to know what they mean by it. I saw in the papers yesterday the name of my friend, General Hines, who has been here for 20 years. Is he one of the bureaucrats you talk about? Are you talking about some of the new agencies, in which I venture to say 80 percent of them are Republicans? Are you talking about your own?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to know who appointed these bureaucrats.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Now you have it. Then you are sore because a Democratic President appointed Knox and Stimson, and these others.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How can the gentleman who appointed them get away from the responsibility?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Get away from responsibility? No. You have talked about bureaucrats here; you have spread it all around, and you do not dare to name a single person whom you would term a bureaucrat.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial based on authentic reports of the marvelous work done by the Higgins boats in Guadalcanal.

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

There was no objection.

## ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. 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. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have inserted in the RECORD an editorial based on accurate and authentic information concerning the marvelous work done by the Higgins invasion boats at Guadalcanal.

These two distinguished gentlemen who testified before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee saw strenuous action in this particular theater of war and praised the Higgins invasion boats in the most enthusiastic manner.

Right at this point may I state that there have been occasions during the past year when Andrew Jackson Higgins has been criticized vigorously and unjustly and some have even gone so far as to say that the reason for the Higgins contract cancellation was due to poor management. I, for one, inform the membership of this House that there is no shipyard in the country managed more efficiently than the Higgins Shipyards of New Orleans.

The particular individual who made that observation in the nature of a criti-

cism in my estimation is one who gloriously exemplifies the old saying, "What he lacks in intelligence he makes up in stupidity."

Within the next few months Andrew Jackson Higgins will be producing planes with such amazing rapidity that we can all bask in the sunshine of his ability to make contributions to this war effort far beyond our expectations. Any further comment on my part at this time concerning Andrew Jackson Higgins is entirely uncalled for.

## THE PRESIDENT'S FAMILY

Mr. SCOTT. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut has already expressed better than I can my sentiments with reference to a certain type of criticism. When we indict the administration for mistakes we are, I conceive, in the position of counsel for the people, or prosecutors, if you prefer. The Supreme Court has just said that "a prosecutor may hit hard blows but not foul ones."

We may often disagree with the President, sometimes on his war policies, more often on matters of domestic or internal concern, but the President and the Congress and the people have a war to win. Neither the President nor the Congress nor the people ought to be harassed by irrelevant matters. For heaven's sake, let us leave the President's family out of it.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some correspondence I have had with the Wage and Hour Administrator.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I made last night.

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

There was no objection.

## BUREAUCRATS

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

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

There was no objection.

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

## REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

Mr. FOLGER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that 32 years ago today the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, who wants me to call him Bob, but I cannot do it, although he is very young, took the oath as a Member of this House. I would not make any comparison, but I think I will have the agreement of the Members here and those who have been here during his time in office that he has been one of the most valuable Members of the House of Representatives, Nationwide in his considerations, hardworking, intelligent, and a fine, fine man. North Carolina is proud of him.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FLOESER] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PAY OF RURAL CARRIERS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in the rural mail delivery service. Under the present law, the rural mail carrier is allowed only 5 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction thereof scheduled. This amount is wholly inadequate under conditions such as now exist, because, under present conditions, the rural carrier cannot get new equipment as needed, but must maintain the truck or automobile that he has subjected to hard usage since before the war. His cost of equipment maintenance and operation has greatly increased and now amounts to between 8 and 10 cents per mile. The bill that I have introduced provides an increase of only 1 cent per mile, beginning May 1 this year and continuing for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter. I hope that you will support this much-needed legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any other special orders today, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a memorial from the Idaho State Legislature, urging Congress to take steps to pass necessary legislation to suspend the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for the duration of the present emergency. The memorial points out that the emergency for which this act was passed no longer exists, and that the unwarranted expenditure of money and demand upon the services of manpower that might better be diverted to the war effort is not necessary.

The memorial referred to follows:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has, during the period from May 12, 1933, to June 30, 1942, expended \$5,660,400,000 of which \$213,100,000 was for administrative expense; and

Whereas during the fiscal year of 1942 the total administrative expense of said Agricultural Adjustment Administration was \$4,596,872; and

Whereas during the fiscal year of 1942 the administrative expense for State officers administering this act in the State of Idaho was \$181,576, not taking into consideration the county administrative expense; and

Whereas we have requested the administrative office for such act in Boise, Idaho, to furnish us with figures and number of personnel required to administer the act in Idaho; and

Whereas said office has refused to furnish such information; and

Whereas this enormous expenditure of moneys requires the services of a vast number of employees, the exact or approximate number of which we have been unable to obtain; and

Whereas the emergency for which this act was passed to alleviate has ceased to exist; and

Whereas we, your memorialists, feel that such an unwarranted expenditure of money and demand upon the services of manpower that might be diverted to the war effort is not in any way necessary at this time and

could be made available to furthering the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring therein), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take steps to pass the necessary legislation to suspend the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for the duration of the present emergency.*

#### JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES IN LABOR

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I do not have with me a clipping from the Washington Herald of the day before yesterday afternoon and I ask unanimous consent that clipping may be inserted in the RECORD of Monday morning. It was disclosed in that clipping that there was a strike or rather a row between two unions in a new rubber plant in Pittsburgh because of the moving of a pole. One of the labor groups of the A. F. of L. threw the power switch and gave orders that if the switch was thrown back they would cut the main current off the rubber plant. There are boys everywhere in this world facing death, and to permit things like that to go forward is something I do not believe is going to continue. It must be stopped.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. 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. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes. Pending that I wish to make an agreement with respect to general debate today with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for the rest of the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and myself, and that we read the first paragraph of the bill before the Committee rises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California.

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 supplemental naval appropriation bill H. R. 2068, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that during the time I am making my statement I be permitted to proceed without interruption, and at this time I have a very high pleasure, Mr. Chairman. Before proceeding I call attention of the Members to the fact that today is the tenth anniversary of the membership in this body of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member on the naval subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. I am sure that the Members present join in felicitating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] on his service and in commending him for the reputation that he has established in this House over the long period of his service. Also, I know they will join me in the hope that he enjoys all of the time in the future that his constituents may permit him to remain a Member of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. All Members of the House join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on naval affairs in that fine expression, congratulating our friend from Pennsylvania on his tenth anniversary in this House. We on this side have a profound respect for him. We recognize that he is always a foeman worthy of our steel.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], we appreciate the compliment you have paid him and the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He has been of invaluable help to the younger Members of our delegation. He has not only ably represented us on the floor, but he is a profound student, a marvelous debater, as his antagonists well realize, but throughout it all he has been helpful, kindly, and gentle toward every new Member. We deeply appreciate the compliments you have paid him.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I merely want to say that we not only appreciate the fine things the gentleman from California has said about our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], but today is also historic in another respect. This is the first appearance on the floor in charge of the naval appropriation bill of the distinguished new chairman of the subcommittee, the gentle-

man from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. We feel sure that he will carry on with the splendid ability in this new task that he has shown in other capacities in this House.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman most kindly.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a Democratic Member from Pennsylvania, I think it is only fitting that I should join in the congratulatory remarks extended to my colleague [Mr. DITTER] on his anniversary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In response to the courtesy that was extended to me by my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], may I say to him and to all Members of this House here assembled that I thoroughly appreciate the fact that this is my first appearance in charge of a bill, and undoubtedly you are going to find some rough spots in which I have a lack of all the knowledge that you gentlemen may inquire into. So I am going to ask you to stretch your imagination and your friendship that you have so kindly expressed when the going gets tough, and just remember that friendship.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank my friends on the committee, the men who have worked with me, the gentlemen, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. The gentlemen were fine and most cooperative. Their attendance was perfect. They have all been of most material help to me.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], one of the minority members of the committee, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOBLE J. JOHNSON], another member of the committee, for the fine and splendid cooperation those gentlemen have given in the handling of the bill which I had so much to learn about.

Mr. Chairman, we are called upon today to make further financial provision for the sea branch of our armed services.

Not since last October have we had before us a measure appropriating for the defense establishments as such.

Prior to that there had been a continual succession of war appropriation measures. We were paving the way for the big war machine advocated by our military and naval leadership as essential to successfully overcome the forces allied against the United Nations.

As the program became better crystallized and organized, long-range appropriations became more practicable. That is why we have had a brief defense appropriation holiday.

The maximum objectives, however, still lie ahead, and while expanding, there must be considerable expending.

The bill we bring to you today very largely is responsive to those two considerations and is to augment prior appropriations in divers directions over the period to next July 1.

I fear the impression prevails in some quarters that we have reached or about reached the peak of annual naval budgets, and that we should be meeting with a scaling downward. I wish that were so, but I cannot see the ceiling yet. It is my considered judgment that only until peace definitely is at hand may we look for a downward trend in naval and defense budgets.

The Navy is expanding. We have in course of construction today over 10,000 vessels for the Navy of all types. True, there are some lend-lease craft in that number, but until the vessels are finished and actually turned over for operation, there is no way of telling whether or not we or some allied power will be charged with their maintenance and operation. Our allies may man some of them, but it is my judgment that it will devolve upon us to keep all of them operating.

Turning from ships, let me remind you that operating naval aircraft are scheduled to be increased many, many fold, which will entail a far heavier expense for maintenance and operation than we have yet been confronted with, and, not at all unlikely, a large recurring expense for replacement planes.

Ships and aircraft make up our Navy, Mr. Chairman. They dictate the manpower requirements, they dictate the shore establishment requirements at home and overseas, they dictate the maintenance, operation, and repair bills.

This measure makes provision for an enlisted force of 1,450,000 persons. By the end of the next fiscal year we are told that the strength will need to be 2,250,000. What the other added expenses will be we are without information at this time. The Navy's 1944 budget is now being processed downtown. But the point I want to impress upon you is that it is all one integrated program, ramifying in many directions, and it is a program, irrespective of the cost, that we have got to support until the kind of peace we are fighting for has been achieved.

Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that the American people predominantly are in back of that sort of support. They want nondefense spending cut out, but they want this Navy of ours ready in all respects to do the job that must be done.

Some people would have you believe that this is not a popular war with some of our people. God forbid that war should ever be popular with civilized people, but I know this, that when war is thrust upon the American people they will fight to the last one to preserve our freedom and our cherished institutions.

This war is not over in any sense of the word. The Navy's part in it, I should say, has been infinitesimal compared with that which lies ahead. So, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that our approach to the consideration of naval estimates must still be one of wholehearted support of the judgment of those upon whom we must rely to achieve victory.

We may see an item that bulks large, or we may see a project that looks like too much money, but the occasions are rare that the items under scrutiny are



not part and parcel of the integrated program, the efficient and effective accomplishment of which is dependent upon each individual component.

We have made some reductions in the Budget estimates. In the main, they may be only deferrals. If not, we are that much ahead. If so, there can be no harm, because within the month we shall have before us the estimates for the regular 1944 bill, in which rectification may be made.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget estimates upon which this bill is based contemplate additional appropriations for the current fiscal year of \$4,000,000,000, and contractual authority of \$460,000,000. The latter is all responsive to legislation of the present session, classing as such the naval Public Works bill which passed the House but a few days ago. As of yesterday noon that bill had not been reported to the Senate, but I should like to call your attention to the fact that the provision we carry specifically is made subject to that authorization becoming law.

The committee has made reductions in the cash part of the estimates, that is, in the \$4,000,000,000, we cut \$183,793,417, and reduced the contractual authority part of the Budget submittal of \$460,000,000 by \$9,009,600.

Members will find on page 2 of the committee's report on the bill a segregation of the cash part of the estimates into general objects of expenditure, and, if you will turn to page 3 of our report, you will find commencing there a table wherein we list all of the money changes we have effected, with a very concise statement after each as to why the reductions are proposed. For the most part, I think those statements will suffice, but there are some of them I feel I should bring to your particular attention.

First, you will see an addition for the Naval Research Laboratory, maintained over here across the river at Bellevue, D. C. That is the only addition we have made. Our action is explained at the bottom of page 6 of our report.

This really is a great institution, ladies and gentlemen, staffed with some of the best scientific minds in the country, including the inventor of Radar, Dr. Taylor. That development alone, has proven of inestimable value. It is to this establishment to which we must mainly look for progress in ways that will give us an invincible fleet and a jump on our enemies.

The next item I should like to speak about pertains to the naval petroleum reserves. We had before us an estimate for an entirely new proposition, namely, the purchase of private holdings and leases in naval petroleum reserve No. 1, in California, predicated upon an agreement that upon consummation of such acquisition, the largest land holder, the Standard Oil Co. of California, would thereafter operate the reserve for the Navy's account under certain prescribed conditions and restrictions, compensation for so doing to be effected, principally, by oil and other products in kind.

We have struck the item out. I am not certain whether the agreement is

binding or not. It was entered into in advance of a specific appropriation for its fulfillment. If there be legal authority to proceed under the agreement, my thought is that the money should be paid from the naval emergency fund or any other fund which might have been considered available when the agreement was executed. If there is not such availability, and I believe there is not, I feel that the whole matter should be thoroughly investigated by disinterested parties, because, very frankly, I question whether or not the Navy is getting a good deal. Standard may be depended upon to have had the most expert advice and counsel, and they no doubt are not intending to lose anything. I just do not feel that we should be a party to the matter, if an appropriation be necessary, and I am inclined to believe it is, then, until we are perfectly satisfied that the proposition appropriately looks after the public's interest, the subject should rest.

I should like to discuss with you next the "Naval Reserve" item. The Budget estimate calls for \$48,000,000. That applies to the major projects which you will find enumerated at the top of page 8 of our report. I think your chief interest will be in the item applying to the college training program.

As we say on page 8 of our report, the amount earmarked for that purpose, namely, \$4,913,340, is intended for equipment and alterations necessary to prepare educational institutions to care for a maximum of 63,000 trainees, consisting of college graduates or students in intermediate stages of college training, and, possibly, some high school graduates, all of whom will pursue their further education in the light of Navy needs and then enter specialized schools already established. Selection of the educational institutions is now in progress. Procedure as to procurement or designation or selection of trainees had not been determined upon at the time of our hearings of the matter on February 17.

The per capita cost for equipment and alterations has been estimated as \$117.10.

In the next fiscal year, of course, we shall meet with the student cost, and we have been told that we may expect a bill in the neighborhood of \$120,000,000.

This is a very costly program, Mr. Chairman, but the Navy feels that it is essential in order to make certain that it will have an adequate feeder of young officer material possessing proper educational and physical requirements, because selective service naturally will diminish the supply of material of that type. Of course, it will serve incidentally to prevent our educational institutions from becoming defunct, or many of them practically so, and we should not lose sight of the fact that there is later national defense in that angle.

Independently of the college training program is a large program for preparing new officer pilot material. This is new only in respect of lads under 18 years of age and in the method of handling C. A. A. training. Otherwise it is a continuation of the program already inaugurated and operating.

The C. A. A. under the new plan will continue to give flight training, but the trainees will have assumed a naval status and the Navy will pay the C. A. A. for conducting the training.

The aviation training program now will operate in this way: Boys will be entered in flight preparatory training—a 12-week course in ground training at some 20 universities. Next they will be processed through primary and secondary C. A. A. courses, covering about 16 weeks. Then they will undertake pre-flight training, which consists of physical and Navy indoctrination training, lasting 12 weeks, after which they will be processed through the regular naval aviation training centers.

I should like to turn now to the clothing item. This bill provides for a maximum enlisted strength of 1,450,000, and no more. We are advised that the next Budget will include provision for a force of 2,250,000 persons, to be recruited by the end of June 1944. In anticipation of that increase we are asked to appropriate now for the clothing outfits for that projected total.

We have examined, not as fully as we should like to, the operating force plan upon which it is based. I am inclined to the view that it is somewhat extravagant and possibly out of step with the material expansion that makes more men necessary. Personally, I think the program should be inquired into by the Naval Affairs Committee. When I say that, I am not trying to dodge any responsibility. Like the House membership generally, I have great confidence in that committee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and it always is helpful to have the advantage of the studied views of both upon important subjects with which we are called upon to deal, even though they do not require further legislative authorization.

Before recommending the full amount for clothing for such a force, I should like at least to have more time myself to analyze the operating force plan; and, so we are recommending for the present but \$100,000,000 of the \$147,240,000 requested. If need be, we can provide the difference earlier than next July 1, by including an immediately available provision in the 1944 regular bill. I do not think that will be necessary.

There is one other matter involving the appropriation of money to which I wish to direct especial attention. The House on February 23 passed a new naval public works authorization bill, H. R. 1692. It provides for projects to cost a total of \$1,256,607,000. That bill passed the House unanimously.

We had before us for consideration a supplemental estimate of \$250,000,000 of contractual authority to get that program under way. We were supplied with a break-down of the projects, and I may say that they touch practically every section of the country, as well as areas beyond our shores. It would have taken a week or more to have examined into each one of the projects properly. All of them, it was represented to us, had been reviewed by the Committee on

Naval Affairs, and on the recommendations of that committee, the House passed the authorization, and passed it as I already have stated, unanimously and on a record vote. True, the authorization bill is not yet law, but I wish to impress upon you this thought—we are not appropriating any money for the program—we merely are authorizing the Navy to get a part of the whole program under way, subject specifically, mark you, to the final enactment of the authorizing legislation.

All of the projects embraced by the Budget submission, I may state, have been approved by the vice chief of naval operations. Possibly there are items among them we might not think are essential to the war effort. Admiral Horne, who acts for Admiral King in such matters, has given them his endorsement, and we have recommended the estimate, except as modified by Admiral Moreell, the chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who called our attention to seven projects, as I recall, which he found it was necessary to start out of an available reserve of a prior appropriation. Their cost will be \$9,009,600, and that amount we have deducted.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to occupy too much time, but possibly, before closing, I should briefly comment upon some relatively minor provisions of a legislative character of fiscal year duration.

If Members will turn to page 11 of the report, they will see a number of such provisions we are proposing. Those on page 11 are sponsored by the committee. Those on page 12 came down to us in the Budget estimates. The explanation with respect to two of the three provisions on page 11 is given on that page. The provision not explained on that page is explained on page 6 of the report, just ahead of the paragraph pertaining to communication expenses.

The bases for the provisions on page 12, briefly, are as follows:

No. 1 extends to Public Health Service officers on duty with the Coast Guard, the right to per diem enjoyed by Coast Guard officers when absent from their official stations.

No. 2 is designed to take full advantage of the time of inspectors of naval material in course of manufacture. An inspector using his own automobile in his district can cover several plants in the course of a day. If he had to rely on public transportation, his contacts in the course of a day very evidently would be considerably fewer.

No. 3. In the 1943 Naval Appropriation Act provision was included, at the instance of the Department, limiting the number of inductees into the naval forces to 200,000, and into the Marine Corps to 20,000. Since the bulk of additional men must now come through selective service, obviously this limitation should be lifted.

No. 4, the last item, is proposed to simplify accounting procedure in connection with work performed for the Navy by other Government departments, particularly the War Department as it re-

gards ordnance. The Army and Navy have gotten together and have worked out a procedure that will reduce paper work and accounting work without in any way disturbing proper accounting procedure. The plan proposed has the endorsement of the very efficient and capable Navy budget officer, Rear Admiral Ezra Allan, who has the admiration and respect of all who are privileged to know him.

Mr. Chairman, the report on this measure directs attention to all of its salient features. I have endeavored to focus attention upon those in which it seemed to me the Members would be particularly interested. I should be very happy to supply such details as are at my command when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule.

In my judgment, it is a sound measure and warrants the approval of the House. Such approval would carry with it a message of trust, and faith, and confidence to our men all over the seven seas who are fighting your battle and my battle for victory.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to be a member of the delegation to which the distinguished gentleman from California also belongs. As a fellow Californian, I want to compliment him on his splendid presentation of this bill. It is a pleasure to be in this Chamber the day he handles his first legislation on the floor. I am sure I voice the sentiment of the entire delegation when I say that we are very proud of the able way in which he is presenting this bill.

Coming from San Francisco, I want to thank not only this Appropriations Subcommittee but also the entire Committee on Naval Affairs for the splendid improvements that have been made in San Francisco. I visited the Hunters Point drydock last fall, and wish every Member of this House could have the privilege of visiting this facility, which I understand will be one of the largest repair yards in the entire world.

I also thank, Mr. Chairman, the two members of a subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], who recently visited San Francisco. I had the pleasure of seeing them there. The gentleman from Washington, Representative MAGNUSON, and the gentleman from California, Representative ANDERSON, have just finished a report to the House covering shipbuilding on the Pacific coast. I commend my two colleagues on the full and complete report, as well as for the splendid work they are rendering in helping to build up the Navy of the United States.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks, and assure him that the committee is vitally interested in both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Speaking about trainees in certain colleges, there are a number of high-class schools that have the teachers, the equipment, fine research departments, the facilities to equip the trainees for specialized work in both the Army and the Navy. Is it the intention of the gentleman or the gentleman's committee to completely wipe them out and confine the training program to certain colleges, or will you continue the established schools that have already trained thousands of men to the satisfaction of the Navy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not the intention of the committee to which the gentleman addresses his question to eliminate any particular school or to foster any particular college; in other words, I may say to the gentleman that the Navy Department has sent throughout the Nation a questionnaire to all educational institutions. Each one of them has the right and the privilege of submitting its qualifications and ability to serve. I understand there has been set up a board for the express purpose of selecting the schools that are most adaptable to the personnel requirements without any favoritism in the matter of selection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may also say to the gentleman from New York that our committee has had this matter under consideration for some time. We deliberately, as a matter of policy—you know sometimes it is better to use a club than a planer on some of these things—cut off the Navy's request for the enlargement of certain colleges for training periods; we even went so far, I may say to the gentleman from New York—and I know my good friend from California will back us up—that even if it costs more money to go throughout the United States to various small colleges that we are saving money in the long run, because if the small colleges of the United States go down because of the war effort and the concentration, the extra amount we spend now will be multiplied hundreds of times after the war; and this committee is trying to spread out this matter of education.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We have two or three fine schools in New York and in New Jersey. They have been doing some splendid work. They have machinery of various kinds, almost every kind of equipment for trainees. They have not received one contract, while some people outside on the prairie some place have received a contract for five or ten thousand students and they have not the teachers and they have not the equipment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will give the gentleman an example of what I mean. The Navy Department decided to train



WAVES at various colleges throughout the United States. They named four or five. Finally they got concentrated up in Brooklyn; at Hunter College, where there were 9,000 they were going to train up there in Brooklyn. They were transporting women from my home town, from the gentleman's section in California and elsewhere, across the continent to train them in Brooklyn. They even went out and leased apartment houses all around Brooklyn to train these WAVES. The Committee on Naval Affairs decided to put a stop to that. I know the Chairman will not mind my telling the House that in the 30 years that the gentleman has been chairman and member of the Committee on Naval Affairs nothing has ever happened in his district, but finally they decided to put some WAVES down in his home town and he got \$50,000. The gentleman from Georgia cut out an appropriation in his own home town in Georgia, so serious is he about this matter of changing it around and putting it all over the country.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am happy to see that that is the attitude of the splendid gentleman from Georgia, because knowing his proclivities and ability if he decided he wanted WAVES in his district undoubtedly they would be there.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I express with a very grateful heart the kind compliment of my distinguished chairman and of the majority leader and of my colleagues from Pennsylvania. My hope is that in the time that is mine to serve in the future I may continue to merit not only the kind comment of my friends but that the ties of friendship that have already been established may be perpetuated through the years.

At the meeting of the full committee yesterday I congratulated the majority on the selection of the man who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. For the benefit of the House as a whole I want to repeat that I believe the majority is to be complimented in the selection which was made and which brought to the chairmanship of the committee the very able, conscientious, and painstaking Member from California. On behalf of the minority members of the subcommittee, may I express to him and to those on the majority side who joined with him, our appreciation for the courtesies and kindnesses extended to us at all times throughout the hearings.

We do not always agree. After all, it is easy to be friendly if we are always in agreement. The sure test of friendship is the friendship that can persist despite seeming differences at times. Out of those differences, I believe, there came compromises that have been beneficial not only to the Naval Establishment but to the country as well.

I want to stop at this time to pay a well-deserved word of appreciation to the clerk of the committee, Mr. John Pugh. Some of you may feel that it is your intellectual approach to the problems of legislating and appropriating which ultimately brings order out of chaos. May I

say in a humble way, after long years of service, that were it not for the work of one John Pugh, than whom there is no better clerk on the hill, I can hardly imagine what an appropriation bill for either the Army or the Navy would look like.

While we are extending compliments, Admiral Allen of the Navy deserves the commendation of every man who is interested in the service that the Navy provides. Admiral Allen is forthright and frank. There is nothing about him of the cunning which gives half-truths and withholds the rest. He inspires confidence, people believe in him, because there is about him that fine trait of character that if he is wrong he will admit it and if he does not know he will say so. For myself, I found rare occasions when he was either wrong or when he did not know. As the budget officer of the Navy, he renders an invaluable service.

No better opportunity could be afforded than the present one to make some reference to the circumstances surrounding the initiation of our rearmament program and its intensified development under the pressure of our abrupt entry into the war.

Such reference will throw some light on certain conditions which prevail today and which many of us feel should be corrected. You will remember that nothing was done of any consequence looking toward an expansion of our armed forces so that they would be in line with the administration's course in world affairs until the collapse of France. Up to that time little, if anything, had been done to adjust our domestic economy to the rigorous exactions which were soon to make their demands upon it. Even that calamity failed to disturb those in high places who insisted that security could only be found by an enforced scarcity of the providences of God. Crops continued to be curtailed. Nor did it disturb those who insisted that artificial stimulation was necessary to keep the wheels of our domestic economy in motion. Made-work programs were continued.

As we reflect further on the initiation of our expansion program and the demands that it might make on our domestic economy, we cannot help but be impressed with the seeming reluctance of the administration to disclose what the program would entail. There seemed to be a studied effort to make the dose more palatable by giving it a sugar coating. Assurances were given that the women need have no concern about the supply of cosmetics, lipsticks, and chocolate sodas and no one need be "discomboomerated" as a result of the rearmament program. When suggestions were made that the social objectives of a peacetime world and the economic restoratives prescribed for depression days should give way to the sterner demands of preparedness, they were met by stubborn resistance—a resistance which at times took on a vituperative vein.

The President may have been justified in the spring of 1940 for approaching the rearmament program leisurely

and with an evident desire to give it a pleasing and attractive appearance. He may have had in his possession information, not available to the Congress, which prompted him to resort to the easy-going policy which he adopted. He may have known better than the Congress the temper of the people and what they were willing to accept at that time as the necessary privations for preparedness. It is a debatable question whether or not the approaching election influenced in any way the decision to prepare the program with the least amount of offense. The fact remains, however, that the leisureliness of 1940, aggravated to a large degree the extreme pressure which prevailed as the chocolate-soda phase of our rearmament gave way to the sterner and stricter demands of practical preparation.

As the time for our actual entry into the war became shorter, as the time of our own needs for meeting force with force approached, a feverish haste was fanned into flames. Of necessity some methods of procedure had to be adopted to the exigencies which we faced and which exigencies were made the more acute by reason of our leisurely approach to the problems of preparation. The presence or absence of "discomboomeration" meant nothing then. We could brook no delay. Action was imperative. As a result, huge appropriations were made for the Army and the Navy, many of them carrying extraordinary delegations of authority and the widest latitude of discretion, with only a hurried and superficial examination into the justifications for them.

The strides which we have made since then is a most favorable reflection on the resourcefulness of a free people to meet the dangerous threat of tyranny. Private enterprise assumed and continues to discharge a tremendous responsibility in a noteworthy way. The Army has demonstrated its adaptability. The Navy has lived up to her finest traditions. By and large, our people have shown a will to work. We are moving, moving surely and steadily toward a certain victory.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the superficiality of examination which was an incident of the pressing need for prompt action when hostilities broke out should now give way to a more thorough and exacting scrutiny. Ours is the duty to provide the necessary funds for the expeditious and efficient prosecution of the war. And ours is also the duty to see to it that those funds are spent wisely and well, and not wasted. I would not be misunderstood, Mr. Chairman, I am not urging or even suggesting the disallowance of a single dollar that is necessary for winning the war quickly, decisively, and completely. I believe in economy in government. I always did. Unlike some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, I am not a recent convert to this faith. It did not take the wastages of war and the costs of prosecuting it to impress me with the fallacy of trying to spend ourselves into prosperity. I need have no remorse today, as some may have whose conscience troubles them, because of their advocacy of spendthrift poli-

cies. I opposed such policies when they were adopted. And I continue in my opposition to them. But economy is not the primary objective in waging war. The primary objective is the winning of the war—winning it decisively and completely—at a minimum loss of life.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we have the duty to assure ourselves and the country that the money which is appropriated for the prosecution of the war is wisely and well spent. That duty cannot be discharged faithfully if information is not available from which reasonable conclusions can be reached as to probable needs. That duty cannot be discharged honestly if a careful inquiry is not made into the details of the justification presented to us. That duty cannot be discharged conscientiously if we are unwilling to reassume the responsibilities which are ours and which were surrendered by the last Congress under the stress of extraordinary circumstances.

I am supported, Mr. Chairman, in the position which I take, by the Secretary of the Navy. In his appearance before the committee he declared that in his speeches to the Navy council he had given instructions that "we have got to justify everything you ask for, and notwithstanding the fact that we are in the war, we are no longer in the early war enthusiasm." I do not feel that our enthusiasm is waning, but I do believe that the pressure of earlier days has been relieved and that more orderly processes can be pursued in making appropriations.

After the able presentation of detail by the distinguished chairman, I feel that addressing myself to those details is not necessary. I shall rather address myself to what I shall call the administrative policies of the Navy.

I shall first direct the attention of the House to the policy that has developed in the Navy and that can be labeled the employment of contract and intermittent employees. Let me direct your attention to how this policy developed. In the early stages of the rearmament program the Navy came to the Congress with the suggestion that it would be necessary from time to time to employ specialists in certain fields, that it would be necessary for them to call upon technicians of one type or another, so that these skilled specialists, these technicians, might bring to the Navy the benefit of their training and experience.

The matter of how much compensation might be paid to them was a matter of debate. Suffice it to say that we ultimately placed a certain salary ceiling, and then in the course of the development the Navy coined the phrase and set in motion the policy of employing individuals on a per diem basis. They were supposed to come for a day or two and then go. The supposition was that they would approach a particular problem and having directed attention to that problem they would go on their way and in due time, if necessary, be recalled.

"Intermittent" means something to me and I think it means something to all of us.

"Intermittent" means from time to time. It is the direct opposite of "continuous." An intermittent employee is one who comes and goes. A continuous employee is one who stays.

We have discovered that intermittency has become continuity; that the casual, occasional contribution of these technicians has become a regular, fixed habit. Whether they get a small or a large per diem, they are kept on the roll from the time of their appointment uninterruptedly. I say that practice should stop. I served notice on the Department that if it did not stop, when the regular supply bill comes before the Committee on Appropriations I shall object, and strenuously object, to the appropriation of one penny for the purpose of circumventing—and that is the word—circumventing the clear intention of the Congress in providing for these technicians.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Are these specialists included in the list of absentees when they are away from the Department?

Mr. DITTER. As far as we have been able to learn, they are so delighted with their tenures that they are not inclined to be absent. I will answer my distinguished friend from New York by saying that if he had a pleasant berth, if he had a delightful surrounding provided for him under the most pleasant circumstances, the chances are he would not absent himself very frequently. No; they are there to stay, and they continue uninterruptedly. They are paid by the day, so why be absent.

Let me call the attention of the House to some of these technicians. I am very happy that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs graces this occasion with his presence. I do not know whether or not my distinguished friend happens to know about one of the technicians to whom the attention of the committee was directed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I state that the entire Committee on Naval Affairs adjourned a very important hearing to come to listen to the debate this morning.

Mr. DITTER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Georgia that I hope it is for the purpose of supporting the bill which prompts the attention and the attendance of this distinguished committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is. That is what we are here for.

Mr. DITTER. I hope that when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule the Committee on Appropriations will have the wholehearted and unanimous support, not only of my distinguished friend from Georgia but of all the Members of the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I could never decline to yield to my very able friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I have heard the gentleman express his profound regard for the opinion of Admiral Allen of the Navy's budget section. Can the gentleman inform the House as to Admiral Allen's opinion with respect to the need of the Navy for these employees of whom he speaks?

Mr. DITTER. I had supposed that my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, with his long service here and his intimate knowledge of what the traditions of the Navy require, would hardly propound that question. After all, a part of naval tradition, as I understand it, is that no officer, be he warrant or commissioned, should presume to question what the policies of the Secretary's office may be. The suggestion almost smacks of insubordination. So I could hardly imagine that the very able budget officer would presume to tell a Member of Congress what his opinion of these technicians and specialists might be—these intermittent individuals.

I direct the attention of the House to one of the specialists who is employed. The Department provided us a list of these specialists. I am not certain whether or not it was a complete list, but in glancing through the list my eye fastened itself upon the name of Ina. The lady's full name is Ina S. Lindman. I thought Ina was a girl, and probably that intrigued me a bit. I was curious to know what the girl technicians and specialists were doing. I could see that probably the WAVES might provide a reason. But I want to tell you what Ina is doing. Bless your hearts, Ina's job as a specialist, as a supertechnician, as one of these intermittents who supposedly come in and go out, these specialists who are supposed to tell us how Diesel engines would operate and what the strength of steel might be, and how projectiles should be made—no; that is not Ina's job. Ina's job is to prepare palatable dishes and to edit the Navy cookbook.

I ate with the Navy long before Ina appeared on the scene. The meals have always been palatable. I have eaten at shore stations and afloat. I have enjoyed the meals; whether they were beans or ham. The meals were palatable. They were nutritive. They provided a balanced diet. But we have gone to the point in this abortive process—and no other word fits it—in this abortive process adopted down there at the other end of the Avenue of taking these specialist privileges and twisting them in any fashion.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCOTT. May I comment at this point that the gentleman seems to be "cooking on the front burner" himself now.

Mr. DITTER. I take it the gentleman intends a compliment and I do appreciate his kindness.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman has rendered a distinguished service to the House in pointing out how there has been a complete circumventing of the intent in authorizing specialists in the Navy. His indictment is well founded. It is a matter I am frank to say has disturbed me for a long time. We have, and so has the gentleman, a complete list of all these people who have been employed as specialists. It never was the intention of Congress to classify this group now employed as specialists.

The intention was that the engineers and the draftsmen whom we need in very high, technical positions should be employed. There is no doubt about it, this privilege has been abused, and the indictment is well founded. The question I rise to propound to the distinguished gentleman is, What remedy does the gentleman propose?

Mr. DITTER. I suggest two things. I suggest first that the Committee on Naval Affairs under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia should direct its attention to the problem so that legislation might be brought here limiting the privileges of those who presently are chargeable with the indictment I have framed.

If that will not correct the condition, let us put a limitation in the regular Department appropriation bill when it comes up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. And provide that any money provided for in that bill should not be used for an abortion of the clear intent of the Congress.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Now, in reference to the limitation: Is it not true that the Navy Department's justification for doing this—in my judgment, it is not a justification—but did the gentleman not find they justified their position because the Appropriations Committee had a limitation of \$5,000 as the top sum?

Mr. DITTER. I am glad the gentleman brought that up; I do not agree with it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not that the Navy Department's position?

Mr. DITTER. That is the Navy's position; yes; the gentleman is quite right. But the Navy finds itself in this very unfortunate position. After it advanced this argument to the Appropriations Committee it compared Navy salaries with other Government salaries. The Navy suggested that these top salaries be compared with the top salaries of some of the other agencies of the Government.

That is a bad argument to advance at this time when the country as a whole feels that economy should be the order. To suggest that what the O. P. A.'ers are getting or some of the rest of the alphabetical jugglers and trapeze artists are receiving should be the basis upon which salaries in the Navy Department should be paid is not convincing.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. In regard to the economies to which the gentleman referred, am I to understand from his remarks that the Navy is to publish a cookbook in competition with Aunt Sally's Recipe Book, issued by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. DITTER. No; I do not believe so. I do not believe they will do that. They possibly want to get out a new cookbook for the use of the Navy. They have a good Navy cookbook now and I doubt if any "Inas" can improve on it very much.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman in position to tell us the per diem pay of this specialist?

Mr. DITTER. I think she is paid \$12. I do not know whether she is on a 48-hour-week basis or not. I do not know how long she has been busy preparing or editing this cookbook or the time it will take to reach a final conclusion as to the sort of palatability desired. I am not certain on that score. But at least she is here; for how long, I do not know.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. She is on the pay roll somewhere between \$5.20 and \$25 per day?

Mr. DITTER. Well, she is betwixt and between. Maybe ultimately she will come to the \$25 level.

Now let us pass the matter of specialists for the moment. I want to direct the attention of the House to a situation which I think is slightly embarrassing. My very able chairman has already referred to a contract entered into by the Government and related to oil deposits in California. The committee saw fit to delete from this bill the amount that was to be provided for that purpose.

I am not necessarily, at the present time, taking violent exception to the action of the committee, but I am pointing out what I believe to be a rather dangerous situation. I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the committee was not satisfied that the rights of the Government were protected under the terms of the contract.

I have here a photostatic copy of that contract. I find the Secretary of the Navy has entered into the contract on behalf of the Government of the United States. I find something more; I find that the contract has been approved by the President and that the contract bears the signature of the President.

What are we to infer? I have no interest in the parties to the contract, but I do believe that it is a loose practice, that it is a practice that should be corrected.

The careful, painstaking, conscientious chairman of the Appropriations Committee is not convinced as to the conditions and terms of this contract. He does not feel warranted in appropriating money for it. Nevertheless the executive branch of the Government saw fit to enter into the contract and binds by contractual obligation the United States, as evidenced by the signature approving the contract. It is time that we put our house in order. Approval should not be given as a perfunctory matter.

The executive branch of the Government is chargeable with the same degree of care in approving contracts as that exercised by this committee. Contractual obligations should not be lightly entered into or approved.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question with reference to naval oil reserves?

Mr. DITTER. I do not care to discuss the merits of the contract.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is the point the gentleman raises that of whether there is legal authority to justify the action?

Mr. DITTER. I am not questioning the legal authority. I submit there should have been legal authority before this contract was entered into which would satisfy the Secretary of the Navy and which would satisfy the President that the rights of the Government were protected. And further, I contend that the contract should not have been entered into or approved unless there was such legal authority provided in advance of the execution of the contract.

I make the point that contracts should not be entered into unless there is enough at hand in the way of legal interpretation to satisfy those who enter into those contracts that the rights of the Government have been protected.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman by that statement mean to convey to the House that there is doubt in his mind as to the legality of the contract?

Mr. DITTER. Did the gentleman follow me? I believe the gentleman is trying to place me in an awkward position.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am trying to get the matter straight.

Mr. DITTER. I very definitely said that the issue which I was raising was that contracts should not be entered into unless all doubts were removed. There should be nothing which would permit of a lingering doubt in the mind of the able chairman of our committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman reaches that conclusion, we are forced to conclude that the gentleman from California shall be confined by his position as to all kinds of contracts that the Secretary makes.

Mr. DITTER. No; hardly. May I suggest that entirely unlike my distinguished friend from Georgia, I do not feel that my friend from California is at all ambitious. I might tell my distinguished friend from Georgia that at the present time he enjoys a rather unusual privilege. He and his committee are the final arbiters to determine whether real estate shall be bought by the Navy or not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not altogether, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. DITTER. We will not discuss that. My friend from California is not presumptuous. I believe he is careful and cautious. He has not tried to set himself up as an arbiter. I insist, however, that if there was sufficient doubt to warrant the chairman in taking the course which he did, the contract should not have been approved in the first place.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. No; I cannot yield at this time, but I will in a moment. I want now to say a word about the training program. I think the training program is one of the finest things that has been projected by the Navy. Faced as it was with many difficulties, the Navy adjusted itself, and a large part of the credit for the adjustments that were made is due to Admiral Jacobs. He had the nucleus, and from that nucleus he has built wisely and well. His program provides for the training of enlisted men and commissioned officers.

The college training program, the aviation program, the basic-training program—all of them have been integrated and fitted together. I believe that it deserves the commendation of the House and its fullest support. The training program contemplates a broad, comprehensive program which will utilize the available resources of manpower to the best advantage for the needs of the Navy. It takes into account the needs and the best methods of meeting those needs.

I regret that the committee saw fit to delete a certain small item from the training program. I refer to the appropriation for Great Lakes. Enlisted personnel should not be used for work which civilians could do. By disallowing certain sums for the Great Lakes Training Station, enlisted men will have to be used for civilian tasks. We should provide funds to make this practice unnecessary.

I now direct the attention of the House to the fact that Uncle Sam is realtor No. 1. He is the largest owner of real estate in the world. We have gone into the real-estate business. We have bought real estate everywhere.

Somebody said that the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee was so humble that he rejected a project in his district. Maybe he rejected it because of the WAVES that were coming. I can hardly think of any other reason. He is unique in this respect. He is certainly a most unusual exception.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Let me finish. I say the time has come when the real-estate acquisitions should be stopped. Despite what the House did by its vote a few days ago, I question the wisdom of giving to the Naval Affairs Committee of the House the final jurisdiction to determine whether more real estate should be bought for naval purposes. I am concerned about the ends to which the policies might reach. I have perfect confidence in the members of the Naval Affairs Committee. I believe they will discharge faithfully the responsibilities they have assumed. I would not want the responsibility. As I understand it, the Secretary of the Navy, if he contemplates the purchase of real estate, need only report to the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is the gentleman's thought that the Navy De-

partment should be required to obtain congressional approval for the acquisition of any parcel of real estate, no matter how small?

Mr. DITTER. I think the Navy Department ought to be guided by Admiral Moreell's statement to this committee when he said in no uncertain terms that the peak of shore-facility production has passed. That means the acquisition of real estate. I am not concerned about the acquisitions beyond the continental limits of the United States. Strategy may require, war needs may require, such acquisitions. It is my firm conviction that the practice of purchasing real estate on the scale that the Navy has in the past, should be stopped. The Army and Navy have bought acreage equivalent to the acreage of all the New England States. The Bureau of Yards and Docks has become a colossal agency in itself as a result of this shore-station expansion. It is high time we emphasized fighting rather than fence building.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I am not only going to agree with the gentleman that the Government should quit acquiring real estate but when the gentleman was discussing the contract which he had on the desk a while ago I think he made a statement that he did not intend to make. That was to this effect, that he has no interest whatsoever in the contract or any of the parties to the contract, which I assume he meant applied particularly to the Secretary of the Navy and to the President. Now, the Government is a beneficiary of the contract, and I am sure the gentleman is looking out for the Government.

Mr. DITTER. I meant I had no interest in the petroleum company, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, or any other. I need make no profession of my interest in or my concern for my own Government. I shall let my record stand on that score. I shall make no profession with reference to my interest in what I believe to be the welfare of my own country. I do emphatically say that I represent no private interest that may profit from the contract. I have but one interest at heart—the interest of the Government.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. I am wondering if the gentleman is not attributing to the Naval Affairs Committee authority which it does not possess by reason of the legislation passed within the last few days, to which he has referred, because that legislation simply provides that the Navy Department shall report to the Naval Affairs Committee before it makes a purchase of real estate. It is not stopped from purchasing real estate, and the only way it could be stopped from purchasing is for the Naval Affairs Committee to bring in legislation and the House would then pass upon the matter.

Mr. DITTER. Well, I question whether the gentleman's interpretation is correct. I think he is in error. I re-

member the bill. I do not intend to enter into a discussion of that at the present time. Suffice it to say that the gentleman from Michigan is not as convincing as the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee might be on this point.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DITTER. I yield no further.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has all the time he wants.

Mr. DITTER. No, I do not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will ask my distinguished friend to give him a minute to answer a question.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], has correctly stated the effect of the amendment which was passed and which I discussed with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. The effect of an amendment and its practical operation are two vastly different things. The gentleman from Michigan has offered the gentleman from Georgia a technicality. Let us see how the operation will take place.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not hiding behind any technicality. It operates just exactly as the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] stated a few moments ago.

Mr. DITTER. Now, I am performing this operation and I will let the gentleman, if he cares to, take on the job of sewing up the patient.

This is how it operates: The Navy comes and reports to the Naval Affairs Committee its intention to purchase real estate. If the Naval Affairs Committee says "Yes," the Navy proceeds to acquire the ground. Then my distinguished friend from Georgia comes here. A finer technician, a more capable draftsman, a better mariner for legislative procedure cannot be found in the House than the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. And so, passing over any of the rocks and reefs of the technicalities suggested by my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], my friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] steers the boat through, and what he approves the House accepts.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Including the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I cannot yield further. I do want to get on.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will get the gentleman some time.

Mr. DITTER. Of course, I cannot help but yield to my distinguished friend from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman will be kind.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman, in his eloquent and honed phrases, in heaping tribute on the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], shields a rather unfair insinuation.

Mr. DITTER. I hope that I was not unfair.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I think the gentleman was.



Mr. DITTER. I would not be unfair to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think you would, but I think the gentleman has been.

Mr. DITTER. I withdraw any inference or innuendo that might have about it the construction of unfairness. I do want to compliment the gentleman as a mariner.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Because the gentleman always follows the mariner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Here is the point I wanted to make, and I think the gentleman and I will be in agreement on this. The gentleman has paid high tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, a deserved tribute, as perhaps knowing more about naval affairs, the needs of the Navy, what they should have and what they should not have, than any Member of the House, flanked on each side as he is by the majority members and the distinguished minority members. I do not think we should assume at all that because the gentleman is a good technician that he would come in here for an instant, as the gentleman has insinuated, and get anything for the Navy that they ought not to have.

Mr. DITTER. I take violent exception to the interpretation that the gentleman from Virginia has attempted to place on my remarks. There was no insinuation that the gentleman from Georgia would get anything that the Navy should not have. The gentleman from Georgia is enthusiastic for the needs of the Navy. The Navy feels it needs certain things. It convinces the chairman of Naval Affairs. He is honestly persuaded of the needs. I inferred in no way that the gentleman from Georgia got anything for the Navy which it should not have. I resent the effort made by the gentleman from Virginia to draw inferences which are groundless and unfounded.

Mr. Chairman, I address myself at this time to a phase of the war effort which has caused me much concern. I approach the subject with reluctance. I regret that I feel called upon to refer to it. I wish it were not necessary to question the indiscretion. I was shocked a week ago when my attention was directed to the March issue of a certain magazine, carrying an article by the Vice President of the United States. The article was entitled "What We Will Get Out of the War." I want to read to you one statement from that article. In directing your attention to this statement, may I emphasize the thought that in my opinion the Vice President is chargeable with the greatest possible degree of care in making public utterances. The statement is as follows:

The war with all its hardship and pain has brought one blessing: it is providing a job for everybody who wants a job.

Let me reread that statement to you so that you may get the full significance of it.

The war with all its hardship and pain has brought one blessing: it is providing a job for everybody who wants a job.

As you reflect upon that I want you to think of the homes throughout the length and breadth of this land; I want you to think of the homes where there are mothers tormented and tortured by the one thing that is the hardest thing for folks to bear, and that is waiting, just waiting and wondering about their boys. I want you to think of that mother who sees a bit of a toy, probably a bat or a ball, to remind her of that boy who is gone. Ask her about a blessing in the way of a job for someone as she worries about her boy, buffeted by the storms of the high seas, lashed by the winds of that storm, aboard a ship dodging a treacherous submarine.

Ask the mothers as they bow on bended knee beside the empty cot of a boy, pouring out their hearts in supplication to heaven for protection for that boy, whether the blessing of a job for someone means anything to them. Ask these mothers what solace or comfort to them in their hours of longing is brought by the suggestion that the surety of a job is a blessing. Ask these mothers whether this suggested blessing will mean anything to them to ease their anguish or their pain. Ask these mothers as they listen to the long tick-tock, tick-tock of the hours of the day and night of separation what they think of this blessing.

Have we come to that point where we are so impervious to heart throbs that jobs—providing jobs—can be counted as a blessing, when the loss of loved ones pays the price of these blessings? Providing a job at the price of heart throbs. I care not what others may think. I deplore that the Vice President has seen fit to suggest that our economic structure, this matter of making jobs, depends on the making of war.

We are in this war and we are going to win this war; we are not going to win it by a dependency upon a philosophy that satisfies itself by saying that a blessing of the war is the making of jobs. We are going to win it because of the hardihood, because of the unquailing courage—yes, because of the unfaltering faith—of free men that our way of life is worthy of the sacrifice which heroes are making.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that the Vice President fell into the grievous error of referring to jobs as a blessing of the war. I regret that he permitted his enthusiasm for social objectives to carry him to the lengths that it did. Our people are enduring hardships and privations because of their faith, because of their spirit. Men are willing to suffer because of a confidence in spiritual values, not because of material worths. Jobs mean nothing to men who are called upon to make the supreme sacrifice. Nor do they mean anything to those who suffer by separation as a result of this supreme sacrifice. Material things mean nothing when we pass

through the valley of the shadow of death. Search your hearts today. Will jobs mean anything to the men who are forever deprived of the joy of seeing a sunrise or of hearing the laughter of a child? Will jobs mean anything to the men who are robbed of their reason by the shock of shrieking shells? I believe the Vice President himself on reflection will hesitate to evaluate tears and toil and sweat and blood in terms of material advantage. The suggestion strikes at the very soul life of the Nation—the soul life without which sacrifice would have no purpose and suffering no meaning.

The war which we wage today—the war which we will win is a war to defend a priceless heritage—the heritage of freemen—the heritage which is ours because of the dedication of those who have gone before us, those who have inspired and challenged us to serve, to suffer, and to sacrifice.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, there are two minorities in this country relative to the subject I want to discuss briefly this afternoon, neither of which I expect will approve of much of what I have to say. I want to discuss for a few minutes the question of labor relations.

There exists a minority in this country which believes that labor can do nothing wrong. There is likewise a minority in this country which believes that labor can do nothing right. In fact, some of them believe that they have no right to exist. I am not concerned with either of these minorities, but am intensely concerned with some of the problems which, it seems to me, will face this Congress in the next 30 to 60 days.

Within a few days negotiations will begin with reference to the contract which expires in the coal industry, the expiration date of which I believe is the last of this month. If we have a stoppage of work in the coal mines of this country, it will involve the entire production facilities of our war effort, or certainly a major part of it. We are having some difficulties in the aircraft industry over wage adjustments. We have a wage case going on now in the railroad industry. Both of these have an effect on the question of inflation control.

We have growing up in this country, right at this moment, a hysterical build-up over the question of absenteeism and threats to deal with that subject by the use of a "meat ax" instead of finding out what the real causes are. Frankly, I do not know what the real causes of absenteeism may be. I have read some things about it, I have some ideas which I have formed from what I have read, but I doubt seriously whether anybody has made a comprehensive study yet of this problem, which apparently has come to be the greatest problem in connection with our war production.

It is for these reasons that I suggested in a letter written to the chairman of the House Committee on Labor, the dis-

tinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORRON], that that committee undertake at once a thorough, searching, and painstaking factual survey of the entire field of labor relations. I think it has been too long postponed. I know that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has recently voiced similar opinions on the floor. I have discussed the matter with some other Members of the House, and I feel that we should undertake this investigation immediately and bring the facts to this House, because it is my judgment that within 30 to 60 days the Congress of the United States may be faced with the necessity of legislating in this field. Certainly we ought to have the facts available to us and the public is entitled to have those facts. I think most of the membership of this House feels as I do, that in any question involving production for our war effort, no matter where the acts of Congress may strike, we must keep our factories turning and we must not permit any stoppage of work that interferes with that.

In connection with this question of absenteeism which is being built into a hysterical question today, one of our distinguished committees of the House is considering a bill that they call a work-or-fight bill. Perhaps it may be all right as far as it goes. I have not read it. Certainly I am opposed to absenteeism, as I know you are, but I point out the fact that threatening to draft men into the Army is not an answer to this question. I point out the fact to you that it probably could not reach 25 percent of the cases that exist because we have employed in these production places older men and women today who cannot be reached by that method. Writers in whom I have confidence say that many other causes exist for absenteeism than simply a desire on the part of the worker to be absent. I do not know what all the facts are but I think we should find out.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAY. I would like to say to the gentleman that as the result of the studies made by the House Military Affairs Committee of the manpower problem generally, it is disclosed that there are only about 20 percent of the workers in any factory who are within draft age and that would be affected by the work-or-fight provision. The other 80 percent are not affected.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for that information. It verifies an opinion I had formed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I am sure every Member of this House appreciates the observations and constructive suggestions being made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, one of the ablest Members of this body.

May I also add that the country knows there is no better friend of labor in either House of Congress than is the gentleman. I have been delighted to work with him and vote with him on matters affecting the welfare and protecting the interests of laboring men and women. Let me add that I am also pleased to know that he has written a letter to the chairman of the Labor Committee urging that a full and fair investigation of this very distressing question of absenteeism be made. I am sure that the Members of this body, as well as the fathers and mothers of sons in the armed forces, will be glad to know that such an investigation will be made and I am sure the gentleman from Georgia, who is a member of that committee, will give it his very careful and unbiased consideration.

Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact, however, that absenteeism in the various industries of the country is by no means a hysterical matter built up by somebody but is a shocking reality, when we take into consideration that in the shipbuilding industry alone there has been enough absenteeism to build 42 merchant ships and that in the airplane industry the man-hours lost would build 4,004 bombers. Of course, a vast majority of the workers in industry are loyal, sincere patriotic men and women. Nevertheless these figures of losses are tremendous and cannot be passed over lightly as hysterical.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is known by those having served with him here as a true friend of labor and of all people who work. Let me say to him that if he understood me to say that this is a hysterical question he misunderstood me. I realize that it is a very serious problem, that it has reached serious proportions, and that hysteria is being built up about this serious problem which may result in forcing Congress to deal with it with a meat ax instead of in a skillful, competent manner. We have to find out what is causing it, just as Great Britain has done and just as some management people in industry in this country have done in particular places, and not undertake to deal with it without knowledge and without skill and without information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, that I agree with him, and I am delighted to know that the gentleman is interesting himself in this very important matter, but I do call attention to the fact that there is approximately 10 percent of the people working in the various war industries of the country absenting themselves voluntarily or otherwise and that a vast majority of those who are absenting themselves from work do so on either Saturdays or Mondays. Again, let me say that a vast majority of workers are loyal to their tasks, but I have many letters from workers themselves strongly indicating that too many workers actually have hang-overs from the night before.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I realize that what the gentleman says is what has been reported in the press. I do not know, and

I doubt whether any gentleman on this floor knows whether those reports are based upon fact or information. I think we should find out the facts. We should not make the mistake, Mr. Chairman, of dealing with this thing until we do have the facts.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman spoke earlier in his address about attempting to stabilize wages.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman think that if the ceiling or the top is blown off farm prices and food prices, as it is threatened to be at the present time, there is any chance of keeping wages anywhere in line and preventing inflation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would not like to get into a discussion of that here this afternoon. We have to deal with the whole price question as one problem. You cannot let one part go up and the other stay down. You have to deal with it as a whole problem, and I do not feel competent to discuss that question now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As a member of the Committee on Labor, I believe the House would be interested to know just what hearings and just what investigations the Committee on Labor is now making and has been making toward a solution of the problems to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman evidently did not hear all that I said, because I started by saying I had written a letter to the chairman of the committee urging that this investigation be made.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did hear what the gentleman said, but the fact remains that the Committee on Labor has done nothing this session up to this time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I agree with the gentleman, and I think that is unfortunate. It is due, in part at least, to the illness of the chairman, which we all regret.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to my colleague from Georgia that last week the Committee on Naval Affairs started an investigation and hearing on the subject of unauthorized absenteeism, and on Wednesday of this week we started a hearing dealing with the Maritime Commission, the War Department, and the Navy Department on the whole phase of this subject matter. We have had Admiral Land before us, who this morning testified that unwarranted and unauthorized and illegal absenteeism in the last year had prohibited the construction of 100 Liberty ships, and that all absenteeism has had the effect of prohibiting the construction of 200 Liberty ships.



We are approaching this matter in two phases. We propose that as to those within the draft age information shall be sent by the Government and the employer on each employee to the respective draft boards. As to the large number who are not within the draft age, which constitutes probably 50 percent of the employees of the country working in war industries, that information will be sent to a Government agent, so that Government agent can find out what is bringing on absenteeism, such as inadequate transportation, lack of housing, and things of that character. We propose to have before the House within the next week a bill that goes to the very heart of the unauthorized absenteeism in this country.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I appreciate the sincerity of the purpose the gentleman from Georgia has in mind and the purpose of his bill. Insofar as he can, he is trying to reach the problem. The point I am making here is not a defense of absenteeism, for of course I do not defend it, but that the gentleman's committee has not found out what causes absenteeism. The witness to whom the gentleman referred, for whom I have great respect, does not know what causes it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As soon as you get the information that will be sent in by the various employers of the country, you will be able to determine whether the absenteeism is due to this, that, or the other, as concerns those who are not in the draft-age group.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the Congress of the United States should have this information and find out what is causing absenteeism before undertaking to prescribe a cure for it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But if a man within the draft age who has been given a deferment to do a particular piece of work does not do that work, then it is proper at any time for the draft board to know about it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman answer a question for me?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Suppose the reason he was absent was because he was ill or could not secure transportation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is not an unauthorized absenteeism.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Who is going to determine that question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The local draft board.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Are they going to give him a trial?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a member of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I yield to my friend from Michigan, a member of the Labor Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that nobody knew what this absenteeism was about?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what I said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will refer to the United States News of last week he will find that they sent a reporter around the country, and he learned that the boys were getting so

much money that, as long as they could not spend it for food or gas or tires and go somewhere, they had to frequent places where there was dancing and where liquor was sold, and on Monday morning they could not work. That accounted for the absenteeism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Let me say this about that article in the News: I do not question that the causes which the gentleman has recited are partly true, but the point I am making is that nobody has any accurate or authentic information except what has been gathered by some man who wanted to write a story about it. We ought to find out about it, and we ought to prescribe the remedy on the basis of the facts, instead of simply using a meat ax, which may do more harm than good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me say that I support the gentleman on that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman that he is absolutely right. There has been no witness before our committee so far who has given any concrete information as to the cause of absenteeism.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is it not true that all the evidence the Committee on Naval Affairs has had is as to how many absences there were and what the effect has been on production, not as to the cause?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. They all say they do not know why there is this absenteeism.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will agree with me that in spite of the fact that this great Dies committee has been functioning, and the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Labor has not had its finger in the pie at all. I should like to go along with the gentleman and see if the Committee on Labor cannot do something sometime.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We are going to have a meeting next Tuesday, and we will see what we can do about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We are just going to see about it; we are not going to do anything.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. With all due deference to the gentleman, whom I love, and to his committee, for whom I have profound respect, I am just wondering if that committee is the proper committee to make this study. Thirty days ago I discussed this matter with some members of the Committee on Rules. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct; some study ought to be made of it.

I think it ought to be made by a committee of this House, a special committee of this House, and not the Committee on Labor, because, as the gentleman knows—and I know and everybody else knows—that committee is not the committee to make that study.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I would say to the gentleman this, and I think that is what he has in mind, that the Committee on Labor made a mistake in the past in not going into the questions of labor relations that have been boiling up in this war effort.

Mr. COLMER. Has the gentleman any reason to think that the Labor Committee is not going to make the same mistake in the future?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have reason to believe that, and that is one reason why I am making this speech, because I want to put as much force as I could behind the suggestion I have made, to have the Labor Committee do this job as it ought to be done.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, I am appreciative of his observation in mentioning the fact that 2 weeks ago I called on the Labor Committee to take action. Following the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I know we can commend that committee and other committees for their initiative and industry in going into the subject of wartime labor relations, but I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] in his answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], that it is the responsibility of the House Committee on Labor.

Because of their pertinency to the subject now being discussed, I include my remarks in this House on February 11:

#### THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the 48-hour week order set forth by the administration, through the President and the heads of agencies, causes me to once again say publicly what I have said on many occasions in the past, and that is that the House Labor Committee has itself a responsibility to consider corrective legislation in the field of labor during the prosecution of this terrible conflict. Desirable as this longer work week is to our war production, it is regrettable that Congress was not the leader in securing its adoption. We should have acted months ago.

I regret exceedingly the illness of the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey, the chairman of that committee. I know I express the feeling of her friends in this body when I hope for her complete recovery and an early return to this forum. I feel, however, that the Labor Committee should proceed promptly to survey the production field and take appropriate action at an early date to correct many of the inequities now existent.

Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-seventh Congress the Labor Committee, of which I am a member, was charged with failure to properly consider desirable legislation. I trust that condition will not again exist. Rightful gains of the worker must be preserved. Our committee can be constructive and propose desirable corrective measures.

If we fail to assume leadership, I am certain enemies of unionism and sound labor prac-

tice will act destructively and thus impair unity during the war effort. That must not take place.

Mr. RAMSPECK. And may I conclude by saying that when we get into the House I am going to put into the RECORD, if I get permission, a very fine discussion of absenteeism by Richard L. Strout, of the Christian Science Monitor, which I hope everyone will read, and also an article by T. E. Murphy, who is connected with the Employment Service of the State of Connecticut, which I think furnishes valuable information.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following articles concerning the question of absenteeism in war plants:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 2, 1943]

INTIMATE MESSAGE: WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

#### SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON ABSENTEEISM

Absenteeism is growing in American factories and it is likely to grow. It is a phenomenon that accompanies long hours, unsettled war conditions, bad housing, poor transportation, and employment of women, elderly persons, and groups not normally used to the discipline of industrial life.

The problem is a big one, but it should be approached rationally and impartially. There is a tendency in Congress just now to bait labor over the increase in absenteeism. This criticism may be justified against certain individuals. But to open up a new attack on trade unions and American workers in general as somehow less patriotic than the rest of the Nation is not only silly, it is dangerous. It increases just that poor morale which is one of the causes of absenteeism.

Great Britain has splendid morale, but it has absenteeism too, and despite everything that is being done about it, it is taken as a problem that can be kept in bounds but probably not cured while the war continues. It is obvious from the British experience that a good deal can be done about it in the United States.

Drastic work-or-fight laws, however, are not the best method of proceeding. They are apt to produce an attitude of defiance which defeats their own end.

The best way to meet the problem is to win worker support, and that worker support can achieve a great deal may be seen in present strike statistics. Despite everything that is said to the contrary, the plain fact is that man-hours lost from strikes are at a remarkably low point right now; the figure is something around one-tenth of 1 percent of total time worked, and a better average than we made in World War No. 1.

"Slackers" in war industry, as in the Army, should be given short shrift under any arrangement and this is not intended as a defense of them.

That there is plenty of slacking among war workers is all too evident and so far as absenteeism is due to unpatriotic loafing it should be dealt with summarily. Many workers, who seem to forget the country is at war, and who have never before earned so much money, stay away from their jobs after 3 or 4 days. Many when they are on their jobs do their work carelessly, or extend it wastefully.

So-called "feather bed" rules are designed to increase employment, often at the expense of the job. Another particularly dangerous kind of absenteeism is that which in-

creases over week ends, indicating that liquor and hangovers are two of the big problems holding back full war production.

But it does no good to dismiss absenteeism simply as a form of moral delinquency, because it really is more complicated than that, as studies by the Labor Department point out.

Take the case of a patriotic married woman who has taken a war job. Most war jobs now run to about 48 hours a week. When can this woman go out and shop, or carry on her minimum of household duties? What frequently happens is that she takes an extra afternoon off, and is guilty of absenteeism. Then again the United States Public Health Service finds that women generally are absent for physical causes to a considerably higher degree than men, and women are replacing men more and more. In the same way the vigorous young men are being drafted and the average age of workers is going up. That promotes absenteeism, too.

Take the case of a man living in a trailer, a rooming house, or temporary barracks at a war job, a long way from home. He is going to take time off occasionally to visit his family. That makes absenteeism. Better housing would help cure that, for his family could join him. Take the case of Jimmy Jones, who rides 20 miles to work every day in a car-pool with four other men. In the last cold spell the car wouldn't start, and there was no other transportation. That caused five cases of absenteeism.

We all know that public transportation is under a big strain these days, but many of us don't realize just how bad it is in some of the congested factory districts. Consider the effect on workers' stamina of putting in a 48-hour week over a machine—and some men in Detroit are working 60 or 70 hours—and then having to stand up in an overcrowded, fetid trolley or bus for an hour each way. I saw some of the workers in the Detroit district recently, and they seemed dazed as they hung onto straps. That makes absenteeism.

A good many of the problems the United States is running into now, curiously enough, are just about what Britain had a year or so ago. Our point rationing system, for example, which we are all getting used to, is old stuff to the British. The British housewives have known how to play points for 2 or 3 years.

In the same way, the British have been battling absenteeism. It seems rather silly to say it, but one of the ways to meet the problem is just to make factories more attractive: greater regard for toilet facilities; better arrangement for lunches; music during meals and right while people work—anything to boost morale, including pep talks from men who have been at the front. Inasmuch as women are bound to come more and more into factories, shifts in city store hours to aid them shopping may help, and for mothers, communal care for children, and communal meals. It seems strange that the House should knock out a \$2,973,000 item for a State-aid program for children of employed mothers just at this time.

The problem has come, and is likely to stay and there is no rule-of-thumb way to end it. Accidents and injuries cause absenteeism; material shortages indirectly produce it; so does hoarded labor. The theoretical absentee figure will go up also if a worker quits without notice and is carried for 3 or 4 days as "absent" when he is really on another job.

It seems too bad that the House threw out a \$337,000 item last week advocated by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins to investigate the problem, and to promote better working conditions. Using absenteeism simply as a club with which to beat labor, while neglecting to investigate basic causes, will simply delay the remedies which the war effort requires.

#### THIS THISTLE OF ABSENTEEISM

(By T. E. Murphy)

(Some observations on what is considered by many to be the most critical question of the day—absenteeism. Is the American worker shirking his duty? Analyses of some of the factors entering into the problem of absenteeism shows that there are many contributing causes—and that responsibility does not always rest with the worker.)

Absenteeism, which rose to 20 percent in some factories during the last war, is again appearing as an important factor in "all out" production. In Hartford County, according to recent figures released by the Manufacturers' Association, absenteeism has risen to 6.2 percent, a figure which is certainly no worse than most areas and better than many.

Horseback opinions given out by some personnel managers indicate that there is no general appreciation of absenteeism as a result having not one cause, but many causes. Some of these publicly expressed opinions paint the worker as a wastrel, spending his week end elbow-bending or lying abed, regardless of his country's welfare. Another states that "So many of these people have been on relief so long, they have developed bad work habits." Others state that the present financial security of the worker has removed his driving force; that ease in procuring a new job has made him careless about reporting for work.

All of these opinions are true to a certain extent. Workers are in the main as patriotic and anxious to win the war as any manager and such expressions of opinion indicate a superficial understanding of absenteeism. Management usually places the blame for absenteeism on workers, without considering manifold contributing factors to absenteeism, many of them directly traceable to lack of leadership in management itself and is thereby missing the opportunity to improve conditions.

For example, not even the fact that Monday morning absences exceed all other days is an indication that workers have spent their week ends unwisely. Competent industrial physicians have pointed out repeatedly that men who have fought off a cold or feeling of malaise, during the working week keep "fighting it off" until the slowdown of the Sunday lay-off. When Monday comes they don't have the drive to get back to work.

Monday morning absences are as likely to result from excessive fatigue, the cumulative result of 12- or 13-hour days or nights over a period of days.

The first step in combating absenteeism intelligently is to make an inventory of the causes of absenteeism, and then to set about correcting these causes.

In one New England factory recently, where an intelligent study was made of absenteeism, it was discovered that one department suffered more from colds than any other, with consequent increased absenteeism. Further study indicated that these colds resulted from the practice of leaving a large door open all day so that workers were standing in a draft. When the door was closed, absenteeism dropped. That was a relatively simple problem, but illustrates the principle of seeking causes and eliminating them.

In another factory, a study of absenteeism disclosed the fact that chronic absenteeism was confined to a relatively small group of people. Specific study of these offenders disclosed the fact that most of them suffered from chronic malnutrition—not because of lack of money—but because of poor eating habits. When these people were instructed in the principle that doughnuts and coffee for breakfast, hamburger and coke for lunch were insufficient for efficiency, absenteeism dropped abysmally.

There is a definite connection between good health and good work habits, and while sickness causes more lost days than accidents,



many Connecticut factories, which have "safety" drives, have no intelligently directed drive against poor health.

During the latter part of January, the Connecticut State Labor Department conducted a survey of one highly industrialized community to ascertain what facilities were afforded workers who were employed 12 and 13 hours a night, 7 nights a week, week in and week out.

Quoting directly from the report of Edna Purtell, industrial investigator for the State labor department:

"These 12 plants engage a total of 18,596 workers and the only eating facilities were lunch wagons which served hot drinks, sandwiches, and pastry. In one, only cold drinks and packaged cookies were available.

"Two plants were on a 13-hour night shift for men, and all operated 11- and 12-hour day shifts in some departments. One plant employed men on 2 shifts of 12 hours each, 7 days and 84 hours a week. Weekly hours ranged from 60 to 84. The average hours were about 65 per week.

"The day-shift workers have 1 full hour for lunch, but those on the night shift, most of whom are on piece work or premium production, eat on the job. They usually take 20 or 25 minutes to eat. They can take longer but don't like to lose the time, I was told."

In another plant, apparently reaching the Charlie Chaplin "machine age" optimum, the investigator was informed that workers who were on a 13-hour night shift were to be the subject of experimentation by a professor from Yale, who was to feed them vitamin pills three times a night.

In conclusion, Miss Purtell said: "This lack of satisfactory eating facilities and of a specific meal period which would provide the worker with rest as well as representative of a large percentage of war-production plants in Connecticut. It is not unreasonable to attribute some of the absenteeism so widely discussed here at the moment to the effects on the worker of long hours without a break for adequate nourishment or the time to digest it.

"Connecticut labor laws do not require a meal period. In many States employers in manufacturing operations are required to allow time for rest or meals or both and some States specify a maximum number of hours, usually 5 or 6 beyond which no employee may work without a pause for rest or a meal."

In view of these findings, absenteeism in many Connecticut factories is not difficult to understand. It is not due to "poor work habits," but because many workers are now being employed beyond the optimum, and the law of diminishing returns in human endeavor comes into play. The British Medical Research Council recently reported, "The time lost due to sickness, injury, and absence without permission varied with the weekly hours of work. It was usually reasonably low when the hours of work were less than 60 per week, but was higher, and in some cases excessive, when the hours were from 65 to 73 per week."

Some Connecticut factories are attacking the problem of absenteeism in a forthright manner, not merely pinning blame on workers and assuming nonresponsibility themselves. Mr. C. G. Mitchell, assistant manager of service at the Remington Arms Co. of Bridgeport, recently told the American Management Association that "absenteeism is a problem to be solved by the foreman and not one to be handled directly by the personnel or industrial relations department." The fact that Mr. Mitchell claims a 50-percent reduction in absenteeism warrants a hearing:

"Many factors exist at present that did not exist in peacetime which affect attendance; employees are experiencing shift work for the first time; a large number of women have home responsibilities; pay checks are large but employees have little time off to

spend the money; many employees live in day-to-day expectation of being drafted; plenty of other jobs are readily available; transportation difficulties and housing shortages exist in many areas."

To effectuate this program Mr. Mitchell stated that each foreman personally interviews each absentee upon his return to work, asking certain pertinent questions; once each month the shift supervisor and the foremen hold a conference on absenteeism. Specific problems are brought up and efforts made to develop corrective measures to meet them. The individual who becomes a chronic absentee is interviewed off the job by the foreman and the supervisor. Every effort is made to discover the source of his difficulties and to devise means of assisting him. If this fails and the employee is absent again, he is put on probation. Only after the most exhaustive efforts have been made to help him is he subject to dismissal.

Another factor affecting absenteeism is the entry of women into Connecticut industry. Many of these women have answered numerous appeals to their patriotism to report for war work. They have other ancillary responsibilities which they take seriously. Many of them have children; most of them have homes to maintain in addition to this extra burden which they have assumed.

Again we can profit by the experience in England, where women have been employed on heavy duty jobs for a longer period of time. Women workers in British shipyards are three times as numerous today as they were a year ago. On the railroads of Britain, 105,000 employees are women. In a tank factory in England, one worker in every five is a woman. Here they grind and mill and shape component parts for 28-ton Matilda tanks.

A woman must sometimes go shopping, and this factor was responsible for much absenteeism among married women who were otherwise satisfactory workers. One big aircraft factory found that absenteeism rose to 13 percent from the normal 4 percent when the total number of its women employees had reached 70. The firm remedied the situation by providing women with special shopping facilities and with a hairdressing establishment on the premises.

Again, we revert to the statement that "Former relief workers have difficulty in developing new work habits." Many of the men who are now working in Hartford factories at lathes, drill presses, and boring machines were, a few months ago, operating their own businesses behind desks, but have cheerfully assumed new duties; many of these men have a long background of management experience, are intelligent and critical.

Recently, in one local factory where workers were criticized specifically for their absenteeism because of "poor work habits," a worker on the night shift complained because, as he said, "I'm sick and tired of sitting around at night without a thing to do. Some of the men go home because they get tired of sitting around. We don't work more than 2 or 3 hours a night."

Materials shortages perhaps was the cause, but it illustrates that absenteeism frequently has its roots in the sterile soil of management that never explains, as well as in the soil of selfishness and laziness of workers.

Labor-managements committees have sturdily tried to combat absenteeism. They have devised spectacular but fumbling methods of combatting it. They have tied crepes on machines; inserted German marks in the pay envelopes of delinquent workers; have utilized high-pressure publicity with methods of combatting it. They have tied the high pressure of fellow workers and the importation of war heroes into the factory to bring the war home.

These are all excellent measures but they do not get to the root of absenteeism, which

is a personal problem. Frequently the causes are fatigue, family obligations, or boredom and the need for diversion.

Fatigue may be due to the job itself, or to working conditions, or too active a social life. Among women workers fatigue is found to be often caused by the attempt to run two jobs at once; one at the plant and another in the home.

Family obligations play an important role in the absenteeism of women. Women frankly say they need the time off to "clean the house" or because a dependent or collateral relation is ill.

Boredom or the need for diversion affects younger workers and particularly the young man who expects to go into the Army in a few days.

Frances M. Smith, of the Murray Manufacturing Corporation, of Brooklyn, recently put her finger on the nub of the situation. She said, "Management will be quick to agree that there is no foolproof method of eliminating absenteeism, as the problem is made up of many complex factors \* \* \*. We must be on guard against the assumption that absenteeism is always wholly the worker's fault. The fatigue element and its concomitants—boredom, need for diversion—are ever present. Management must continually review conditions of work on specific jobs to be sure they are not causing absenteeism. The personnel department must be familiar with the resources of the community—the location of day nurseries, for instance—in order that it may help married women make the adjustments that are necessary when they take jobs."

An inventory of causes, and an intelligently directed campaign toward the elimination of these causes might produce results here in Connecticut.

Absenteeism can never be eliminated by horseback decisions or a sluggish adherence to old static ways of thinking.

Absenteeism can be reduced in Connecticut and will be reduced in Connecticut, when there is an objective, intelligently directed campaign in this direction.

When you conjure a picture of a worker, as in a typical Connecticut area, where the hours may well range from 60 to 80 hours a week, working without sustenance from his employers, as is true in many instances, one must arrive at the conclusion: Labor is doing all right.

What about management? Is it still feeding on old prejudices, or is it adapting its work plant to new conditions, to women, to the feeding of workers, or is management sitting back, walling at labor's lack of patriotism?

Imagination—not only for workers, but management, as well, is sorely needed in solving this problem.

It will not be solved by a recourse to old prejudices, or old bogies. Where these are raised, either by labor or management, there is definite evidence of a lack of leadership.

Absenteeism can and will be solved only by mutual exploration and definitive action, by labor and management working together. It is a nettle to be grasped firmly, by labor and management together.

Mr. PLUMLEY: Mr. Chairman, I yield myself so much time as I desire.

Mr. Chairman, my leader of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] has discussed the bill at length before us and with some enthusiasm in respect to his opposition to certain items. I generally agree, if that helps, though he needs no help. I do not propose to take much of your time at this time to rediscuss those items we agreed to oppose, for I am in general accord with the position of my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

DITTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], with whom I have the honor to serve as minority members of the subcommittee which is responsible for this bill today. We did what we could to bring in a bill limited by dollars and sense.

I am one of those who sincerely believe that time is running in our favor, provided we run with it.

The more time we have and can take to make up for the deficiencies and delinquencies of a rubber-stamp Congress and the inability of this administration to function rapidly, the better it will be.

However, the time is short, and it is an essential element for victory. We are late now.

I have sat for weeks listening to attempted justification of the items in this bill. We cut out a lot. I reserved the right to object to some that are included, but shall not do it. It will be done if necessary. In comparison with the issue involved in getting going and keeping rolling and sailing and flying and winning this war, my objections are of minor importance. Time is important and the element.

I am, therefore, supporting the bill substantially as reported, with some mental reservations, but shall vote for it as it comes out of the considered debate and judgment of the House unless somebody, misguided, attempts to hamstring it by useless and senseless amendment at this time.

My ranking member has covered the needs for amendment, if any, very specifically. I substantially agree.

I wish to assure all my colleagues that I am not tongue-tied nor do I refrain from talking about this bill in particularity because I am afraid to disclose my hand. The truth is there is a great opportunity afforded to take an alleged greedy group for a ride, and it could well be done, except that we are at war. The committee is not unmindful of a lot of things about which the less said about it, perhaps the better, and to everybody's advantage. There is, however, nothing or very little in the bill of which I do not approve with mental reservations as to just why the Navy is trying today to get everything in sight while the going is good, or why this or that is so presently necessary when they can come again soon, and will. As a general proposition, the advocates representing the Navy were forthright; they put their cards on the table. One or two had an ace up their sleeves, but more experienced members of the subcommittee than I saw them, if you know what I mean. It is too bad for the country that we have to spend so much of the taxpayers' money, but it would be worse for the taxpayers if we did not do it now, and the sooner the quicker, and the faster the better for the taxpayers and victory.

#### SABATH'S SABBATICAL WITHOUT LEAVE

If it be not out of tune, in view of certain remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] this very morning, typical of the spirit which controls the district he has so long represented, and has so ably represented for many years, else he would not have been

here from that district—I wish to say now.

#### A SHOCKING STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman, I was shocked at what I read the other day, and then, as now, considered it a violation of proprieties, when I read what the New Deal Dean SABATH quoted the President as saying, or suggesting, with respect to Republican members of his Cabinet.

In the first place, I did not suppose you were expected to come out of a White House conference to tell the world all about what anybody said there. That is not the way I "heered" it.

In the second place, I find it difficult to believe that the President was correctly quoted as suggesting by innuendo that he tried to get the best, but as to their loyalty as Republicans he was not too sure. That is a type of Chicago political practice I cannot let go unnoticed. That is the implication carried in the statement attributed to the President by the distinguished dean of the majority. I doubt that the President said anything susceptible of any such construction, or that if he did do it, he authorized any such quotation.

In the third place, if he did say it, it is no alibi. No more able men ever served a President, or more loyally, and they need no defense from me before Congress or the country.

This may be a New Deal anniversary. We have heard enough of this Sabath kind of cheap personal publicity stunts in these days when all depends on unity of purpose and intent to win this war.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a magazine, or so-called magazine, entitled "The Life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Thirty-second President of the United States." Over on the back I see, "Published by the Government of the United States." Inside for 16 pages there are all sorts of caricatures and comments on the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, from the time he was born until now. That document was printed at Government expense. It was gotten out under the direction of the Office of War Information. It has been distributed overseas to soldier boys, and it was from that source that it came to me, soldier boys who had to see divisions and organizations of this Government not supporting the war effort, but trying to promote by cheap propaganda, something else. The whole set-up of the thing has the appearance that it might have been gotten up by an artist of the type who gets up the Tarzan pictures for the funny papers. It cost thousands of dollars to get that thing up and distribute it. Let me say to you that the organization or the man that got that thing up and distributed it is in the same position as a cashier, a defaulting cashier of a bank, who runs off with the depositors' money—spending money for something that it was not authorized to be spent for. How much longer are the American people going to be ground in that way; how much longer are the people going to have that kind of stuff

pulled on them? There is nothing in it, absolutely nothing, with reference to the war, and there is absolutely nothing in the nature of anything that would help the war effort about the document. No one in Congress was told that any of that money would be used in any way for any such purpose as this. It is purely political propaganda, purely political propaganda designed entirely to promote a fourth term, and a dictatorship. I wonder, Are the American people going to have to put up with that sort of thing any longer?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I do not wish to seem unduly critical, but let me read you one or two things haphazardly:

It was only natural with his love for boats that Franklin should go out for the crew when he entered Harvard.

One day he was visited by his famous cousin, President Theodore Roosevelt, who had a powerful influence on Franklin's future.

And there is a picture of Franklin sitting at his desk, and the President of the United States standing up. Further:

At the Roosevelt summer home at Campobello Island the youth studied books on navigation and naval history.

Roosevelt conducted an unusual campaign by automobile. Cars were a rare sight in those days. Horses shied, but the voters were impressed.

And there are the horses rearing up at the sight of the automobile.

Mr. GILLIE. Is there anything in there about Superman?

Mr. TABER. It is perfectly evident that the gentleman must think himself a superman or he would not have had the audacity to permit such a thing to be printed.

Now, in all seriousness, it is time for us to force bureaucratic organizations to stop the use of public funds in such a way. Is there no longer any faith, is there no longer any respect for truth and honesty and square dealing? Are we to continue to have our public servants violating the trust that has been imposed upon them by the Government of the United States and getting out a lot of cheap political propaganda? From what I get the men who wear the uniform of the United States resent such a waste. They resent the failure of the bureaucrats to keep faith with them and to devote themselves wholeheartedly to the war effort.

I again call upon the President of the United States and those who are under his control to keep faith with the people to support the war effort and to stop this sort of thing without even a further request from the Congress.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. In this 16-page booklet do you find any pages devoted to instructions to soldiers, or anything of that sort, or is it all of the type you have read?

Mr. TABER. The things I have read would be the most favorable things you could pick out of it.

Mr. CURTIS. It is all like that, is it?



Mr. TABER. And worse.  
Mr. CURTIS. It has nothing to do with the war?

Mr. TABER. Nothing at all.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it possible the gentleman is mistaken about the organization issuing that publication?

Mr. TABER. I called Elmer Davis, head of the Office of War Information, last evening. He told me he would check up on it and find out if his organization put it out. This morning he called up and said that they did put it out. So I have it straight. There is no mistake.

Mr. BENDER. It was not the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no, no; it is Elmer Davis and the Office of War Information.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many of those were distributed?

Mr. TABER. I do not have any idea. One would be enough to damn it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the gentleman also found out whether or not the President himself knew anything about it?

Mr. TABER. I do not see how he could help it, but maybe he did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Since yesterday noon, through yesterday afternoon and this morning, I have been trying to get a copy of that pamphlet. I asked the Office of War Information; I asked the Public Printer; I called the Congressional Library. I was unable to get a copy. Will the gentleman tell me how I can get a copy of that publication, which was paid for by tax money?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. This came from a soldier boy over in Africa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in these days when all segments of our economy are confronted with curtailments and shortages which vitally affect their ability to carry on, it is highly important that we properly determine the values of each. Those which are vital and essential in the war effort should be designated as such and should be given such reasonable preferences as their needs require.

To my mind, the newspapers of the country, both dailies and weeklies, are one of the most essential and vital factors in the winning of the war. We have always cherished the freedom of our press as the ultimate guaranty of our fundamental liberties. We have jealously guarded the freedom of the press in peace. With the Nation at war, we must be doubly sure that the freedom of the press is maintained.

But beyond that, with the Nation at war, we should also recognize the very

definite and direct contribution that the press of the Nation is making to the war effort. That it is a real and valuable contribution cannot be denied by anyone who observes the newspapers from day to day. It is a contribution which should clearly indicate that the press must be classed as an essential industry and given consideration as such. That certain recent actions on the part of some governmental agencies and administrators have seemingly failed to consider the press of the country, leads me to ask your indulgence while I recount some of the things our newspapers have been doing and are now doing to step up our war effort and hasten the day of victory.

All of us have been sobered by the aspects of the tremendous task which this country faces in managing its domestic economy. Review and calculate, if you can, the thousands of communications and regulations about which the public must be immediately informed. To distribute such information quickly to every city and farm, to set it out in proper detail, to define and explain and interpret—these are in large measure beyond the scope of personal interviews, the telephone, the mails, periodicals, and the radio. Such media can be most helpful, but cannot adequately meet this need. Only newspapers, through their printed pages, can set out quickly and in detail, the lengthy and complicated regulations which can be studied by, and kept before, the individual citizen. Only newspapers can keep pace with day-to-day changes.

Last week, food rationing registration provided just one example of the indispensable position occupied by the newspaper in relationship to the Government and the people. In some communities, not only were the blanks to be filled out by the housewives of America unavailable in the quantities required, but the explanations sought by the housewives were in such volume that the staffs set up could not cope with the gigantic task. Newspapers stepped into the breach and printed forms in their own columns so that housewives could clip them and use them when they visited their rationing boards. Where confusion developed in local bureaus, newspapers printed copious explanations. They supplied a service for which there is no substitute.

How the newspapers rallied to meet this emergency and helped lift the country over one of the most critical periods in civilian life is eloquent testimony of their importance.

This instance could be multiplied again and again. We only need to recall a similar situation when the Army began to induct men into our armed services. Despite the energetic efforts of the various departments of the Government and the civilian boards, only through the newspapers could the millions of men involved get the immediate information they required.

Day in and day out, throughout the weeks, as new instructions were developed, the newspapers printed them. One needs but to look at the back files to

know the great and all too quickly forgotten aid rendered by the newspapers.

Another splendid example of the power of the newspapers to aid the Government in the prosecution of the war is written in the records of voluntary enlistment. The campaigns, feature material, and special promotions instituted by the newspapers have been repeatedly cited by the recruiting officers as being of incalculable aid.

Currently the country is engaged in working out a manpower program. Here again the newspapers provide the Government with a medium through which to secure the cooperation of the workers of our country. In cities, on farms, in large cities, and in villages newspapers are making plain to the people on whose cooperation our success in war depends the urgent need for intelligent and voluntary cooperation.

War is costly. The requirements of the Treasury Department stagger the imagination. In this field the newspapers have supplied the means by which the Treasury Department has been able to reach its goals again and again. I confidently assert that but for the efforts of the press, sales of bonds would have fallen far short of the hoped-for funds. Newspapers provided the vehicle through which the Treasury Department can and does explain its position and need. Further, newspapers have repeatedly undertaken promotional programs at their own cost. They have contributed millions of dollars in space to stimulate the sale of war bonds.

The success of the fat salvage and the scrap-metal drives is largely due to the unselfish manner in which the newspapers of the United States donated their space, time, and energy.

To the inspiring records of the newspapers' contributions in bringing about husbanding of rubber tires and oil, in winning ready cooperation in the rationing of gasoline and food, in promoting the sale of bonds, in increasing recruiting, and in expediting the selective-service operations, should be added their very important work in stepping up war production. Newspapers were quick to present the problem to the American people and have labored steadily to help government and suppliers set up an efficient program of production. Because of the news and feature matter run by the newspapers, workers have been made to see the importance of increasing their production and in finding their places in the production line.

The output of American factories has eclipsed expectations and due credit can be given to the newspaper through its focusing of public attention on this crucial need.

The list of newspaper accomplishments is endless. Newspapers are helping us through the shortages in foods by educating readers to buy the proper foods and to plant gardens. They are cooperating with the intelligence departments to prevent harm to our factories. They cooperate with all branches of government. They have been without equal in preparing the public mind for change and in keeping it helpfully responsive.

With such a record before us, it is incomprehensible that there should be some who should incline to classify newspapers as nonessential and dispensable, and, for instance, should mistakenly and unnecessarily seek to reduce the amount of paper which they may use.

I have referred to the aid given by newspapers to some of the departments of government during these days of war. The acknowledgment should be extended to include the services rendered to this body which has discovered anew a staunch supporter and effective aid in the press. Without newspapers, the voice of Congress would be virtually unheard beyond the walls of its chambers. Its aims and labors would be distorted and misunderstood. To refute the falsehoods of the propagandists who have attempted, and will continue to attempt, to minimize and discredit the legislative branch there has been the press which, with a very few exceptions, has reported fairly and fully the deliberations of the Congress. Through these reports of the newspapers the public has been correctly informed.

Our sessions draw daily strength and clarity because of the invisible presence of the electorate who, through their newspapers, sit with us formulating wise legislative measures to meet the great problems of the day. Our legislative acts which seek to interpret the public will are enlivened because they are made known through the newspapers.

Congress has been forced to assert its prerogatives against an ever encroaching bureaucracy whose serpentine coils seek to draw tighter about the affairs of the Nation. The various inquiries undertaken by us in the discharge of our responsibilities would fail of public support and of much effect if the newspapers did not carry to the public the facts which necessitate such investigations, and which are disclosed by such investigations.

Great as are the resources of Congress, it is extremely difficult for us to keep abreast of all the activities and developments in our great country. Newspapers through their own inquiries bring to us knowledge of mistakes and wrongs which demand attention. They are a constant check on the expanding ambitions of those who use the delegated power of government for private purposes or personal theories, and who attempt to arrogate to themselves unauthorized power.

We have seen in the past several years a mushrooming of bureaus and offices designed to direct the lives of the people. We have seen such bureaus and offices multiply in numbers and in the scope of their operations. We have watched the rise of men who now lay exclusive claim to every virtue so that they may better further their own ambitions. They talk smoothly of public need. They are the self-anointed—but if I were to choose between the bureaucrats and the newspapers for a guardian of the rights of men, I would unhesitatingly choose the newspapers.

There are some in the various offices of government who decry the importance of

the newspaper, who sneer at them as an institution, yet I cannot help but observe the steps they take to surround themselves with writers and publicists whose sole purpose is to see that their daily output is printed by the newspapers. Strangely enough, certain of the most bitter enemies of the press are those who sedulously seek publicity in the newspaper for themselves and their programs. It is not inappropriate to suggest that some of the pulp and paper materials used by the bureaucrats might be more properly allotted to the newspapers for which they have decreed shortages. And I might include the one we just saw a moment ago.

Let us not tolerate any carelessness and groundless opinions on the part of those who drafted these regulations which have been released and who threaten further curtailment in the amounts of paper which newspapers can use. And if there are some whose animosity leads them to attempt to destroy the newspapers which stand between them and their goal, let us seek them out and render them harmless. For when you destroy the newspapers, you destroy one of the most effective internal implements of war and of peace which this Nation possesses. Destroy them and you destroy the confidence of the people in their Government—and with it that Government. Destroy the newspapers and, in effect, you make possible an Axis victory—a victory for ignorance and oppression in our assembly halls, in our schools, and in our homes, if not on the field of battle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for permission to address the House for 10 minutes on an important subject to every Member of this House and to every constituent in their districts.

As a new Member, I have hesitated to take the time of this honorable body, and would not do so today unless I believed the occasion warranted it, and that my remarks would be constructive.

For many years as a businessman and an extensive direct-mail advertiser, I have had occasion to use the postal services. I have had the opportunity of knowing a great number of postal employees, not in an impersonal way but in a personal way. I have talked with them and know something of their financial problems. I know from the lips of their wives how hard it has been to clothe, feed, and educate their children; to pay dad's insurance premiums, to pay mother's hospital bills, and to meet all the other costs of maintaining an American family on a scale which will assure good citizenship. These good people have long occupied the role of the "forgotten man" among Government employees. Ah, but someone may rise and

say, "We passed Senate Joint Resolution 170 on December 15, which provided a 10-percent raise to the postal employees."

Let me state emphatically: Letter carriers, clerks, and the vast majority of the postal personnel did not receive a 10-percent temporary wage boost.

Let us remember that Senate Joint Resolution 170 was rushed through both the Senate and the House of Representatives on December 15, 1942, just 1 day prior to the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress. There were no public hearings, and I dare say that few Members of Congress were familiar with the provisions contained in that enactment.

Admittedly, some of the postal workers were granted the 10-percent upward revision, but that provision was not made applicable to those employees who work longer than 40 hours per week. Letter carriers, clerks, and the others were actually granted a 23-cent hourly increase on their overtime rates, which amounts to \$1.84 per week additional for 8 hours' extra service. In 52 weeks the increase will amount to exactly \$95.68 added to the pay of an employee in the \$2,100 grade. Yes, my friends, after waiting more than 18 years for an upward salary revision, your letter carrier and post-office clerk were granted a niggardly increase approximately 5 percent per annum providing they perform 8 hours' additional service per week. The increase under Senate Joint Resolution 170 is even smaller for the village delivery letter carrier and the others in the extreme low grades.

It is an indisputable fact that the cost of living enters into every wage adjustment. Although not necessarily the determining factor, yet the percentage by which living costs increase must at all times be considered before a wage award is granted or refused. It matters not what yardstick or scientific measurements are used to determine the extent into which the question costs of living enters. Regardless of the policy finally adopted, it is my firm conviction that the ultimate finding will be ample justification for the contention that these unprecedented conditions under which we are now living makes it imperative that postal salaries be revised upward.

The last reclassification of postal employees' salaries was signed on February 28, 1925, to be effective as of January 1, 1925. It would take a very scant knowledge of mathematics to calculate the difference between the years 1925 and 1943; in fact, 18 years have elapsed since letter carriers and other postal workers received an increase in pay. Many of my colleagues will remember the postal employee back in 1932, when the cost-of-living principle was applied in reducing wages, not once but several times, during those dark depression years.

On June 30, 1932, President Herbert Hoover signed the bill known as appropriations for legislative branches of the United States Government, which embodied certain economy measures applicable to postal employees. The specific



section affecting the lower paid employees provided that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, employees receiving annual salary of more than \$1,000 shall be furloughed without pay for 1 calendar month, for which purpose 24 working days shall be considered as 1 calendar month. This procedure was justified on the grounds that our country was in the throes of an economic depression brought on by the stock-market crash of October 1929. Following in the wake of the market crash, living costs fell below the standards maintained during the so-called boom years, and letter carriers were required to cooperate in bringing about national recovery. A payless furlough committed postal workers to adjust their level of living from the basic maintenance level to an emergency level. In view of the general rise in wages throughout private industry during the past few years, letter carriers and other postal employees are still maintaining their existence on an emergency level.

March 20, 1933, marked the day President Roosevelt signed the bill H. R. 2820, which, briefly stated, was intended to maintain the credit of the United States. Under the terms of the law it was provided that beginning April 1, 1933, and continuing until June 30, 1934, the President was authorized to investigate and determine an index figure of the cost of living for the first 6 months of 1928 and also make a similar determination of the index figure of the cost of living for each succeeding 6 months thereafter. For any percentage reduction in the cost-of-living index a similar percentage reduction not to exceed 15 percent was to be levied against the employees during the following 6 months' period. Upon finding the increase of 21.7 percent below the 1928 base period, the President, in an Executive order dated March 28, 1933, directed a wage reduction of 15 percent to be levied against employees for the period covered from April 1, 1933, to June 30, 1933. In compliance with the law and authorized by same, another ascertainment was made to determine the continuance of this reduction, and when it was proved that an increase of 23.9 percent below the 1928 base period existed, an extension of the order was directed, dating from July 1, 1933. On January 9, 1934, a third Executive order was issued sustaining the 15-percent reduction because an increase of 21.1 percent below the 1928 base period prevailed. The third Executive order brought the percentage up to and including June 30, 1934. For the purpose of accuracy it must be remembered that although H. R. 2820 superseded the 30-day payless furlough order, nevertheless many of the employees were never reimbursed for the payless furlough time they took prior to the enactment of H. R. 2820.

The independent offices appropriation bill was enacted into law on June 16, 1933, and became effective July 1, 1933. Section 9 of that bill having to do with rotative furloughs, authorized the heads of the several executive departments of the Government to furlough without pay, on a rotative basis, such employees as

they deemed necessary, in order to meet the requirements of rigid economy. Soon thereafter, definite action was taken by the Post Office Department to give this legislation effect. In the Postal Bulletin of June 20, 1933, there appeared an order directing a payless furlough of 9 days for each employee to be taken over a 3-month period. The entire schedule was to run for 1 year.

It is interesting to show a summary of happenings during a time when the Department of Labor published statistics showing a decrease of 20 to 30 percent in the cost of living:

a. Postal workers were given a 30-day payless furlough.

b. Postal workers were given an outright 15 percent cut in salary. This cut, however, superseded the 30-day payless furlough but without restoration for those who had already completed their 30-day furlough.

c. Postal workers were given an additional 9-day payless furlough.

Payless furloughs were discontinued May 1, 1934; a partial restoration—10 percent—of salaries was made February 1, 1934. The remaining 5 percent was eventually restored April 1, 1935. None of these restorations became effective until the index on the cost of living showed an upward trend, as the final date will clearly indicate.

Thus, on a precedent established by the Government itself, I now contend that a postal employee pay raise is long overdue. If the argument is used that conditions in industry or costs of living have declined to a point as to justify a reduction in wages without causing hardship, it is logical to assume that a reversal of these conditions of industry, accompanied by an upward trend in the cost of living, is every reason for an increase in wages.

The postal workers, country-wide, have been performing a yeomanlike service to our great Nation. They do not have the right nor do they desire to strike. The global war in which we are now engaged has placed heavier loads on the shoulders of letter carriers and greater burdens upon all postal employees. All of them are willing and anxious to work longer hours in behalf of the war effort. Thousands of the experienced postal personnel have been forced to leave the Service to take up more gainful employment in private industry. Thousands of other postal workers have been called to the colors. The chaotic conditions among those who remain in the service of the Post Office Department can be directly charged to substandard wages and the failure of Congress and the administration to take the necessary remedial steps.

As I have stated, I am personally acquainted with a number of the postal people in Los Angeles County offices. A more loyal, faithful group of workmen never lived. Conditions are already deplorable and becoming increasingly worse in these offices because Congress and the administration has failed to grant them a deserved salary increase. The postal employee meets all the requirements exacted from others of our citizenry. He willingly pays the new 5-

percent Victory tax. The Seventy-seventh Congress increased his retirement deductions to 5 percent of his annual salary commencing on July 1, 1942, and the Government demands that he purchase his own uniforms. Soon he will probably be required to sacrifice a 20 percent pay-roll deduction, if the Ways and Means Committee tax plan is enacted. On his meager earnings he strives to purchase his share of War bonds and Defense stamps, and like other public-spirited citizens he makes his contributions to the Red Cross drives and Community Fund campaigns. These deductions will reduce his expendable income from 25 to 40 percent.

I am certain that conditions similar to those prevailing in Los Angeles County exist throughout the Nation. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, the cost of living has increased 21 percent since 1939. The present rate of increase is said to be one-half of 1 percent per month—Time, February 1, 1943. The Postal Service is the basic line of communication and is so essential to the Nation's welfare in either peace or war times. Simple justice demands that the Seventy-eighth Congress take immediate steps to correct the unwholesome situation that now exists within the Postal Service.

The Post Office and Post Roads Committee has been considering H. R. 1366, introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN]. This resolution is identical with Senate bill 360, introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. Both bills request a flat \$300 per annum increase for all postal employees during this emergency period of the war and extending this payment for 6 months thereafter.

We have had extensive public hearings. The postal organizations have approved the principle involved, numerous Members of this House have given their approval. There has not been one protesting voice among my colleagues at the committee hearings. This bill, properly amended to include and protect all classes of postal employees, was reported today. I have confidence that the Members of this House will pass this legislation quickly and for the first time since 1925—18 long years—give these patient, loyal public servants not a bonus but a justified wage increase—as one of my colleagues has said, "Justice long denied." Let us show the forgotten men in the Postal Service that we appreciate the loyalty so eloquently portrayed by their slogan:

Neither rain, nor snow, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers in the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DITTER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is very likely that in the near future the subcommittee handling the appropriation for the Department of

Commerce will consider recommending a cut on all the field offices and field personnel in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce. For some reason that I cannot understand, the Budget has recommended that that service which for years has been an integral part of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce be eliminated.

Field offices of the Bureau—

I am reading from the Budget message—

now located in the 12 headquarters cities of Federal Reserve districts and in 18 other cities, were originally established to facilitate the promotion of the country's commerce, both foreign and domestic. Because of war-time impediments to normal business, these field offices cannot perform their basic functions and the 1944 estimates contemplate their discontinuance.

Mr. Chairman, these offices are all over the country. There are 18 regional offices and 22 district offices and they prove very efficient.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, 25,000 additional services are being performed in these Foreign and Domestic Commerce offices in the districts; 25,000 more services were performed during the past year over 1941. During 1941 509,000 services were performed and 534,000 services were performed in 1942. That is an increase of 5 percent in the services that were performed, not only for large business, but most of it for small businesses, the businesses that cannot afford to have research personnel.

It seems to me the Budget Bureau in making that statement has disregarded the increase in the services which have been performed. It is clearly another severe blow to small business.

We know big business has the money to send its personnel to Washington to get information from the various departments, whereas the small businessman has no staff of experts and he cannot afford to pay even the transportation expenses of any person to come to Washington. Also the sending of personnel to Washington overtakes the railroads. I should like to point out some of the services that have been performed by the district and regional offices. There are 12 regional offices and 18 district offices, and I doubt if there is a Member of Congress today who does not know of the services that have been rendered to business as a result of these offices. Letter after letter attests the high approval in which these activities and the work are held.

I will list a few of the services that are now being performed.

They have gathered material for the Foreign Service under the Department of State, which as you now know is now handling our trade in foreign countries, so far as our business people are concerned, and this Bureau furnishes data and acts as a clearing house for business with the Department of State.

Their problem, of course, is to keep regular business going. It is of particular importance at this time to keep

regular business going and to decide what business is most necessary for the war effort.

I should like to point out also that this Bureau acts as a clearing house for the Board of Economic Warfare and business.

In other words, these offices of the Bureau tell the Board of Economic Warfare what both large and small business can do, and in turn the Board of Economic Warfare tells foreign and domestic commerce what essential supplies can be spared for immediate war efforts and for regular business not concerned primarily in the war effort. These offices tell business the restrictions on foreign and domestic trade, and actual results have been accomplished through a greater use of all of these offices during the past few years. I have just talked with the Board of Economic Warfare and they stated to me they have found their use of the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce very helpful. They told me the field offices sell their export control books giving information regarding export control. Through them they send out their regulations, and so forth, to merchants and trades people. They have lessened their load of work very much. Through them they secure special information from returned travelers. They also feel it is important to have continuity of service in trade which is now operating. They have performed many beneficial services for the Board of Economic Warfare and other commissions and saved money for that commission. It is the focal point for manufacturers and trade people for many services. They have been valuable in looking up many contracts.

I have had a great many communications from trade organizations and they cannot understand why this action should be taken. Business has confidence in these offices because they have used them for years, and they find them thoroughly satisfactory.

Foreign and Domestic Commerce offices gather materials for the Bureau of the Census. The materials which they gather for the Bureau of the Census are for manufactures, population, agriculture, housing, retail wholesale trade. This material is made available to the Bureau of the Census through the trained personnel. It is very valuable because they know how to secure it and to give it to this Bureau.

So far as agriculture is concerned, the county agents find these offices extremely useful. The Office of Statistics has proved very valuable to them.

They get up material for the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, the Manpower Commission, the Bond Division of the Treasury Department.

They notify other bureaus, Government agencies, and trade people of essential materials they must bring in for conduct of the war.

They are familiar with all conditions abroad, high tariff, trade restrictions, import quotas, food and drug regulations. On top of that Commerce has its own restrictions.

#### EXPORT CONTROL, FUND CONTROL

They have and give information as to blacklists or lists of firms with which certain consignees cannot deal; information on shipping control; lack of shipping; determine which things are essential for the war effort of other countries and for our own.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, the membership of the House will feel like putting this item into the appropriation bill even if the subcommittee does not decide to do so. The sum is very small, only \$430,000. It is a mere pittance considering the service rendered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for bringing this matter so forcefully to the attention of the Committee and the House. It is nothing more than shortsightedness to omit money for this use, when it is so much needed and when such large results flow from its expenditure. The gentlewoman is to be congratulated for urging it at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. We must do things positive and definite for the small businessman.

Mr. CHURCH. The Chicago area is very much interested in this item. I hope the gentlewoman has included Chicago among the names of the offices she has listed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is included in the list of offices. Boston has an office.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I have received communications from San Francisco asking me to request that these offices be continued. I join in the gentlewoman's request that these appropriations be granted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very small amount for the magnitude of the work done. I thank the gentleman for his interest.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I should like to add also, coming from the Portland, Oreg., district, that my people are very much interested in this agency. Various industrial enterprises testify to the great service that is being performed. They hope it will be continued and urge that the appropriation be granted. I want to compliment the gentlewoman for the fine presentation she has made of this very important subject.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Oregon. I believe more letters will be coming in from all over the country just as soon as people realize that it is contemplated to discontinue this greatly valued Government service.

I cannot understand just why the cut was recommended, because instead of



there having been a decrease in useful service there has been a 5 percent increase during the last year, and I know the intense interest the Members of the House have, and all the impassioned speeches made by Members in behalf of small business would seem absurd if they allowed small business the benefit of this assistance. My colleagues will not agree to give up this aid for business.

I have here letters from small businessmen of Massachusetts, and also from men who represent large business, all saying it is a very valuable service and begging that the foreign and domestic field offices be kept open.

The contemplated elimination of the appropriation for its continuance would be not only a serious handicap to both large and small business but would result in an additional expenditure to the Government and to the taxpayer, because, in my judgment, it will be only a question of time when Government agencies who avail themselves of information from the field offices of the foreign and domestic commerce, must set up sections in their own departments to handle this far-reaching service for trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, representatives of the American people about to feel the pangs of hunger will begin soon to take an interest in the problems of food production. I think we shall wish we had known what food canners are thinking today of the way Government is messing up the food problem.

Cherished theory of the O. P. A. which, canners think, is going to help force Americans to try to keep fit and do best work on a reducing diet, is the idea of making the food-canning industry label each can of food according to grade. The Agricultural Department approves grade labeling. The so-called experts advance arguments which sound practical, except to canners.

The administration says that because the trade grades its products in selling to distributors according to whether a batch of cans is choice or standard, that the trade should not object to having Government inspectors over them making them grade each little can. You have to know the canning business to understand how disgusted canners are at the thought of undertaking such a difficult and delicate job. The O. P. A. insists that this is necessary to prevent chiseling.

In addition, planners in the Agricultural Department hope to buy most of the American canned food packed this year, shipping what the armed forces do not use to foreign nations. They are playing with the idea of having each can

labelled "U. S. A." in big letters. This, they seem to think, will advertise and glorify America, giving it glamour. The fact that the canner's trade-name may have taken him 50 years to build, is a valuable property asset to him, and that if he chisels too much he may lose his clientele in a few months means little to the experts. It means everything to the women of America. Without the firm's name on a can they cannot tell what they are buying. They know what is good for the canner's business better than he does, they think. They say that all this will help him grab foreign markets in a post-war world. They are even toying with the idea of sending pretty Government lady dietitians on a junket to London and other foreign cities to demonstrate American cooking of American foods. They do not foresee that it may not be such a pretty spectacle on the streets of London and elsewhere if, at the same time, newspapers there are carrying the news of food riots in America. Canners think it is likely that within 12 months we shall see food riots in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentlewoman hear the speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was called from the room at that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He showed us a book that had been sent him containing the picture of our Chief Executive. Did the gentlewoman see that?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Seriously, does the gentlewoman think it might be contemplated to have the President's picture on the cans also?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I expect if they want glamor they will get it.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that this matter of grade labeling was before the Congress a few years back when the Pure Food and Drug Act was revised and that the Congress at that time, having heard many of these same arguments, refused to go along with the proposal to write that into the act.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for recalling that to my mind.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Where is the authority in the O. P. A. for this grade-labeling?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The bill is very broad and without further study I would not undertake to say they had not the authority, although I do know that in rent cases and in other cases they made the most fantastic interpretations of law that I have ever seen, the kind of interpretations that only a man a few months out of law school could make.

Canners are warning the public now that grade labeling is one of the restric-

tions thought up by the administration that will help cause food shortages. Like many bureaucratic schemes, this plan is predestined to cause damage because, as usual, the Government planners are underestimating one of the most significant and potent factors in business—psychology.

Canners have been hamstrung, inspected, quiz-kidded, and red-taped until they are groggy. They never know what fantastic rule the Government will foist upon them next. Neither does Government. Canners have come to think that whatever Government chooses to do will probably hurt them. Normal times, a canner makes good money in his business. It is a highly speculative business, however. You gamble a lot of money every year. In one season you may, as the saying is, "lose your shirt."

Last week the O. P. A. finally summoned the canners to Washington, having waited until the season for making planting plans was almost over. O. P. A. told the canners it would fix price ceilings which would take into consideration some, but not all, of their increased costs. Canners are discouraged. They cannot see their way ahead. The one who worries them most, apparently, is Dr. Galbraith of the O. P. A., who has been well advertised as a man who is an expert on all kinds of businesses. A walking encyclopedia. This peripatetic pedant should have gotten his walking papers the same time as Leon Henderson, who should have gotten his sooner.

The canners do not know what they can depend upon from Government. They fear to assure the growers that they will have the facilities to transport vegetables from farm to factory. How can they be sure what the Government will do to prevent it? The canners are losing their key employees. Into the factories, however, have come Government inspectors and accountants. The accountants stay in the factory week after week, nosing into accounts, pretending to understand them, hanging about like the man who came to dinner and stayed on for months, eating at taxpayers' expense, creating manpower shortages by dodging draft or essential war work. The canners, bound and gagged by O. P. A. restrictions, never know when they will unintentionally violate one of the innumerable restrictions carrying penal consequences with which Government has been pleased to fetter them. They have to hire high-priced lawyers to chaperon their activities. Canners are not even certain that they will have storage for this year's pack. Their warehouses are still filled with last year's pack, left there by America's worst hoarder, the Government.

Representatives of city people and newspapers which serve city people have often talked as if the farm industry were the enemies of city people, maybe because farm representatives boast too much of the little they are able to do in behalf of the food industry. All of the American people should be as interested in the success of those who produce, process or distribute food as a little calf is interested in its mother and

for the same reason. This correlation was not plain enough, perhaps a year or so ago when we had our chance on the first and second price control bill. Maybe it is still obscure but tomorrow you may hear hungry people demanding why you thought price or politics more important than food.

With your permission I quote as follows from a letter written by a man of high caliber who was formerly president of the National Association of Cannerymen:

The chances are that we will make up estimated costs of the coming year and submit same to Office of Price Administration trying to get a readjustment. At these costs they have shot at us there is a question whether we will lose more money operating heavily than we would light and naturally we will operate the way we are going to lose the least money. In 1941 our factory had out 8,000 acres; 1942, 7,000 acres. This year on account of the labor situation, we feel that 6,000 acres would be the top and if we cannot get by under these Government regulations will drop down to 5,000 acres. The feeling in Office of Price Administration, we understand, is that by holding down on the price the canners would be inclined to get maximum production, the same as we have the last 2 years, in order to get by. This is a nice way to think, but it just won't work practically.

The way the total picture in Office of Price Administration is working out is they have now reduced everybody in the Middle West to the same price for the same grade, regardless of what kind of quality they pack. They are putting a limit on each grade as to price and the good canners in the same boat as the poor canners. This, of course, is what many of the boys down there want and it is pure socialism and is certainly doing more damage to our war effort than good.

The canning industry want to produce everything they can and will if given a decent chance, but it cannot be done with a rope around our necks at every turn we make. If this is what Washington wants, let it ride this way and take our punishment and possibly we will learn when it is too late.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentlewoman know whether there is any protection given to the consuming public against poor canning, which is often poison in this leveling down?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I undertook to point out briefly that there is no protection for the housewife when she goes down to shop on a can that says only "U. S. A."

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not the gentlewoman familiar with the Pure Food and Drugs Act and does she not know that under the law we have Federal inspectors to inspect the food from the standpoint of health in an effort to protect the health of the people?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am no expert on that, but as I understand it the idea is that there is a minimum standard and you cannot let your food get any worse than that or you are out.

Mr. COOLEY. In addition to that may I call attention to the fact that the Agricultural Marketing Association or

servicing bureau in the Department of Agriculture likewise provides grading services in the different canneries of the country in order to protect the housewife.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understand the situation is very different from what they apprehend in the Department as to what will happen under this provision.

Mr. COOLEY. The House Committee on Agriculture for the past 2 or 3 days has been hearing representatives of the canning industry.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understood so.

Mr. COOLEY. Also the O. P. A., and at this morning's meeting it was agreed that the representatives of the industry would meet with the officials of O. P. A. in the office of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of trying to work out all of the matters and things in controversy.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I had lunch with the chairman in the dining room this noon and he informed me of that. I was very glad to hear it, and I was glad to be informed of the committee's interest; at the same time, as I pointed out in these remarks, the industry has met with the O. P. A. before. I appreciate the committee's help and I hope it will do more good than I expect.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman knows I am not defending O. P. A. in making the few remarks I did.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would not expect the gentleman to turn into a Benedict Arnold to the food production program of this country at this late hour.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. If this controversy and uncertainty is not settled soon, the pack for this year will be reduced to almost nothing, is not that about the situation?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There are about 2 or 3 weeks left. If they do not have their acreage in then, it is gone. As one canner said to me, "Washington has to learn that Mother Nature does not wait for politicians."

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. This morning we learned in the Committee on Agriculture that already deep in Texas, where there are early spring crops, the canners have already closed their doors because they have no idea what price they can get for their goods. We were told that 10 had already closed. That is the information we have and some more are going to close in the next few days. Now, if I may make this further observation: The average housewife is accustomed to buying not on grade but on packer's integrity behind his canned goods, by his brand, and when you remove that packer's integrity which stands behind that brand, which has as much to do with the continuation of his business as the high standards, you take away that so-called protection and the

consumer does not know what to expect when she opens a can.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. She will see one good product, we do not advertise names here, say from Chicago. She will buy that can of meat or vegetable for her family thinking she will give them a good dinner, and she will buy a product canned by another canner to feed her dog.

To conclude, I understand a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is now before the Committee on Rules to investigate grade labeling. I urged the committee to give the House a chance to adopt it. I personally am willing to do anything I can to remedy this situation, and I know the House feels the same way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly wish to commend the gentlewoman on the fine statement she has made about this problem, and to suggest that, in my opinion, while at the moment the most critical matter seems to involve so-called grade labeling, there is very definitely in the background a trend in the direction of doing away with all brand names and trade-marks and doing a lot of other things throughout our whole economy of production in respect to standardization and simplification which, in my opinion, will not do one thing to promote the war effort but, on the contrary, will hinder the war effort.

I take this occasion to thank the gentlewoman for her fine contribution to the solution of this problem in which we are all interested.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the gentlewoman to say that someone said Mother Nature would not wait for the politicians in Washington.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have not the politicians in Washington been at war with the laws of Mother Nature and Mother Nature herself for the last 6 or 7 years, since they started in to kill the pigs and plow under the cotton and all that restricted wheat acreage?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thought they were fighting windmills, but maybe it is Mother Nature.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I have sought this time, not that I felt myself capable of enlightening the Members of the House on the importance of the bill under consideration but for another purpose. As to this bill, I was entirely satisfied when I read the bill and the report, and especially heard the presentation of the matter by the chairman of the subcommittee. I am, therefore, ready to vote.

I must be frank and tell you that I have sought this time impressed with the



idea that we are in war. You and I may not so fully realize it, but I suspect right now the men and the boys in the Solomon Islands, in north Africa, and on other battlefields of the world are quite sure we are in war. What is disturbing me perhaps as much as anything else and maybe a little bit more, is the callous disposition I find evidenced on the floor of this House, a disposition to forget to give importance to the realization of the fact that men and boys, our own men and boys, are dying upon the fields of battle. It brings to me a great regret that we should find it possible to take the time to indulge in petty politics, we Members of the great Congress of the United States of America, a country which is at war.

If I were minded to debate the subject today I might suggest that as a Democrat I would be happy to realize that the only complaint that could be raised against my party is that the Navy Department has been allowed to provide a cookbook for some of the people who are engaged in this terrible conflict. I might congratulate myself also as a member of that party that it was only found important to bring attention to the shortcomings of the party in power by stating that the Vice President of the United States had said that amidst all these hardships and the pains war has brought to us there is one happy contemplation, that it necessarily provides jobs for some people.

Maybe a great deal of consolation would not be found in that realization to the rich, but it is not hard for me to visualize the young boy of the unpretentious parents coming back, being spared in the providence of God from the worst, to our own country and to his home, walking in at the door of the house and saying, "Pa, I know you are poor, and mother did not have much. How have you got along since I have been in the war?" The father might say, "Son, this war has brought great distress to our souls. We have thought about you and prayed for you every night and a great many times in the day. But there is some incidental blessing; your dad and your mother have had something to eat and to wear, and I have had a job."

I do not see anything so bad in Mr. WALLACE's making mention of a thing like that.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman, for whom I have an affection.

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression to the House that he endorses the statement of the Vice President that the war, with all its hardship and pain, has brought one blessing, and that the blessing of the war is the sordid thing of providing a job? Does he mean to convey the impression to the mother who has lost a boy at Bataan or in the Philippines or in the Solomons that the blessing to her, the solace to her heart, is the fact that somebody else got a job? If he does, then I stand on my original denunciation of the declaration by the Vice President that the blessing of the war can be the making of a job.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I conclude that the gentleman did not want to ask a question but wanted to argue. I am through with that.

I want to read you something about this war. Let us have unity. Let us forget this partisan politics business and rise to the requirements of an American citizen, and remember the boys and the men who have yielded themselves willingly to the last measure of devotion that is necessary to protect our land and our homes. I want to read you something about what is going on.

Ira Wolfert, a newspaper reporter who saw the biggest naval battle that has taken place up to this time, unless it be the one that took place yesterday, was present in this great airplane fight as a spectator. I read what he has to say in this article that appears in the Reader's Digest of March 1943:

#### FOUR-MOTORED DOG FIGHT

(Condensed from *Battle for the Solomons*)

(By Ira Wolfert)

(Ira Wolfert, a newspaper reporter, had a front seat from which to watch the only big naval battle ever fought within full view of shore (A Grandstand View of Jap Naval Disaster, the Reader's Digest, February 1943). He was in St. Pierre-Miquelon when the Free French seized it, and he scooped the world on the news. Aboard a Flying Fortress on what was to be a routine patrol, he was participant in one of the strangest of dog fights, which he here describes. And perhaps most amazing coincidence of all, he was in a plane just above the transport *President Coolidge* when it hit a mine and sank. Wolfert, who is 33, has been on the staff of the North American Newspaper Alliance since 1929, covering important assignments. Aside from his newspaper job he is an accomplished short-story writer whose work has appeared in magazines and anthologies.)

First Lt. Ed Loberg was scheduled to take his B-17, an old Flying Fortress, on a routine search mission from Guadalcanal and I decided to go along.

Loberg is a farm boy from Tigerton, Wis. Copilot was Lt. Bernays K. Thurston, an accountancy-minded, guitar-playing, blues-loving youth of 23 from Indianapolis. First Lt. Robert D. Spitzer, 26, of Anderson, Ind., was navigator and the bombardier was Second Lt. Robert A. Mitchell, 24, of Washington, D. C. Five noncoms completed the personnel.

We took off in a tropical noontime swollen with weather. There were patches of steaming sun lying breathless on glassy water and patches of squalls and cloudbursts rising in thick pillars over heaving seas. We searched low for a while, then climbed to 6,000 feet to give some Jap a chance to sneak in under us if he wanted to.

Suddenly Lieutenant Loberg called for battle stations. I looked out of the glass-enclosed nose where I stayed through all that followed. Far below us was one of our PBV Navy planes. It turned and lifted and fell like a bird in trouble. Near it was a *Kawanishi 97*, the best four-motored bomber the Jap Navy has. It, too, looked like a bird—an eagle bunching itself for the kill, its propellers glinting like claws. Quickly we muscled in and took the fight over.

We dived so rapidly that I fell on my knees and couldn't get up. As we pulled out, I could feel my cheeks drawn far down below my eyes and everything that was inside of me pressed into a tight little bundle. I became aware that the bottom turret guns were chugging; this made the nose buck like a riveting machine. Then a curtain of sooty gray dropped over my eyes—the beginning of black-out.

When we got on an even keel, I could stand up again and look out. We were in a squall. The rain drummed all over us with a sound like running feet. The plane was being thrown around so much that I had to hold onto the navigator's table with two hands.

"We lost him," Lieutenant Spitzer shouted. "He ran into a cloud."

And we, it seemed, had gone in headfirst after him—almost vertically, like a dive bomber. At every window men stood straining to see through the scudding mass of wind-blown water. We hurtled through the cloud and into blinding sunlight and there the Jap was, right alongside of us, maybe 50 feet away.

Both planes were firing full broadsides at each other. Thousands of bullets crisscrossed through the narrow spread of air. The planes rocked along side by side. It was a fantastic spectacle. We shuddered under the impact of bullet after bullet, and teetered and bucked from the recoil of our own guns.

The thousands of explosions seemed one vast unending blast. I could see a cannon firing at us, smoke blowing from its open mouth like frosted breath, and I could see our red tracer bullets pelt like darts into the Jap, ricochet off his armor, and streak straight up into the air. I saw the Japs clearly, shrunken figures huddled over their guns. Our men and their men, in that terrible fire, were bent over as if before a high wind, their faces wrinkled and gray, but they stood to it and kept at it.

The Jap made a tight turn. To keep away from the deadly sting in his tail and give our nose and side guns a chance to work him over, we had to turn inside him. This could have broken a B-17 in half, but Lieutenant Loberg did it neatly.

Then the whole wild scene was blotted out as a cloudburst fell upon us like a mountain of loose rocks. Lieutenant Spitzer stepped away from his gun, dripping with perspiration. "Oh me, oh my," he said, as he pulled and pinched at his sweatshirt and blew a current of air from pursed lips. I looked at him, startled that he should utter such mousy words at such a time, and stand there plucking at himself like some plump woman fretful about a hot afternoon. He took off his sweatshirt, threw it on the floor and went back to his gun.

The Jap had dived into the cloudburst either to lose us or to maneuver into a position to kill us. We lost him five times in the fight, sometimes for 3 or 4 minutes. He was very brave and also very smart. But Lieutenant Loberg and Lieutenant Thurston out-thought him every time. They had marvelous help from the crew, who kept looking to the very last flicker of the disappearing Jap and reporting his maneuverings. Every time he plunged into a cloud and went racing along behind it as if it were a board fence, we went after him and caught him again just as he was breaking into the clear.

The Jap kept close to the water, to make sure we wouldn't come in under him. He has no guns there and we could tear his belly open with our top turrets. We were both flying so low that a hit on the controls meant the end. There would not be time for anybody to bail out or even get through the escape hatch if we hit the water. This was "git or git got," as they call it out here.

I kept thinking of that and kept wishing that our crew would not be so damned smart every time the Jap got lost. I would say good riddance to him and let him stay lost. It was not only a question of fighting in weather that no pilot in his senses cares to meet, and of stunting and half-rolling and power-diving the big Fortress as if it were one of those BB-size pea shooters meant for such dog fights. It was also a question of trying to remember what Intelligence had said about this spectacular Jap plane, so that we could maneuver our strong points against his weak points—trying to remember where his

guns were, and which of ours were shot out. And the two pilots had to do all this with a sergeant firing two guns right across in front of their eyes.

Lieutenant Spitzer got burned on the legs five times by hot shells, not one of which broke the skin. I don't know just when it happened. Bullets were whizzing and smacking all around us throughout the fight. I remember once he rounded his lips as if howling, but I couldn't hear his voice in all that noise, and he went right back to his guns, so I didn't think any more about it.

Lieutenant Mitchell was hit by fragments from an armor-piercing bullet that buried itself deep in the side of his machine gun and made a smack that could be heard above everything else. We both looked at him frightened. He was standing dazed over the gun, his head bowed and his face stunned and loose-looking. I tried to get to him, but the plane was bucking terribly, and I couldn't move across the few inches of floor without falling. He was trying to balance himself, his head rolling slackly on his neck. Then he tried to work the trigger. No bullets came out and he tried to lift off the top cover to see what was jamming it, but the cover had jammed, too.

I thought he must be all right if he was fussing with the gun. Then, I don't know how long later, I noticed he was standing alongside me. He put his lips close to my ear. "Where am I hit, please?" he asked. His voice sounded very soft.

Blood was coming down his eye and dropping down his neck into the golden hairs of his bare chest. I wiped the blood away with my finger and saw that his wounds were only gashes. "My foot hurts, too," he said. "I can't stand on it." He seemed to think it was bad luck that the only gun in the nose he could work lying down had been shot out.

Twice we passed right over the Jap, so close I could see the jagged bullet holes we had torn in him. I looked apprehensively at the floor, expecting a spew of bullets and cannon shells to come up through it. Then Lieutenant Spitzer shouted, "He's smoking. One of his motors is gone." I could see the propeller windmilling idly.

I looked at my watch and noted the time—1:01—and thought how silly it was to measure such time as we were living through in the standard units of minutes and hours. Such moments as these are timeless things flung out of the ordinary orderliness of the universe.

A moment later Lieutenant Spitzer, who was still working his two guns, shouted, "He's down!" Lieutenant Mitchell was sitting quietly in a corner on a parachute pack. I asked him if he'd like to have a look. There was an aching silence in the nose of the plane. Anyway, it seemed like silence. We had all been deafened.

I helped Lieutenant Mitchell to his feet and held him as we looked at the somber spectacle on the sea below. He was steadying himself against me with one hand and trying to clear the blood out of his eye with the other. Lieutenant Spitzer had dropped his guns and was grinding away on a movie camera to provide headquarters with proof of the kill.

The three of us stood like that in the smother of quiet, pressed against each other, looking out. The Jap was burning like a tanker. There was an oval of flame laid like a blister over a sea as smooth as skin. The orange-red flames rolled up in big, unfurling billows, flapping like a flag into clouds of black smoke.

There must have been acres of flame when we first passed over. In the center lay the Jap plane, skinny and black like the bones of a skeleton. Two small, black objects that could have been men or maybe were just bits of debris were on the edge of the oval. They were either trying to get away from the

flames or maybe just being swirled away by the currents created by the heat.

We circled and came back at 500 feet. The smoke mushroomed high above us. The skeleton of the Jap plane had disappeared completely and flames covered the place where the two black objects had been.

We headed home, a bullet in one motor, two flowering holes as big as derby hats in our wings, uncounted smaller holes, and five guns shot out. The plane, one of the oldest models still in use in this war, had, in weather calculated to hack any ordinary plane apart, done spiral dives, banks past the vertical, and power dives that put us on the edge of blackout. Maybe Rear Admiral John McCain didn't overshoot his landing so much when he called the Fortress the best fighter plane for this part of the world.

On the way back, after we had powdered Lieutenant Mitchell with sulfanilamide and made him as comfortable as we could and had jelled over Lieutenant Spitzer's burns, I wanted music. Music seemed to be the only thing that would do and Lieutenant Thurston obliged over the interphone system, singing a marvelous little song.

And when the war is over, we shall see those spared, returning home, saying: "I am glad I am an American citizen and have been privileged to dare every danger for my country."

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, several times in recent days we have heard Members of the House deplore the fact, if it be a fact, that from the Well some Members indulge in what is referred to as petty politics, and if it would not be presumptuous, most respectfully and humbly, it may be suggested that those who so characterize the speeches or the observations of their colleagues, should give the Members a chart to guide them so that each and every Member of the House might avoid the error of carping political criticism, of indulging in petty political talk. Probably it would be admitted by most, at least, that whatever a Member says from the Well of the House, is by him considered important, otherwise it would not be said. A gentleman sitting on the left here said to me awhile ago, "Why is it that some Members do not stay and listen to me?" He said there were only a few present whenever he talked. My suggestion to him was this, "Why do you not follow the course that I take—talk so often that after a while you get a majority of the Members, because they cannot all stay away all the time." I said to him, "Now, perhaps you may walk out today when I talk, but tomorrow, when another Member from California happens to be here, he will listen to me, and I get him, and the next day another, and so on down the line, and eventually several have listened to me, because they will not feel that they can walk away when there are so few here, because their departure would be so much more noticeable."

Today I heard something well worth while from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], a member of the Labor Committee, who is also chairman of the Committee on Civil Service. He seemed to deplore the fact that the Labor Committee was given the run-around. I, too, deplore that fact,

but I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that the Labor Committee deserves that run-around. I recall that for something like 2 years the Labor Committee has not been doing anything. I can understand why it is that the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the committee charged with legislation having to do with the operation of the War Department, have grown impatient when they find production for the Army and Navy has been hindered and curtailed because of labor troubles.

We all realize that this question of production of food is a vital one, and we all realize that the labor situation raises issues here which must be decided and decided correctly. We can start with the assumption that the Army and the Navy will do their part. We need not worry about them, about those in charge of the fighting end of the war. In the first place, we do not know anything about the fighting or how to do it, and in the second place, we have the utmost confidence not only in the courage but in the ability of those charged with the task of carrying on. So let us just forget for the moment the Army and the Navy, and remember that we have many problems that confront us other than those that have to do with the actual fighting and one of them is this problem of getting the men to perform the work in the factories.

I notice another member of the Labor Committee here, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] told us that there was in prospect a meeting of the Labor Committee, but that committee will not have anything to do, I am afraid, unless it avoids further delay. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] suggests that we should learn what is the underlying cause of a lack of a full measure of production; why it is that, for example, we have absenteeism, and why it is that we have had strikes all through the duration, and why it is that we have a shortage of production. He was correct in stating that we have here no official record made before a committee of Congress showing why we are not getting production as we should, although we have surprised the world with the production we are getting. In my judgment, most Members know why. It goes back to the sit-down strikes which began the last day in December 1936, when certain organizers and labor politicians—do not confuse those gentlemen, with the workers; they are not workers; they are just skimming the cream off the workers' pay checks—when certain organizers and labor politicians took over those factories in Michigan and were sustained in their efforts by the State government in Michigan, and the National Government in Washington, and were permitted to carry on those sit-down strikes. It was then that we started a snowball of carelessness rolling downhill, gaining impetus with every foot it rolled, and from that time on those racketeers and politicians have been in the saddle, and they



are the source of the trouble that we now have.

Here is an article which I will ask the permission of the House to extend in the RECORD, in today's press, an A. P. dispatch. It says at the top, "Admiral says union forced ship walkout." The substance of it is that out in California the unions suspended one man and fined three others because they worked on a Christmas week end in violation of a union order. So the union suspended one and fined three and some of them walked out because of that suspension. Others, it is said, walked out in support of the union. There was a union order punishing men who wanted to work and perform their jobs as usual.

The suggestion I want to make is that the labor committee might look into that, and similar incidents. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] of the majority party—the majority party has control of that committee—are here and I am sure they are greatly worried over the situation. Some of us on the minority side will go along. That committee has not performed its duty in the past. So the Labor Committee, I believe, has become known as the sit-down committee of the House. We just do not function. Now, do we? If I am in error, I hope the gentleman from North Carolina will correct me. I would like to hear what he has to say on that.

Mr. BARDEN. I am just wondering why the gentleman keeps referring to me when the gentleman is on that same sit-down committee and is sitting down for the same reason the gentleman from North Carolina is sitting down. That is because the committee has not been called together and the chairman has not seen fit to put us to work. I do not know that the gentleman from Michigan or myself could do very much about running the committee at all one way or the other until the chairman of the committee calls a meeting of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can agree with what you said except one thing. You said, "Because the chairman has not put us to work." I will go one step further. The chairman has not let us work. The gentleman will accept that correction, will he not? You are not waiting to be put to work any more than I am. You are rarin' to go but you cannot get started because the chairman will not open the door and let us out. She will not call a meeting.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think in all fairness there ought to be a distinction made between last session and this session on that particular point. The gentleman from Michigan knows that the gentleman from New Jersey was quite ill around the first of the year and just came back to the House the middle of this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. Let that show in the RECORD. She has been ill this session; but last session she was around all right. And this year the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK],

the ranking member on that committee, has been here. She was right here, as I recall, as was the gentleman from Georgia, who is the next ranking member, and yet we did not get anywhere. We did not get started.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have introduced several bills which I think would help on this situation, but they have been shifted around, the Labor Committee over to the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee so far has not taken any action on them. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] in his remarks made a moment ago that we should have a hearing on the whole matter, but I fear the action comes too late. I think we are about 3 years late on starting our hearings. But "better late than never," as the saying goes.

If the gentleman can tell me anything I can do to hasten a meeting or get a hearing so that the Labor Committee can get out from under this—would you call it a cloud of distrust, or whatever it is we stand in before the House—the House does not have any use for the Labor Committee. I will be glad to help.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I will say it is true that a great many Members of the House and a great many people in the country have felt that the Labor Committee was not willing to legislate. I think that is an unfortunate situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But true, is it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, there is some justification for it, yes; although not as much as some people would say. We did bring in a bill here in December 1941, and the House rejected it and substituted the Smith bill, which I think was too drastic. If we had passed a more moderate bill, we might have gotten some legislation at that time. But this is a new Congress and a new committee. The Republicans have a larger representation. We have some new Democrats on the committee. The chairman has called a meeting for next Tuesday, and I hope we are going to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad of that and I hope the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from North Carolina—he wanted to know why I referred to him. I referred to him because occasionally when the Labor Committee met I noticed he was familiar with the question of labor legislation and labor conditions and that his views were sound and he wanted to do something—will insist that the Labor Committee do some real work.

Mr. BARDEN. Is the gentleman fussing with me or is he my friend?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, if you do not tell anyone who said it, I will say I am not fussing with you and I am honored to be considered your friend. In my district, where labor is organized, the rank and file pay no attention at all to the so-called leaders. They go along, do their work, pay their taxes and their debts, take care of their families, go to church on Sunday and vote the way they please. The prospect of the Labor Com-

mittee going to work next Tuesday is an encouraging one. Let the Speaker assign to us for consideration some of the bills which have been offered. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I want to discuss for a few minutes a problem confronting this Nation which, I think, is being dealt with in a very inadequate manner. I speak of the food problem. The question is not now one of profit to the farmer; it is a question of food for the Nation.

We may pass orders, rules, and regulations for rationing, but if we have no food the rationing card would provide a rather poor diet. I have just been to the O. P. A. I went down for a conference with Mr. Brown. I have conferred with others in that Department. They are perfectly delightful gentlemen. I do not wish to indict them personally, but I have yet to find a single one of them who can speak the farmer's language or who seems to be familiar with the farmer's problems.

The particular commodity we discussed at the time I called on the Director happened to be Irish potatoes. In one county in my district there are approximately one-half million bags of potatoes produced.

All around this county there are located defense projects. The Department of Labor has been very solicitous of the conditions in those projects, but not one minute's time has been given to trying to solve the problems of the men who are feeding the men who are doing the work.

Up went labor prices. Certainly I am not opposed to improving living standards, living conditions, or increasing wages to a reasonable degree. All my life I have tried to earn more in order that I might be better prepared to take care of my family, and that is the ambition of every honorable man. Yet the wages have gone up until day labor draws, I think now, approximately 80 to 90 cents an hour in some cases. That is all right if the Government wants to pay it, and certainly the man who labors is not to be blamed for trying to get it, but how is a man in that same community going to produce an agricultural commodity with the price fixed on that commodity by the O. P. A. which will not permit him to pay 15 cents an hour? The man who does not have any better sense than to work on one side of the road at 15 cents an hour when he can get 75 cents on the other I doubt has sufficient judgment to be of much use on the farm. To me it is fundamental that if you increase labor cost, then the price of those products of which labor is a part must of necessity be increased in proportion, and that is true whether the product happens to be shoes or potatoes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman has mentioned the price of potatoes. This morning I received a complaint from a farmer that he is having to pay \$6.50 a bag for seed potatoes. Who is receiving that profit?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know, but if the profit is going to the right crowd my guess is that there will not be one word said or one thing done to correct it. They have fixed the minimum price. In other words, the Government will protect the price at \$2.25 per hundred; the maximum price they have fixed at \$2.40. Seed potatoes are selling today in my district for \$7.50 per bag. On last Saturday evening I bought 4 pounds of potatoes and paid 25 cents for them.

I submitted some prices and figures to Mr. Brown. I am going to tell you the frank, honest truth about this and I challenge any man in this House to deny it: Because some organized minorities in this country have called for cheap food at the farmer's expense, the O. P. A. is willing to gamble with the proposition of having enough food and are willing to use the farmer's labor at less than a living wage in order to gratify the desires and demands of those small minorities.

It is not a question of profit to the farmer; I tell you it is a question of food for this country.

One man who for 10 years has planted 300 acres of potatoes told Mr. Brown:

I have cut my crop to 50 acres because I cannot raise potatoes at the price you have fixed and I am going to sell my seed for eating potatoes.

I sometimes wonder if we are not confronting a more serious shortage of common sense than of labor. The young farmers of America are going into the service and answering the draft call unhesitatingly. They are not calling for exemptions, but by permitting them to go we are losing our best food producers and then trying to substitute rationing for production which has resulted in using thousands of men, many of them young men, to handle the program.

Any man worthy of being called a man is willing to make whatever sacrifice necessary to furnish food and comfort for his family, likewise he should be willing to make any sacrifice necessary for the safety and protection of his country—but I am sorry to say there are still too many people in this country who have their eyes more closely fixed on profits, money, shorter hours, less work and more pay than on the American flag and the boys who are defending it.

The average farmer works from 10 to 14 hours per day. If the other 100,000,000 people in America would work the same number of hours per week as the farmers and their helpers, there would not be any labor shortage. Now let someone deny that. I would like to read here a statement made recently in a speech by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker:

If 12 men work 10 hours a day instead of 8, they gain 24 hours—a day and a night. If 12,000,000 men work on the same basis, they gain 1,000,000 days and nights.

Assuming 300 work days to a year, the total gain of those men—in 1 day—is 3,333 work years, the equivalent of 3,333 men working

24 hours a day for a year or 10,000 men working 8 hours a day for a year.

Those figures seem unbelievable—but they are true. Figure it out for yourself. Let the men who are walking out of war production plants at the end of 8 hours of work figure it out.

The most valuable weapon we can develop is time—precious hours and days which will speed production of ships and planes and all the munitions of war. That is the biggest advantage which Germany and Japan had over us—the time to prepare for war.

Time is the essence of our victory. That is why the enemy seeks to war on civilians—to destroy production time.

Men who destroy time by refusing to work are equally as effective in their result as a completely successful air raid by the enemy.

The hideous part of our time destruction is that it is being done by men who call themselves loyal Americans. They do not seem to realize that by their very acts they are putting themselves, their families, their liberty, and freedom in peril.

If they can't understand that, then a way must be found to make them understand. We must gain time.

For minutes are lives—they're falling—brave American boys—soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators—yes; even civilians.

Those men are going to continue to fall, and the sorrow will continue to spread until we do something about it. The longer the war continues, the more boys will fall. That is the story of war. It kills—and kills—and kills.

Can't you see what it all means? Surely we are fighting treacherous, ruthless foes to protect our country, and to preserve our liberty. But every hour of effort, every Defense bond we buy, every bit of material we save, everything we do right now can be measured in lives.

Time—what we do now—that is the important thing. Every day we move closer and closer to victory; every hour we save, yes, every minute we cut from the length of the war, means lives—lives of our American boys—boys who will not be killed because the war will have ended.

What further inspiration do we need to do something about it—now?

And yet the farmer is called upon to produce more with less labor, less machinery at more cost to be sold for less than cost of production in many cases. But you can count on him to do his best. He will not be among those who make the newspaper headlines, by walking out of airplane plants, refusing to work over 40 hours per week or 48 hours per week without double pay, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be too late in just a few days, not a few weeks, it is going to be too late.

The Department of Agriculture is not either directing or influencing the prices fixed. I make that statement after some very careful investigations with the Department of Agriculture. They are taking orders, not giving them.

There is being raised quite a hullabaloo about the solution of the farm labor problem. Some propose to solve it by enlisting about 3,000,000, I think they say, farm laborers from the cities, and then they are going to have the high-school boys and girls help end the farmers' labor problems.

I just want to say this to you gentlemen, that the average farmer down in my district just laughs at any such statement. Necessity has forced him to be a practical man. It takes longer to

train farm workers than it does electric welders. You cannot go out on the streets and pick up just anybody and make a farm worker out of him. I am inclined to think that even the mules would show resentment against any such practice. They just simply would not know which end of a mule to put a bridle on. The farmers are not going to mortgage their homes and borrow money to put seed in the ground on any such assurance as that.

You have heard the story about the rancher who hired a city boy to herd his sheep. The boy was out until way late in the afternoon, in the evening, and even after dark. Finally he came in with the sheep. He went to the house and reported to the man and said: "I did not have much trouble with the sheep, but those lambs were the worst things I ever tried to drive."

The rancher said, "Lambs? I haven't any lambs."

The boy said, "Well, you've got some now; you come out to the barn and look."

So out he went to see the lambs, and found that the city boy had rounded up nine big jack rabbits along with the sheep. This may be a little extreme, but it is not much of an exaggeration of the type of experience they would have if they tried to work entirely with city labor.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman was raised as a farm boy; so was I. From the gentleman's remarks I should assume that these people would not know which end of the mule to put the crupper on.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is about right.

The farmers must have not only trained labor, but equipment. I am not here just fussing; I do not want to be just quarreling. I have talked to North Carolina four times in the last 3 days, spent 3 weeks' time, and have already talked twice today trying to get a piece of tractor equipment for a man to finish planting his crop. I know these O. P. A. and W. P. B. folks are confused, but I think it is high time somebody began to talk some farm sense down there in the department. At this point I want to read a letter from one of my farmers and a card from the company he refers to:

NEW BERN, N. C., February 27, 1943.

HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the farmers of America, have been called on to produce all the foods and other war essentials possible, which we will gladly do; but we must have the necessary farm equipment.

Since my brother was drafted from the farm in May 1942, I had to sell out my service station and return to the farm.

I received my call and reported to Fort Bragg on December 6, 1942, for medical examination, but rejected, due to physical condition.

In my check-up of farm equipment, my truck was in very bad condition (1931 Model A Ford truck) and my tractor tandem harrow was beyond repair, being purchased in 1920.

After filing an application for purchase of a new tractor harrow and two-horse farm



wagon with the county war board on December 10, 1942, I received a certificate for purchase of harrow and wagon on January 8, 1943.

I contacted the McCormick-Deering dealer here, but he didn't have a harrow or wagon in stock. He called by phone to dealers in Washington, Raleigh, and Charlotte, N. C., but couldn't locate either.

A few days later a salesman informed me that he saw a harrow of my description in Fayetteville, N. C. (130 miles). The next day I drove my car, with farm trailer, to Fayetteville, but the harrow had been sold. On my return, I stopped in every town and all farm-equipment dealers in each town, but no luck.

On February 1, 1943, I received a report that I could buy a wagon in Goldsboro, N. C. (70 miles), but the only wagons there were old Army wagons from World War No. 1, without body. It was very necessary that I get a wagon of some kind, as my only other means of hauling on the farm was with my old 1931 Ford truck; therefore I bought a wagon for \$110, without body.

On this same trip I located a tractor harrow, so returned for it the next day.

A few days later I wrote the Hackney Wagon Co., Wilson, N. C., for a wagon body, but received a reply that they were allowed only 25 percent production of their 1940 business. Now lumber is frozen, so I can't buy the necessary lumber to build a wagon body.

Two weeks ago I bought a pair of mules, to make a total of six on my farm, but find it is very difficult to buy harness. Couldn't buy bridles or hames in seven stores in New Bern, so after calling other towns, located bridles in Morehead City (35 miles), and hames in Washington, N. C. (35 miles).

To buy farm equipment is very serious as we get the same answers from all of the dealers: "We have had it ordered from 3 to 6 months," or "the company has gone out of business for the duration."

At this particular time the manufacturers of farm equipment should be forced to make our implements, rather than be cut 75 percent on production.

It is also expensive locating this equipment as I drove my car over 700 miles, and at present it is very necessary that I get a wagon body, and a fertilizer distributor to carry on my farm operations for 1943.

This is a summary of the larger equipment we are in need of, as it would require a book to list the smaller articles that could be necessary in farm operation.

Yours very truly,

JOE D. WILLIAMS.

WILSON, N. C., February 13, 1943.

MR. J. D. WILLIAMS,  
New Bern, N. C.

DEAR SIR: We thank you for your inquiry of the 10th, relative to wagon bodies. Am sorry to have to advise that we are not in position at this time to ship a body. Our quota on them is only 25 percent of 1940 business, which isn't anything like enough to fill the orders we have on hand.

Regretting that we cannot supply your needs at this time, we are

Yours truly,

THE HACKNEY WAGON CO., INC.

The farmers are cutting the potato crops; they are going to cut the next crop. The farmer must have equipment; he must have labor. The average man does not stop to think that the fertilizer for 1 acre of potatoes, which is just a little plot of dirt 70 yards square, costs \$37.50 and the seed costs \$28.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. According to the 1942 figures of the Department of Agriculture and the experiment station of the State College of North Carolina, in actual tests the results showed that an acre of potatoes at the prevailing price of \$1 per bushel, which is only about \$1.75 per hundred, and figuring 15 cents an hour for the preparatory work, not counting other labor which amounted to 87 hours on that 1 acre of potatoes, when they sold the potatoes off that acre they had \$8.29 with which to pay for 87 hours of labor; yet Mr. Brown, in his statement to me, said he used those figures in arriving at the present price of potatoes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Gladly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with the same type of calculations, what do the county agents show, for instance, in the allowance of wages per man-hour and per mule-hour on the cotton crop in that area, for instance?

Mr. BARDEN. I have the figures here, but I do not want to go into that right now because cotton is going to be considered later.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It will show up in the gentleman's statement then?

Mr. BARDEN. I can do that; I have those figures on cotton.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Has the gentleman ever found a county agent who knew what it did cost?

Mr. BARDEN. Before they made chief clerks out of the county agents I found them to be pretty helpful fellows. For 2 or 3 years they have just made them chief clerks in the office. The policy has been changed this year and they are back in the field doing a good piece of work. I cannot quarrel with them now since they are back in the field; but I have done a great deal of talking about them during the 3 years before they went back to their field work.

Getting back to this price-fixing business, I suggested to the Department of Agriculture, one of the higher-ups, that if it was true, as they contended, that such a large percentage of the crop was needed for lend-lease and so many bushels of potatoes were needed for the armed forces, why did they not estimate the number of bushels they were going to need and contract for them at a fair price? That is the way private business would do it.

Here we are lumbering into this season with no assurance of an adequate supply, hoping that the people will raise enough potatoes and enough other commodities to feed not only our country but the world, yet they say, "No; we must not raise the price of potatoes to \$2.50 or \$2.75 per hundred, but we want \$100,000,000 to subsidize it." That does not make sense to me. If the price of \$2.25 and \$2.40 is a fair price, then the subsidy is not needed, and if it is not a fair price, why did they fix the price to be \$2.25 and \$2.40?

What difference does it make if the Government subsidizes the clothes I have on to the extent of \$10? I will get the suit temporarily \$10 cheaper, but in

the long run I will pay back to the Government not only the \$10 they paid on my suit but all handling charges, which will amount to almost \$10. Now, why do we not go ahead and fix these prices and take into consideration the labor cost? I am going to give you the figures furnished me by the Department showing how they arrived at \$2.40 per bag, and in so doing I want to assure you that, in my opinion, the figures are more humorous than informative:

In the case of North Carolina, the pertinent figures are repeated as follows:

	Cents per cwt.
United States parity as estimated for July 1, 1943.....	\$1.92
State-wide farm price differential for North Carolina as compared with United States average.....	+7
Early commercial farm price differential from State average.....	-2
Calculated early commercial parity price equivalent.....	1.97
Calculated normal farm price to f. o. b. price spread.....	.30
Adjusted farm price to f. o. b. price spread.....	.43
Calculated f. o. b. price equivalent to 100 percent of parity.....	2.40

In the case of North Carolina, it is not necessary to adjust the final figure in the smoothing operation.

It would have been much less trouble for them if they had simply added the cost of seed, fertilizer, labor and marketing plus reasonable profit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, why do we not take into consideration this increased labor cost? What is holding it up? Food is worth or should be to the man who eats it what it cost to produce it. This suit of clothes probably cost \$40 and there is not \$5 worth of wool in it, but there is \$35 worth of labor in it. It would be just as reasonable and just as sensible for me to say that the man who put the \$35 worth of labor in this suit should not be paid as it would be to say that the farmer should not be paid for his labor costs in connection with the food he produces.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the statement that unless the policy of the O. P. A. price-fixing department on agricultural crops is changed, you are going to have not only rationing but you are going to be hungry. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a crime of this type if committed should not be investigated by a congressional committee. It ought to be by a grand jury. It is a crime, and I say right now this is such a serious and dangerous problem that I am unwilling to continue to let a group deal with it who have up to this date shown such a total lack of knowledge about the cost and production of agricultural products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House to add just a bit more testimony to the already overwhelming and convincing

evidence that some of these little bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture are not only contributing to a food shortage but through some of their orders and directives are actually wasting food in this country.

After mauling the subject about for some 2 weeks more, the Food Distribution Administration has reaffirmed its arbitrary directive that bakeries must not slice bread. This decision was reportedly reached after consultation with the War Production Board and an advisory committee of bakers supposedly representing the interests of the industry.

Thus the effort is made to lend an appearance of justice and necessity to an order which mounting evidence convinces me is wasteful and injurious. And the single valid excuse for the order offered to date is that it is expected to save paraffin and paper, common bread-wrapping materials. No one objects to any saving in waxed paper which may be necessary, but I, like most people, resent the dictatorial abuse of power which attempts to make this saving indirectly by declaring bread slicing at the bakery to be an unlawful act.

American industry has demonstrated time after time its ingenuity in overcoming obstacles, and I am sure that it can find a way to market sliced bread and still make whatever savings are necessary in waxed paper. What difference does it make, and what business is it of these little dictators how the baking industry meets this problem, just so long as it does manage to effect the required saving in waxed paper? If we are still a free people, I insist that the baking industry be permitted to continue slicing bread if it can contrive to do so within reasonable limitations upon the supply of waxed paper.

In the meantime, the evidence grows that this order is sure to waste food and manpower right at a time when we are dangerously short of both. In fact it is as impractical, wasteful, and harmful as was the practice of the Agriculture Department a few years ago in killing pigs and plowing under cotton, corn, and wheat. One statistician estimates that the waste of bread will average at least 500,000 pounds daily. When restaurants, hotels, and institutions start slicing their own bread March 18, it is conservatively estimated the loss in time is going to run at least a half million man-days per year. And all of this loss is forced upon us for no sensible reason by little dictators who go entirely beyond the spirit and intent of the special authority which Congress has granted. These arbitrary men are apparently unaware of, or indifferent to, the loss they are causing. Worse, they apparently cannot realize how seriously these senseless directives shake the people's confidence in the administration and hamper the war effort. Each unnecessary and ridiculous order adds a little to the people's suspicions and jeopardizes the sound and necessary orders which must have wholehearted support if we are to win the war.

LXXXIX—99

I fully intend to take whatever further means I have at my command to force the withdrawal of this order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I desire to commend the gentleman on the fight that he is making, a very splendid fight, that is causing Nation-wide attention. I may say to the gentleman that I have letters from several bakers in Oklahoma who state that they have already bought their wax paper a year in advance, that on the paper is marked "Sliced," so instead of helping them to sell their bread at the same price it is actually costing them more money because in many instances they cannot buy additional wax paper. May I also say that a few days ago we had former Senator Brown before our committee here in Congress.

I personally raised this question with him and pointed out how impractical it was, and he assured me it would be given consideration. I am hopeful that this order will be rescinded before March 18.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, and I hope he will do something to help us get it rescinded. The gentleman understands that the cost to the baker of slicing bread is practically nothing. The net cost to the baker, as I pointed out here the other day, is about 1 cent per thousand loaves, and it is not claimed that the slicing ban would save anything to the bakers. The only official justification for the order is to save waxed paper. Of course, nobody objects to the saving of waxed paper if we are short of paraffin. But why do they impose the slicing ban because of a shortage of waxed paper. Why do they not leave the problem of wrapping to the industry. Industry has been quite ingenious heretofore in providing substitutes for critical materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. In my judgment, the order was issued by the predecessor of Mr. Brown, Mr. Henderson, for the avowed purpose of making somebody war-conscious, as if the people of the United States were not already war-conscious.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman is in error about who issued the order. The order was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. It came from the office of Mr. Roy Hendrickson, Chief of the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am told it was on the recommendation of Mr. Henderson.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I hope the Members of the House will use their influence with the Department of Agriculture to get rid of this senseless, ridiculous, and unnecessary order and directive.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I desire to state that I intend to support the pending bill, H. R. 2068. This bill makes additional appropriations for the Navy Department and for the naval service. We are engaged in a serious war, and we must win this war. Those in positions of responsibility have determined that the various items contained in this bill are both essential and necessary for the prosecution of this war to victory, and we, who do not have access to that same information, cannot set our personal judgment up against that of the so-called experts on that subject. They have demanded that the various sums of money contained in this bill be secured for the purpose of this war, and they have stated that such additional sums of money are highly necessary now—therefore I will not place my own personal viewpoint against the studied information and considered judgment of those in command.

These are truly serious days in our country. We face tragic days ahead. We will face them as Americans. Whatever may be necessary to win this war—and to win it decisively—the people of this Nation will do. We go forward demanding a complete surrender of the enemies. Nothing short of this will satisfy the people of this Nation. In the end, ours must be an all-out victory—and the peace which must follow most certainly must be a lasting and a permanent peace. That is the wish and the will of all of the people of this Nation.

As these huge appropriation bills come before the House, we are appalled as we read the staggering amounts contained in them. We know—and the generations to come will realize—the tragic cost of this war. That cost is not alone in dollars and cents, but the cost is in the lives and the disabilities suffered by our boys who are at the battle front. The casualty lists are coming in with a startling regularity, and the people—some of them—are thinking seriously of the terrible ravages of this war. May I say that a vast majority of the people are thinking seriously of these tragic losses. They are appalling, and they are frightful. As we view these losses, today, we contemplate the views of some groups in this country who, regardless of this war, and regardless of our serious situation at the moment, would seek to inject the thought of personal gain—who would seek to retain advantages heretofore obtained—who would forget the war, and the victory which must come to us, for the glory of personal aggrandizement. This is not the time to inject personal gains or selfish interests into our governmental policies; this is the time to do whatever may be necessary to win this war—this is the time to forget personal interests and think of national interests; this is the time when all Americans must forget any and every selfish motive and plan, and get behind the war effort with vim and vigor; this is the time when we must fight to retain our country, our form of government,



our liberty and freedom, and our opportunity to go forward as free men after this awful carnage is over.

So, Mr. Chairman, whatever the demand may be to win a complete victory in this war—the American people will do it—if it is necessary, and if it will lend aid to a speedy and complete victory. But those things which are not essential to our speedy victory, in this war, should not be demanded of our people. The people are burdened with almost every form of rationing—they have faced the ravages of priorities of every kind—they are facing the payment of taxes of unprecedented proportions—they are buying bonds and they are purchasing stamps—they are contributing to the Red Cross, and every other agency for the relief and entertainment of our soldiers; and they are not complaining. Whatever is necessary for our victory in this war, and for a speedy and complete victory therein, they will do. They want their money spent wisely and judiciously, and they want \$1 in value for every dollar that is spent. The people know what is transpiring in this war effort, and they know there is a frightful waste involved in it. They want that waste stopped, and they want all extravagance to come to an end. They want the money they are providing to be used to win this war, and they want the leaks stopped.

So, Mr. Chairman, as we debate this highly important measure, let us not forget the people of this Nation. They are appealing to us to win this war, to stop the waste, to forget selfishness, to go forward as a united people in our all-out effort to save our Nation, and to preserve liberty and freedom forever.

Lest we forget the intimate relations that each one bears to the fighting men at the front—let us stand firm, as a people, resolved to give all, and do all, to win this war; that we will back up our fighting men without any omission; that we will go forward as a united people to accomplish that result. With this resolution on our part we will win this war speedily and decisively, and we will save the United States of America.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, Judge Robert R. Lewis, of Coudersport, Potter County, Pa., has advised me that Potter County is one of the outstanding potato-growing counties of Pennsylvania and has accepted the challenge of the Department of Agriculture to grow more potatoes.

They had a crop last year of more than a million and a half bushels but they are on record to produce two and a half million bushels this year, or a 40-percent increase, providing, they are able to secure through the War Production Board the necessary equipment to do the job which they have been unable to secure, although all of the necessary equipment to increase production is available at the present time.

Time is essential; but the dilatory tactics of bureaucracy are impeding honest American farm efforts to increase our food production.

The American farmer and the American businessman have for the past several years been the test tube for the scientific research theorists who are experimenting on them to discover a formula by which Utopia might be found. Even though they know that we are in the midst of an all-out war with our American boys being sacrificed in the springtime of their lives at Bataan, Corregidor, north Africa, on the high seas, and in the air, bureaucracy continues to issue the directive orders, as they are called, without any thought as to the consequences, the disturbance, and the confusion they might cause the war effort. The only war they know of is the war for social reform.

They try a little of this by directive order and if that does not work on us American guinea pigs, they try a little of that, and if that does not work they go into a huddle between the different boards, divisions, and departments, and they issue another directive order which just about strangles the patient.

Bureaucracy, even with this all-out war, must continue its social reform, even if it kills off the American farmer and businessman and breaks the Nation.

The Congress points out that the laws are clear as to what the departments can or cannot do, but little or no attention has been paid to laws in the last several years because they have been given a free hand and have become so drunk with power that they would try anything; and what is more they get away with it, running hog-wild without any interference in their efforts to remake America and revolutionize the agricultural and industrial life with but one thought, to regiment the farmer and businessman in a planned program they feel would be good for him and the boys when the boys are back from World War No. 2.

It is almost unbelievable; recently I have been attending hearings of the Agricultural Committee, listening to the interrogations and answers, and from the testimony given this whole bureaucratic set-up just does not make sense.

Food, food, and more food to win the war is the cry in Washington. Bureaucracy sat down to figure out a way to confuse and conflict and muddle up the American farmer with directive orders that the farmer, the food packer, the canner, the container manufacturer or anyone else knows what to do or what it is all about with the result that the growing season is almost upon us and in many places under way and the theorists in the Department of Agriculture are still playing around unwilling to cut out the crackpot stuff that is hampering the war effort to produce the food to keep our boys on the fighting fronts and home fronts to do the job of winning the war.

The businessman is crying to the high heavens for relief. He patiently sits around by the hour; he waits and waits, and after several weeks of waiting and going from one department to another some young smart mind tells him he is sorry but it cannot be done. The businessman is enraged; action is what he wants and if any body of men can give

him relief it will be the Congress reasserting its prerogatives and restoring the country back into the hands of the people, where it belongs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, a visitor to the House of Representatives during the last 2 months would scarcely realize that we are at war. He might have heard statements to that effect in addresses on the floor dropped almost as an afterthought by the Members in their discussion of their more serious concerns. He certainly could not have believed from the discussions that we are in the greatest and most terrible war of our existence—a total war in which the stake is our national life. A war which is being prosecuted by our enemies with a malignance and a desperation which leaves us no choice except a shameful defeat or a complete destruction of their armies. He would think that this Congress, whose function it is to guide the destinies of this great American Republic, had much more important matters before it than the decision as to whether we should live or perish.

In the last 2 months a visitor would have listened day after day to our Representatives bitterly attack the Executive appointees whose duty it is to administer our wartime economy, accusing them of being despotic, impractical, and subversive of our constitutional form of Government. He would have seen the House of Representatives debate for 2 days, while our armies were crashing desperately with the Nazis in North Africa and while the Russians were rolling their gigantic offense against the German line, as to whether or not a Negro who was helping to sell War bonds was formerly affiliated with the Communist Party. He would have listened to speeches about the restrictive effect of O. P. A. regulations upon businessmen, to representatives of farm groups trying to crack the ceiling on food prices and to all the old familiar attacks upon organized labor in which the few slackers were held up as typical of the entire loyal and hard working class, and all the while our young soldiers were facing enemy fire on the far-flung battlefields of the war.

But most of all he would have heard the word bureaucrat and uttered in the same breath the words Communist and crackpot. These names reiterated so often and with so much bitterness that he would think the great battle of the century was not against the Nazis and the Japs but against those public office holders who were appointed by our President. In all these speeches against administrative abuses was a rancor against President Roosevelt which usually satisfied itself with an attack upon his subordinates but which sometimes indeed did not even attempt concealment of its real object. Generally these foes of the President welcomed disaffected Democrats in their ranks and in each measure that was before the House shrewdly appealed to one segment after another in the Democratic Party. They took advantage of the overconfidence and the slackness

which had temporarily overcome the Democrats by reason of their large majorities in the past.

These gentlemen made no attempt to differentiate between the good and bad of the New Deal. Everything that was wrong. All the legislation which had been studied so patiently and built up with so much effort over the past 10 years must be repealed or drastically curtailed. They refused to appropriate money for the War Manpower Commission. The Government departments, including the War Department, were deprived of the right of free use of the mails. The Post War Planning Commission, headed by the President's uncle, was refused its appropriation. So recklessly did these gentlemen proceed that Senator TART, a Republican stalwart, bade them to pause lest they impede the ordinary processes of government.

All this must have been bewildering to this visitor of whom I speak and completely past all understanding unless he should be sufficiently literate in American politics to know and to remember that America again elects a President in November 1944. He should keep in mind while considering the events of the last 2 months that the foes of Roosevelt are also not forgetful of the importance of this election. They are planning now in 1943 the grand strategy of the campaign—that the issue is Democratic bureaucracy, and they do not intend to let a day pass without showing up its shortcomings. If this be remembered, the sound and fury so unintelligible at first then acquires a meaning and a significance. The constant exasperated criticism of minor officials becomes important to him as he understands how all these details fit into the grand campaign of 1944. We learn from our enemies that if a statement, be it true or false, is repeated often enough the people will believe it. It is by this repetition, this constant criticism, these gentlemen hope that the voters of America will lose faith in the Democratic Party and elect a Republican President.

I am wondering all the while about the effect of these tactics upon our national morale and upon the winning of the war. I am wondering whether or not these attempts to cause people to lose faith in the Democratic Party do not go further than perhaps they are intended and shake their faith in the Democratic process. If this be the case then these gentlemen are paying too great a price for political success. I feel certain that every Member of the House is an American before he is a Republican or a Democrat and that every gentleman wishes most earnestly to reach a successful conclusion of this war although at times some of us might lose sight of this objective in the pursuit of less important goals.

I am also perturbed as to the effect of our conduct upon the prestige of our country abroad. This is an age of dictators and, for this reason, we know foreign countries almost entirely by the actions and statements of their leaders. We think of Germany and we inevitably think of Hitler. Russia means Stalin to

us, and China, Chiang Kai-shek. Even the democratic countries, England and America, are identified in the public mind chiefly with the figures of Churchill and Roosevelt. Any legislative defeat, therefore, even any campaign of criticism, must cause our allies and enemies both to question whether or not our Commander in Chief has the American people behind him in the prosecution of the war. This fact, perhaps unfortunate, but nevertheless true, has been brought home to me lately in recent conversations which I have had with those from other countries. There is the fear abroad that America will not fight this war through to the finish and will not stick to its avowed task of writing a decent and durable peace. Many of these people feel that there is a latent isolationism in America which might show itself when events are either too bright or too dismal abroad. This suspicion might well injure our effectiveness both in fighting the war and in bargaining at the peace table for our own future security. These debates of ours, however innocent the intent and however small the issue, cannot help but bring satisfaction to our enemies and confusion to our allies.

We have a two-party system in America with all its virtues and disadvantages. I think that in times of peace when we are secure from foreign foes this system provides an admirable vehicle for the expression of public will. We present at election time an issue simply and squarely to the people. Our voters are asked, "Do you like the manner in which you have been governed?" If the answer be "Yes," the same party is returned. If they are dissatisfied then with a great voice they throw the incumbents out. In America we are used to this way of doing things, and the people take our partisanship not too seriously. They realize there are good and bad in both parties and that most of our great figures are merely trying to do a decent job of government.

But we know the situation is different today. Our two-party system of government is facing a tremendous task. In despotic governments there is no place for a difference in policy or even for criticism of the party in power. In warfare such governments concentrate their entire peoples—both civil and military—and their entire economy for the winning of the war. It is with such governments that we are embattled to death and to defeat them we must concentrate our entire economy and the entire efforts of our people. These nations plan secretly and strike swiftly. We must be equally resolute and united. I am afraid that we are facing this war with a divided people. I know we are facing it with a divided House. It is idle to say that we are united in foreign affairs and divided in domestic affairs. In total war there is no distinction between domestic and foreign affairs.

All our wealth, all our manpower, and all our energy must be concentrated upon victory.

This situation places a great responsibility upon both the majority and mi-

nority parties. Upon the majority it places the duty of self-criticism and a frequent examination of conscience. I think we in the majority have been remiss in allowing our mushroom bureaucracy to get beyond our control. As we passed from a free economy to a war economy it was inevitable that our administrative staff must rapidly expand. But we as a party must join with sincere elements of the minority to attempt to control its growth and keep it in proportion with our national needs. We must insist, however, that these agencies, even though they may at times perform their work badly, are necessary to our national effort. Our aim should be to correct and not to destroy. If a bureaucrat is a bad servant then let us dismiss him, but we must remember at the same time that another bureaucrat must take his place. We must not, in attempting to prune the branches of our Government, strike at the vital trunk of the tree. This is just one of our obligations to our country.

The minority party has a more difficult responsibility. It must, while properly aspiring for success in the forthcoming election, control its political zeal so that in advancing the cause of its party it do no injury to the Nation. This line is rather fine and hard to draw. It must be drawn, however, if we in the House wish to do our utmost in our legislative duties as our soldiers are doing in a far more dangerous capacity. There are many members of the minority who have constantly tried to do this and I wish to commend them for their patriotism. There are others, however, and I fear that they may be in the ascendancy, who are so politically zealous that they are unmindful of their country's peril and of our great need for unity.

I would profess only a portion of my political faith if I did not testify at this time to my admiration and devotion to the genius and gallantry of our great Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt. I have been a consistent follower of his peacetime policies, except as to a minor few upon which I have been in disagreement. It is not my purpose to discuss these policies today. Many sincere Americans have differed with them. I wish to speak rather of his great leadership in war, of his resoluteness and sagacity. While Hitler shouted his hate by radio from Berchtesgaden and chilled the blood of the world, two brave gentlemen, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, laughed at his pretensions and at his threats. When Japan struck treacherously while our State Department tried to preserve our peaceful relations and by this treacherous blow paralyzed our Pacific Fleet, our leader was not dismayed. Rallying his people behind him, he held our ocean outposts until we could consolidate our defenses and with energy, astuteness, and high bravery has started us on our great offensive which must terminate in the streets of Tokyo. None of our great wartime Presidents have been immune to criticism. Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson all were castigated by certain of their contemporaries, but with the passage of time, after the domestic issues of the day had passed



into insignificance and the cold, appraising eye of history looked in retrospect upon what had gone before, these men have stood out like giants in our national life and their critics' names are unremembered.

I feel confident that in the history of the future our President will be judged of a stature equal to those great men of whom I have spoken.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. It is a logical and timely address. I, too, feel as the gentleman seems to indicate, that although we have had a lot of talk here about adjourning politics, there has nevertheless been a lot of sniping at the administration's conduct of this war. Yes; we have had blundering by governmental agents but I wonder if some of these slaps at so-called bureaucrats are not slaps at the administration for a political purpose.

I recognize the fact, as the gentleman has said, that every great President in wartime has had his critics. In searching American history I find, too, that this body, Congress, has sometimes fiercely opposed the President as, for instance, following the Civil War, Lincoln; following the First World War, Wilson; and now in this war, Roosevelt. It seems during war to be the part of wisdom for the President to lead but when the danger lessens, the Congress wants to reassert itself and possibly with a vengeance.

I call attention to the fact, however, that when the swing of the pendulum came, usually after the war—after victory had been won—all the hate and venom that was the outgrowth of that struggle did not do the country any good. Lincoln was a martyr to it, Wilson was a victim of it, and Roosevelt is an object of it today. I think we would be wise indeed to watch our step to see that our pride and prejudice do not hamper the war effort and thus prevent the total and complete victory which all of us must desire.

I compliment the gentleman on the splendid presentation he has made.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, while a passenger on one of the Capital Transit Co. busses the other day I noticed a woman "breaking in" as an operator. It impressed me. It was symbolic of the way the women of America have come forward to take the places of men in essential industries during this emergency. I use the word "essential" without reservation, but think perhaps a stronger word to express the necessity of the local transit company's activities in Washington's war effort is better described as vital.

One does not need an active imagination to picture what would happen here if the bus and trolley lines were to stop

operation for 24 hours. Thousands of Government workers, so necessary to keeping the wheels of the Government turning, hundreds of key men upon whom the boys on our fighting fronts are depending for decisions, for supplies, and matériel, would be stranded. A day's work lost in the War Department, the Navy Department, and the other Government agencies would set back the war effort for days and possibly weeks. The transit lines of this city are the most important home front that I can think of at this moment.

I take this time to point out these things, Mr. Chairman, only because I feel very strongly that everything must be done within our means to encourage the personnel of the local transit company to continue to do a good job. To do that job they must have a peace of mind in the knowledge that there is no doubt that they are in an industry essential to the war effort. They are not going to have that peace of mind if we are going to take "pot shots" at them.

I went to the trouble, after seeing the woman "breaking in" as an operator of a bus, to inquire as to the state of the manpower situation of the local transit company. I did so because I realized that if women are taking the place of men on the city's busses and streetcars, their manpower must be draining off to the armed services.

I found that close to 700 of the Capital Transit Co.'s employees are in the armed services today. These men either enlisted or were drafted. Of the 2,924 employees actually engaged in the operation of the company's streetcars and busses, only a few are under 30 years of age and have been temporarily deferred for occupational or dependency reasons. What concerns me is how this company is going to continue to operate its streetcars and busses if the draft officials continue to take more of their employees, because a few people refuse to understand the seriousness of the situation and what might happen if more of the Capital Transit Co.'s manpower is drained.

I have noticed that the Capital Transit Co. has been advertising in the newspapers for help. I think that company deserves our commendation on the character of this advertising and for its obvious cooperation with the War Manpower Commission in attracting and absorbing into work declared essential those in Washington who are now engaged in an activity nonessential to the war effort. The company offers an opening to those people who are faced with the need of getting into an essential job because of the work-or-fight order. I am assured the Capital Transit Co. is also a great help to the United States Employment Service in placing workers who want to do their share in helping to win this war.

From the information I have been able to obtain, the company is short upward of 600 full-time operators to maintain its schedules. It is attempting to make up this shortage by recruiting full and part-time employees. There are part-time workers, men and women, now in

training to make up some of the shortage, but the recruiting program is slow, and training is long. Not everyone who applies is physically able to assume the responsibility for the safety of hundreds of lives entrusted to their care every day, nor have they the other necessary qualifications successfully to handle the war workers who ride the vehicles of the Capital Transit Co. in the morning and evening rush hours.

It seems that almost as fast as the company trains its men the armed forces or other industries take them. This condition should be stopped and stopped immediately. During 1942, the year just ended, the Capital Transit Co. trained 1,171 streetcar and bus operators. Of these 976 were full-time employees and about 195 were part-time employees. The company is using part-time employees during the rush hours to supplement its regular service. Part-time work should appeal to Government employees in Washington who find themselves with nothing to do after, or just before, they start their regular work. Government employees who so desire can get themselves jobs driving streetcars and busses during their off hours and not only supplement their present incomes but also further aid the war effort. It is not too hard, and, as I understand it, they are paid while they are in training.

In the last year the Capital Transit Co. lost as many men as it trained. This is a terrific turn-over. Local transportation has been declared by the National Selective Service System to be an essential industry. Last September it issued Occupational Bulletin 21, stating that the one-man streetcar and bus operators in highly congested defense areas where local transportation facilities are overtaxed should be given consideration by local draft boards. In asking for deferment for some of its employees the Capital Transit Co., I have been assured, did not ask for preferential treatment, but merely called the attention of the local draft boards to the essentiality of its service already mentioned by the occupational bulletin issued by the Selective Service System.

For the past year, from the information I obtained from the company, it has not hired, nor is it willing to hire now, any man whose status in the draft subjects him to being called into service. It hires only men in 3-A or higher classifications for streetcar or bus operators, or other deferrable jobs. It costs several hundred dollars to train each man and it would be poor business to train men who may go into the Army.

Of the 2,900 operators the company now has, approximately 1,500 are within the age group and within the dependency group of those having wives, children, and others dependent on them for support that would make them likely to be called into service ultimately. Five hundred of these are likely to be called into the service in the near future. These 500 individuals are between the ages of 21 and 38 and are single, with collateral dependents only, or married and have no children. Of the remaining number, approximately 1,000 are married and have

children. About 1,400 others are over the age of 38 years.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Capital Transit Co. needs the encouragement and the cooperation of all Members of this House. As Representatives of the people, we should be alive to the grave manpower shortage that now confronts the Capital Transit Co., and render it every possible assistance. At the present time I learn from operating officials of the company there are between 100 and 150 streetcars and busses left standing in the barns and in bus garages each morning because of the lack of operators to take them on the streets. That is one of the principal reasons for the crowded conditions on the streetcars and busses during rush hours. Are we going to stand by and permit this condition to exist without rendering aid when every piece of available equipment is needed to carry the war workers to and from their jobs? We should all help the transit company to obtain, or at least retain those employees that they have, and none of us should sabotage their effort to provide the city of Washington with adequate transportation facilities.

It requires at least 4 weeks to train a man or a woman to operate a streetcar or bus, all things being equal. They must pass a physical examination and be so constituted that they can deal with the public. The company must necessarily be careful in its selection of employees. It cannot take everyone. After employees have completed their training they are made fully responsible for the carrying of hundreds of people daily. They have our lives and their lives in their hands at all hours of the day and night. The employees of the transit company carry more than 1,250,000 people every day within the District and surrounding suburbs.

Mr. Chairman, for your information, I would like to present these few mathematical facts which I have been able to gather so that you may have something to think about and, perhaps, something more to worry about.

At the end of last year the Capital Transit Co. had approximately 2,924 full- and part-time employees engaged in the operation of streetcars and busses. Of this number there are approximately 1,500 full-time operators available for service under the Selective Service Act. If these men go into the armed services the company will be short more than one-half of its full-time streetcar and bus operators. Think of what that will mean to Washington, with no available replacements.

Let me impress you with the importance of our local transit service as it has impressed me. Let us not depress those employees now in the service of the local transit company with "scare" headlines about the transit company not being essential to the war effort, or scare individual employees by pointing them out as being individuals who should be in the armed services. Let us help local transit officials where we can to retain those employees they now have and recruit others from those Government em-

ployees who now have the time to work part time as streetcar and bus operators.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I trust that many Members of the House will find time to read the February issue of *Factory Management and Maintenance* on *How to Reduce Absenteeism*. This article is a case history of how absenteeism was reduced by more than half in 9 weeks' time through the free cooperation of labor and management in a single plant.

It was found that the causes of absenteeism among women workers were fatigue, poor housing, lack of time to do shopping, visiting back home with their families, and sickness.

Better health facilities were provided, a recreational center was established, full information on absenteeism in each department was made public. Rivalry among plant departments and plant divisions was employed to reduce absenteeism, and every effort was made to bring home to the workers and to management the critical importance of the work being done in the plant.

In 9 weeks absenteeism was reduced by more than half.

This experience demonstrates the intelligent way to reduce absenteeism by removing its causes with the cooperation of management and labor.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read to the bottom of page 1.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAMSPECK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2068, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] may extend his remarks in the *RECORD* and include a statement issued by the National League of Women Voters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] have permission to include in his remarks made today a speech made on February 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] be permitted to extend his remarks made this afternoon and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include an editorial from the *New Haven Register*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks and include an address by Col. Robert R. McCormick on *The Fate of the Republic*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. February 26, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include a statement by Mr. A. G. Cox, of the University of Texas, on the subject *The Cotton Surplus, a Fact or Fancy*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the *RECORD*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the *Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia* entitled "*The Ruml Plan in Canada*."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the *RECORD* and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. BOREN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the *RECORD*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARE, for Friday, March 5, on account of important business.



To Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, for 1 week, commencing March 5, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, March 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on H. R. 1880, a bill providing for the construction of a ship canal across the State of New Jersey, connecting New York Bay with the Delaware River, and forming the last link in the Intracoastal Waterway from Boston to the Mexican border.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on bridges of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 877, to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

You are hereby advised that the hearing on H. R. 134, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes, which was previously scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 1943, has been postponed until Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 10 a. m.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

219. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers

recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

220. A letter from the secretary of the American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

221. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

222. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill which would extend the date set forth in the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 755), for repayment to the Crow Indian Tribe of the revolving fund established by that act, and would authorize an increase in the amount of the fund; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

223. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

224. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize travel on ships at next higher available first-class rate when accommodations at the lowest first-class rate are not available; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. S. 660. A bill to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 83. Resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed; with an amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2076. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 2077. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2078. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, relating to the definition of the term "security" contained therein; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2079. A bill to provide Spanish War veterans wartime pension rates for service-connected disability or death of certain veterans of the Spanish-American War recognized by Veterans Regulations as "veterans of any war," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2080. A bill to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2081. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, so as to make insurance under such act available to merchant seamen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2082. A bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2083. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2084. A bill to extend the status of veterans of the World War to persons enrolled or enlisted and serving on United States Shipping Board vessels during the World War in war zones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 2085. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2086. A bill to authorize refunding to the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota certain moneys heretofore appropriated and expended out of the principal funds of said Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2087. A bill to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 147. Resolution requesting Henry Jensen, Tom Fitzsimmons, and John Adams Carpenter to address a joint session of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 148. Resolution authorizing the Labor Committee to investigate labor conditions, labor and employer practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation relative to the cancellation of seed and feed loans prior to 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps in regard to milk shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to end the colonial system of govern-

ment and to decide democratically the permanent political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, declaring to the President and the Congress of the United States that the majority of the people of Puerto Rico have and do support Guy Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation relative to social security to all, including the military forces of our country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate all activities and practices of the Rent Section of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relating to reviews by United States district courts of decisions by Federal boards, commissions, and other agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of John Rhoden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Jennie Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of C. N. Bunds, of Winchester, Kans., by reason of certain claims arising within the World War period; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2092. A bill granting an increase of pension to William E. McIntosh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of Ray L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Rounie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of Robert Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2096. A bill for the relief of Dominick LeRose; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. R. 2097. A bill for the relief of W. J. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

219. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolutions passed by the Greater Buffalo Associated Meat Industry, having to do with price ceilings and black-marketing conditions in the meat industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

220. By Miss STANLEY: Petition of residents of the Bronx, N. Y., urging Congress (1) to appropriate adequate funds for Office of Price Administration enforcement of price-control regulations; (2) to subsidize the pro-

duction of basic commodities whose costs are increased by the war, so that the price ceilings will remain stable, (3) to restore and extend the food-stamp plan for needy families, so that a well-nourished America may produce for victory at peak strength; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

221. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, specialist in management and statistical control, petitioning consideration of a resolution with reference to United States Army Air Corps against Francis Jean Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1943

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

O God, our shelter from the stormy blast and our eternal home, in the stillness may we grow more sure of Thee. If for any of us duty has lost its high solemnity, if the fires of devotion and a sense of the unseen have burned to faint embers because altar fires have been untended, kindle a flame of sacred love in these cold hearts of ours. If the peril that walketh at life's noonday has spoiled the splendor of ideals that once lured us to far horizons, if our fairest dreams have turned to dust, if tinted morning glories have faded with the scorching rays of the ascending sun, may our jaded souls be restored; may we find at the renewing altar of Thy mercy oil of joy for sadness and beauty for ashes. So may our thought grow reverent again, so may the trivial round be transfigured with an inner light as, with common bushes on fire with Thee, daily duties become sacraments of service and love. We ask it through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 26, 1943:

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; and

S. 418. An act for the relief of Howard M. Sandus.

On March 1, 1943:

S. 167. An act for the relief of Charles F. Negel.

On March 2, 1943:

S. 493. An act for the relief of Emilliano Lopez and Eliza R. Lopez; and

S. 707. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the 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.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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. 739. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places."

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR FRANK C. PARTRIDGE, OF VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, Hon. Frank C. Partridge, of Proctor, Vt., passed away on March 2 after a brief illness.

The American public, including the Congress of the United States, has suffered a loss by the termination of the life of this great public servant.

He was a Senator of the United States in 1930-31. He was my predecessor.

His long and distinguished public service included his being secretary to the Secretary of War, Solicitor of the Department of State, Minister to Venezuela, consul general at Tangier, member of the Vermont State Senate, chairman commission to propose amendments to the Vermont constitution; he rewrote consular regulations; was appointed umpire British-Venezuela Claims Commission and Netherlands-Venezuela Claims Commission, but was unable to serve; was delegate of the United States to the Fifth Pan American Conference at Santiago, Chile, member executive council, American Society of International Law, member New England Council, president Vermont Flood Credit Corporation.

Vermont holds his memory in highest esteem. He was president for many years of one of the basic industries of our State, the Vermont Marble Co., and at the time of his death was chairman of the board of the Vermont Marble Co., as well as a senior director of the National Life Insurance Co.

He was an active supporter of our churches, colleges, schools, and eleemosynary institutions, and was an inspiring example of good citizenship.

He was a man of high ideals, and he had the courage to fight for them. His memory will be kept fresh by the enduring effect of his good life and works.

We share with his family and his intimate friends a great sorrow, and we extend to them our deep sympathy.