subdivisions and governmental agencies for the revenue derived from the taxes upon the real property so acquired by the Federal Government, which action endorsed House bill 1086, by Congressman Zerren, providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for Federal 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 and give Thee thanks.

We pray that the sufferings of war may not be forgotten; that the memories of world offerings 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 great 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 the remarks of the House 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. Belle, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Magnuson asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a letter, and in the other to include an editorial.

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.

The SPEAKER.

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 these young men had been given their 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 glasses. How he got in the air service was something of a mystery. He completed his training at Issoudon, France. The rest of his class was ordered to the front, but his name was not on the list. He went to him 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 Commoner of Corinth, Miss. (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 these young men had been given their 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 glasses. How he got in the air service was something of a mystery. He completed his training at Issoudon, France. The rest of his class was ordered to the front, but his name was not on the list. He went to him 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 Commoner of Corinth, Miss. (Mr. Van Zandt may extend his own remarks in the Record.)

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Mississippi (Mr. Rankin)?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN addresses 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 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. SHAPER. 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. SHAPER]? There was no objection.

Mr. SHAPER. 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.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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.

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. 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.
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. Dougherty, 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. FLORES] 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 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 subject 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. DWORSCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSCHAK. 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 to alleviate has ceased to exist; 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 fiscal year of 1942, expended $5,660,400,000 of which $219,100,000 was for administrative expense; and

Whereas the fiscal year of 1943 the total administrative expense for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was $4,996,872; 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 money results from the taking 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 better 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, that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho, do concur in the request of the President of the Senate, that we recommend to the Congress of the United States that it be respectfully requested that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho be permitted to amend and 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 attesting to the fact that I received an un­

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters 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.

Mr. DWORSCHAK. 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 to alleviate has ceased to exist; 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, 1942, to June 30, 1943, expended $5,660,400,000 of which $219,100,000 was for administrative expense; and

Whereas during the fiscal year of 1942 the total administrative expense for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was $4,996,872; and

Whereas the fiscal year of 1943 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 money results from the taking 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 better 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, that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho, do concur in the request of the President of the Senate, that we recommend to the Congress of the United States that it be respectfully requested that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho be permitted to amend and 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 attest­
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 appropriations bill H. R. 2669, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. SHEPHERD. 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, that is on appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dittre). I am sure that the Members present join in felicitating the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dittre) and in congratulating 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 you yield?

Mr. SHEPHERD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. All Members of the House join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on naval affairs in 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. SHEPHERD. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dittre), 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 in charge of the naval appropriation bill of the distinguished new chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. Shephard). 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. SHEPHERD. I thank the gentleman most kindly.

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

Mr. SHEPHERD. 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. Dittre) on his anniversary.

Mr. SHEPHERD. 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 of this size. I am trying very hard 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 depend upon the your suggestion 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 from Washington (Mr. Crippen), 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 my friends on the committee, the men who have worked with me, the gentlemen from Vermont (Mr. Pumley), one of the minority members of the committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Nosib J. Johnson), another member of the committee, for the fine and splendid cooperation those gentlemen have given in the handling of this 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 us.

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

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

The bill will bring to you today very large expenditures, and I hope two concepts are kept in mind. One is that 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 say it. 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 the Navy's part in the present war has usually to be increased many, many fold, which will entail a far heavier expense for maintenance and operation than we have experienced 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 fix the shore establishment requirements at home and overseas, they dictate the maintenance, operation, and repair bills.

This measure makes provision for an existing force of 2,000,000. By the end of the next fiscal year we are told that the strength will need to be 2,300,000. 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, 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 the sense of the word. The Navy's part in it, I should say, has been infinitesimal compared with that which lies ahead. So, Mr. Chairman, that consideration of the estimate for naval expenditures must be one of wholehearted support of the judgment of those upon whom we must rely to achieve victory.

We may be confident 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 fiscal year, in which rectification may be made.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget estimates upon which the House has based the additional appropriations for the current fiscal year, and 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 provision is made subject to that authorization becoming law.

The committee has made reductions in the Naval Research Laboratory estimates, namely, in the $4,000,000,000, and reduced the contractual authority of the Naval Public Works bill by $400,000,000.

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. It is itemized at the bottom of page 6 of our report.

This really is a great institution, and it touches practically the whole 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 the 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 resources. We had before us a report of a study, made 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 we would give an indemnity of a certain sum to the largest land holder, the Standard Oil Co. of California, would thereby 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, I feel that the whole matter should be thoroughly investigated by disinterested parties, because, very frankly, I question whether the money 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 estimates show a total of $4,813,340,000. 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, $4,813,340,000, is intended for equipment and alterations necessary to prepare 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 to which the trainees will be sent will be made through competitive examination. As to procurement of equipment and alterations has been estimated as $177,10.

In the next fiscal year, of course, we shall meet with the student cost, and we have been told that we may expect an increase we are asked to accommodate.

That 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. It is something we must provide, if we wish 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.

Independently of the college training program is a large program for preparing new officer pilot material. This is needed under 19 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 running 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 six locations. Next they will be processed through primary and secondary C. A. A. courses, covering about 16 weeks. Then they will undertake pre-flight training, and finally, 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 bill will include provision for a force of 2,500,000 or possibly more by the end of June 1944. In anticipation of that increase we are asked to appropriate now for the clothing outfits for that purpose.

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 when they do not require further legislative authorization.

Before recommending the full amount for clothing, I should like to call your attention to the fiscal year, to have sufficient time to analyze the operating force plan; and, so we are recommending for the present but $1,250,000,000 of the $157,240,000 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 special attention. The House on February 23 passed a new naval public works authorization bill, H. R. 1692, which provides to cost total of $1,250,007,000. That bill passed the House unanimously.

We had before us for consideration a supplemental estimate of $250,000,000 of the construction authority to get that program under way, accompanied with a break-down of the projects, and I may say that they touched 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
officers on duty with the Coast Guard, the Act provision was included, at the this district can cover several plants in selective service, obviously this limitation to the Corps to instance of the Department, limiting the time of inspectors of naval forces to official stations. I would like to comment upon some relatively minor provisions of a legislative character of fiscal year duration. On page 2, 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. 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, 50,000. Since the bulk of additional men must now come through selective service, obviously this limitation should be lifted.

No. 4. The 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 relates to the Army and Navy of the Navy of the San Francisco, I want to impress upon you this thought—we are not appropriating any money for the program—we merely are authorizing the Navy to go ahead, and we believe that the bulk of the work will be done under way, subject specifically, mark you, to the final enactment of the authorizing legislation.

All of the projects embraced by the plan proposed has the endorsement of the very efficient and capable Navy budget officer, Rear Admiral Ezra Allan, who has the admiration of all of those 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 to those who have faith and confidence in our armed forces to all men 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 and to hear Admiral Horne deliver his first legislation on the floor. I am sure I voice this 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. We have made 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 gentleman from California on the facilities 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 had 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 that I know my good friend from California will back us up—that even if it costs more money to go throughout the United States and select various colleges that 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.
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 8,000 they were going to train up there in Brooklyn. They were transporting women from my home town, from the gentleman's section in Connecticut who also came 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 had a stop of 30 minutes. 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 my district, but finally they decided to put some WAVES down in his home town and he got $60,000. The gentleman from Georgia cut out an appropriation of $150,000 for 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 I am sure there 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 compliments of my distinguished colleague, the majority leader and one of my colleagues from Pennsylvania. My hope is that in the time that is mine to serve in the future I may continue to meet 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 said 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 may state 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 kindness 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 comprehension that has been beneficial not only to the Naval Establishment but to the country as well.

I want to stop at this time to pay a 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 it was not for the work of one John Pugh, than whom there is no better clerk on the hill, I can hardly imagine that it could be. For instance, if either the Army or the Navy would look 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 sacrifices preparedness. It is a debatable question whether or not the approaching election influenced in any way the decision to cut 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 box of phase of our rearmament gave way to the stern and stricter demands of practical preparation.

As the time for our actual entry into the war became shorter, as the magnitude 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 meet the exigencies which were more acute than ever, and which exigencies were made the more acute by reason of the leisurely approach to the problems of preparation. The presence or absence of "discomomeration" meant nothing to us. Until the 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 some with less degree of discretion, with only a hurried superficial examination into the justifications for them.

The strikes which we have made since then are a most favorable reflection on the resourcefulness of a free people to meet the dangerous threat of tyranny. Private enterprise assumed and continuing to discharge the responsibilities 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 story more palatable by giving it a sugar coating. Assurances were given that the women need have no concern about the long hours, the fatigue, the depression of alcohol, the labor conditions, and chocolate sodas and no one need be "discomomerrated" as a result of the rearmament program. When suggestions were made that the social obligation of a peacetime world and the economic restorative prescribed for depression days should give way to the sterners demands of preparedness, there was no manifestation of such 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 sacrifices preparedness. It is a debatable question whether or not the approaching election influenced in any way the decision to cut 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 box of phase of our rearmament gave way to the stern and stricter demands of practical preparation.
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 restate the responsibilities which are ours and which were surrendered by the last Congress under the stress of extraordinary circumstances.

I address myself to what I shall call the question of 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, I went to the Council of Defense 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 of the policy and the putting into 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 this would be an approach to the 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 it was on a large or small scale, they are kept on the roll from the time of their appointment uninfumted. 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, 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. 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 duties 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, he would not be 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 feel that that 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. It may be based on 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, I went to the Council of Defense 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 of the policy and the putting into 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 this would be an approach to the 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.
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 the House has not kept close enough watch on 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. While I 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 the payrolls of the Navy Department appropriation bill when it came up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. And provide that any more 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 list of the top men?

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 should 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 alphabetic 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 my friend from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. In regard to the economics 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 could possibly use an Indian cookbook now and 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. 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 but she is here; for how long, I do not know.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. She is on the pay roll somewhere between $25.20 and $25 per day.

Mr. DITTER. Well, she is beliwxt 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 issue 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 has approved a contract 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 practice that should be corrected.

The careful, painstaking, conscientious chairman of the Appropriations Committee is not convinced as to the contract and the contract bears the signature of the President. 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 the Government of 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 or casually or perfunctorily 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 some legal authority for advancement 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 information 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 the position of the gentleman 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. Does the gentleman from California at all ambitious? I might tell my distinguished friend from California that at all times, if 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. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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. 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 must go to Mr. Moreell, who was in charge of the project. The peak of shore-facility production has passed. That means the acquisition of real estate. I am not concerned about the acquisition of the acreage of all the New England 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 might reach without the acquisition of 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 also. I think I am correct in saying that he has no interest whatever 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 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 yield.

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

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

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

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

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

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield further. I do want to get on.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Of course, I cannot yield further.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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 hon­
ed 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 the Vice President, that I want to compliment the gentleman as a mariner.

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

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

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

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 technican that he would come in here for an instant or 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 attempts to place on my remarks. There was no insinuation that the gentleman from Georgia would not get anything that the gentleman from Georgia is entitled to. 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 Virginia 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 repeat that I feel called upon to refer to it. I wish it were not necessary to question the indiscipline. I was shocked a week ago when my attention was directed to the March issue of a certain magazine, containing 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 the 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 restate 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 country to which the gentleman has referred; 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 endure—the 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 so impetuous to heart 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, wondering whether 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 compensation for the anguish, for the fear of whether this suggested blessing will mean anything to them to ease their anguish or their pain. Ask these mothers if they listen to the long tick-tock, tick-tock of the hours of the day and night and of separation what they think of this blessing.

Have we come to that point where we are so impetuous to hear the voice of these mothers—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 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 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 unquailing faith of mothers who do not know what the real causes of senteeism may be. I have read some things about it. I have some ideas which I have formed from what I have read, but I do not seriously whether anybody has made a comprehensive study yet of this problem, which apparently has come to the greatest problem in connection with our war production.

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.

Mr. 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 right. 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 I 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 industry 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 do not seriously whether anybody has made a comprehensive study yet of this problem, which apparently has come to 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-
tigulated gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norrow], 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. Hoar] has already 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, 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 conducting an investigation that they call a war-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 the great majority of the 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 for that. I think it verifies an opinion I had formed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I am sure every Member of this House appreciates the observations and constructive suggestions 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 am delighted to work with him and vote with him on matters affecting the welfare and protecting the interests of laboring men and women.

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.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to 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, 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 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 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.
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We are approaching this matter in two phases. We propose that as to those within the draft age, which constitutes only roughly 50 percent of the employees of the country working in war industries, that information will be sent to a Government agent, so that Government agents can find out what is bringing on the 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 into the 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 a defense of the gentleman of course along the lines I can 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 is sick-who is a very large part of the unauthorized absenteeism in this country.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Suppose the reason he is absent is something he is not ill and 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 no one 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 yesterday he mentioned 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 would frequent places where there was dancing and where liquor was sold, and on Monday morning they could not work. That accounted for the absenteeism.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

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

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.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will have seared a point, and 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 whether 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 a full two-thirds 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 the able member 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 this 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 they 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 can 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 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] as 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.
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 a very fine discussion of absenteeism by Richard L. Stout of the Christian Science Monitor, which I hope everyone will read, and also an article on the subject in the British Daily Graphic, which 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 on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there 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 December 24, 1916.

INTIMATE MESSAGE: WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Stout)

SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON ABSENTEEISM

Absenteeism is growing in American factories and it is likely to grow. It is a phenomenon which indicates the unsettled war conditions, bad housing, poor transportation, and employment of women, elderly persons, and groups not normally used to back industrial war effort.

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 absenteeism which is being done about it, it is taken 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 rule out married women and it is quite possible that this woman go out and shop, or carry on her household duties. What frequency happens is that she is sick a few after 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 extent than men, and 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 each way in a school car 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 of putting in a 48-hour week over a machine—some men in Detroit are working 60 or 70 hours—and then having to stand up in an overcrowded, fetid trolley car for an hour each way. I saw some of the workers in the Detroit district recently, and they seemed dashe 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 what Spain had a year or so ago. Our point rationing system, for example, which we are all getting used to, is just what Spain used in 1911. 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 merely a method of driving men to the point of defeat 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 time worked, and a better average than we made in World War No. 1.

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

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 o'clock, or after they feel they are doing their jobs, and then do work carelessly, or extend it wastefully.

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

But it does not go to discuss absenteeism simply as a form of delinquency, because it really is more complicated than that, as studies by the Labor Department point out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to the House.
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The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to the House.
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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. The department endeavored to find out how men, women, and children were being fed and housed during a 10-hour day shift in some departments. One plant employed men on 12-hour shifts, and all operated 11- and 12-hour day shifts in some departments. One plant had lunch waggons which served hot drinks, sandwiches, and cold foods. Employees could have the drinks, and baked goods were available. Other plants had no such facilities.

In many States, employers are about 65 per week. In the Northwest, this is almost twice the amount. Many States have home responsibilities; pay checks are received weekly, and most of the workers have homes. The individual who becomes unemployed 12 and 13 hours a night, 7 nights a week, in week and week out.

The day-shift workers have 1 full hour for lunch, and they have a break, most of whom are on piece work or premium production, eat on the job. They usually have 20 or 25 minutes. They can cut it to 15, but don't like to lose the time, I was told."

In another plant, apparently reaching the Charlie age group, the investigator was informed that workers who were on a 13-hour night shift were to be the same, except in Connecticut. It is not unreasonable to attribute some of the absenteeism so widely discussed to the situation in which the worker on long hours having no 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. Some States specify a minimum 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 plants is not so much as it is supposed to be. The law is one to be quietly ignored, and a break should be planned for in the worker's schedule. 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 80.\"

Some Connecticut factories are attacking the problem of absenteeism in a forthright manner. Attention is being concentrated on the problem of working conditions, on working hours, and on home responsibilities. Some of the absenteeism is due to the job itself, or to working conditions, or to a social life. Among women workers for whom the commute is long, the problem is made up of many complex factors. An intelligent directed campaign toward the elimination of these causes might produce results in Connecticut.

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

What about management? Is it still feeding on old prejudices, or is it adapting itself to new conditions, to the feeding of workers, or is management sitting back, waiting at labor's lack of prudence.

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 bogy. Where these are raised, either by labor or management, there is definite evidence of a lack of leadership. Absenceism can and will be solved only by mutual exploration and definitive action, by labor and management working 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. Driscoll], already mentioned the bill at length before us and with some enthusiasm in respect to his opposition to certain items. I generally agree, if this is the solution that needs no help. I do not propose to take much of your time at this time to discuss those items we agreed to oppose, for I am in general agreement 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 member of the subcommittee which is responsible for this bill today. We did what we could to bring in a bill limited by dollars and cents.

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 work these 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 not vote for it as it comes out of the considered debate and judgment of the House unless somebody, misguided, attempts to hamstring it by a 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 from 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 no more mindful of a lot of this than 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 spiritually have reservations. I just wish 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 if the taxpayers and 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 gentlemen 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 that Dean 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 prepared, in 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 to me is equally 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 majorities. I doubt that the President is 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 loyalty, and they need no defense from me before Congress or the country.

This may be a New Deal annex. 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 yield 15 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 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 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 was going to 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 abated, but the voters were impressed.

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

Mr. GILLIE. Is there anything 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 the spirit of 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 and said that they did 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. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?
Mr. TABER. I yield.
Mr. MAGNUSON. 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, and I do not know. This came from a soldier boy in Africa.
Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taft] expiring.
Mr. FLUMLEY. 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.
Mr. BENDER. It may be 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 protected the freedom of our press as the ultimate guaranty of our fundamental liberties. We have jealously guarded the freedom of the press in peace and in war. No doubt 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 most valuable contribution cannot be denied by anyone who observes the newspapers from day to day. It is a contribution which should enable the President and 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 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 the job which the newspapers are doing. The 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 it out in proper detail, in 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 inescapable 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 interposed 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 need 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. The press was not the demonstrative, but the non-demonstrative press. The newspapers were the means by which the Treasury Department staggered 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 been far short of the hoped-for result. Newspapers provided the vehicle through which the Treasury Department can and does explain its position and need. Further, newspapers have repeatedly undertaken promotional projects of their own. Newspapers 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 unsolicited 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 increases in the production 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 the 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 aware of 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 newspapers in focusing public attention on this crucial need.
The list of newspaper accomplishments is endless. Now, they have helped us through the shortages in food 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. There has been no more active group of sympathizers than the press, who have desired to include the services rendered to this body which has discovered anew a staunch supporter and effective aid in the public interest. Without newspapers, the voice of Congress would be virtually unheard beyond the walls of its chambers.

Its aims and labors would be distorted unnecessarily seek to reduce the amount and misunderstood. To refute the false 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 any who, in an amorous mood, 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 press, you destroy one of the most effective internal implements of war and of peace which this Nation possesses. Destroy them and you destroy the people in their Government—and with it that Government.

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 any who, in an amorous mood, 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 press, you destroy one of the most effective internal implements of war and of peace which this Nation possesses. Destroy them and you destroy the people in their Government—and with it that Government.

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 matter affecting 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 the mortgage on their home, to pay the medical bills, and to meet all the other costs of maintaining an American family on a scale which will assure good citizenship. These good people areurely and unselfishly doing the work of the "forgotten man" among Government employees.

Ah, but some 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 others who work longer than 40 hours per week. Letter carriers, clerks, and the others who are 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 $1,100 group. 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 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 presentfindings 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, 1929, 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 the same increase in pay. Many of my colleagues will remember the postal employee back in 1922, 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 Congress embodied certain economy measures applicable to postal employees. The specified
section affecting the lower paid em-
ployees provided that during the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1933, employees re-
cieving annual salary of more than
$1,000 shall be furloughed without pay for
up to 24 working days. After which 24
working days shall be considered as 1
calendar month. This procedure was jus-
tified on the grounds that our coun-
try was in the throes of an economic de-
gression and the stock mar-
et crash of October 1929. Following in
the wake of the market crash, living costs
fell below the standards main-
tained during the so-called boom years,
and letter carriers were required to co-
operate in bringing about national re-
covery. 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, and the fact that postal em-
ployees are still maintaining their
existence on an emergency level.

March 20, 1933, marked the day Presi-
dent Roosevelt signed the bill H. R. 2830,
which was intended to investigate and
determine an index figure of the cost of
living for the fiscal year 1933, and sub-
sequently, to determine a similar deter-
mation for each of the fiscal years there-
after. Upon finding the increase of 21.7 per-
cent below the 1928 base period, the Presi-
dent, in an Executive order dated March
28, 1933, authorized the Postmaster to
reduce the differential of 21.7 percent to be
levied against employees for the period
covered from April 1, 1933, to June 30, 1933.
In compliance with the order dated by near
the end of August, an ascertainment was made
to determine the continuance of this reduc-
tion, and when it was proved that an increase of
25.9 percent below the 1928 base period ex-
isted, 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 re-
duction because of an increase of 21.1 per-
cent below the 1928 base period pre-
valing. The third Executive order brought the percentage up to and in-
cluding June 30, 1934. For the purpose of ac-
curacy it must be remembered that
although H. R. 2830 superseded the 30-
day payless furlough order, nevertheless
many of the employees were never reim-
burged for the payless furlough time they
took prior to the enactment of H. R. 2830.

The independent offices appropriation
bill was enacted into law on June 16,
1933, and became effective July 1, 1933.
Section 30 of the bill authorizing the heads
of the several executive departments of
the Government to furlough without pay,
on a rotational 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
approve 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 worthwhile providing 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 out-
right 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 addi-
tional 9-day payless furlough.

Payless furloughs were discontinued
May 1, 1934; a partial restoration—10
percent—of salaries was made February
1, 1934, and this 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 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 of industry or costs of living
have declined to a point as to justify a
reversal of these conditions of industry,
accompanied by an upward trend in the
increase in wages.

The postal workers, country-wide, have
been performing a yeomanlike serv-

ice to the United States. 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 personal and postal carriers and
also placed greater burdens upon all postal em-
ployees. 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. Thou-
sands of other postal workers have been
called to the colors. The chaotic condi-
tions among those who remain in the
service of the Post Office Department can
be directly charged to standard wages
and the failure of Congress and the ad-
miration to take the necessary reme-
dial steps.

As I have stated, I am personally ac-
quainted with a number of the postal
people in Los Angeles County offices.
A more loyal group of workers has
never lived. Conditions are already de-
plorable and becoming increasingly
worse in these offices because Congress
and the administration failed to
grant them a deserved salary increase.
The postal employee meets all the re-
quirements exacted from others of our
citizens. He willingly pays the new 5-
percent Victory tax. The Seventy-sev-
enth Congress increased his retirement
deductions to 5 percent of his annual
salary commencing on July 1, 1942, and
the Government demands that he pur-
chase his own uniforms and passbooks,
and it probably will 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 contribu-
tions to the Red Cross drives and Com-
memorative campaigns. These deduc-
tions will reduce his expendable income
from 25 to 40 percent.

I am certain that conditions similar to
those prevailing in Los Angeles County
effect throughout the Nation. According
to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United
States Department of Labor, the cost of
living has increased 21 percent since 1933.

For any increase in wages is said to be
one half of 1 percent per month.

Time, February 1, 1943. The Postal Ser-
vice is the basic line of communication and
is so essential to the Nation’s wel-
fare in either peace or war times. Simply
justice demands that the Seventy-eighth
Congress take immediate steps to correct
the unsatisfactory situation that now ex-
ists within the Postal Service.

The Post Office and Post Roads Com-
mittee has been considering H. R. 1366,
introduced by my colleague the gentle-
man from Michigan [Mr. O’Bannan]. This
bill is identical with Senate Bill 360, intro-
duced by the distinguished Sen-
ator from New York [Mr. Mead]. Both
bills request a flat $300 per annum in-
crease for all postal employees during
this emergency period of the war and
extending this payment for 6 months
thereafter.

We have had extensive public hear-
ings on the postal organizations have ap-
proved the principles of the bills. Members of this House have given their
approval. There has not been one pro-
testing vote among my colleagues at the
committee. The hearings have been so
properly amended to include and protect all
classes of postal employees, was reported
today. I have confidence that the Mem-
bers of this House will pass this legis-
lation 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 de-
nied.” Let us show the forgotten men
in the Postal Service that we appreciate
the loyalty so eloquently portrayed by
these bills:

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 gentleman 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
Mr. CHURCH. The Chicago area is very much interested in this item. I hope the gentleman 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, Ore., 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 that 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 businesses, large and small, 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 which avail themselves of the services of the multi-lingual 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 gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 grade-labeling. The so-called experts think it is a very valuable service, and they say that in 12 months we shall see food riots in America. Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

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

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 gentleman see that picture of our Chief Executive?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Seriously, does the gentleman think it might be contemplated to have the President’s picture on the cans today?

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

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman go on?

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

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that this matter of grade labeling was brought 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 gentleman 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 virtually a routine bill. Further study, I did not undertake to say they had not the authority, although I know that in rent cases and in other cases they may not be able to interpret the 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 restrictions 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 profound factors in business—psychology.

Canners have been hamstrung, inspected, quit-kidded, and red-taped until they are groggy. They never know what the Government wants. A rule, once made, takes effect immediately and the Government lady dietitians on a junket to London and other foreign cities must set up sections in their own departments to handle this far-reaching service for trade.

The Agricultural Department approves grade labeling. The so-called experts think it is a very valuable service, and they say that in 12 months we shall see food riots in America. Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman hear the speech made by the lady dietitian from London?

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 gentleman see that picture of our Chief Executive?

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that this matter of grade labeling was brought 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 gentleman 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 virtually routine. 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 may not be able to interpret the 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 restrictions 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 profound factors in business—psychology.

Canners have been hamstrung, inspected, quit-kidded, and red-taped until they are groggy. They never know what the Government wants. A rule, once made, takes effect immediately and the Government lady dietitians on a junket to London and other foreign cities must set up sections in their own departments to handle this far-reaching service for trade.

The Agricultural Department approves grade labeling. The so-called experts think it is a very valuable service, and they say that in 12 months we shall see food riots in America. Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman hear the speech made by the lady dietitian from London?

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 gentleman see that picture of our Chief Executive?

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is that this matter of grade labeling was brought 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 gentleman 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 virtually routine. 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 may not be able to interpret the 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 restrictions 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 profound factors in business—psychology.

Canners have been hamstrung, inspected, quit-kidded, and red-taped until they are groggy. They never know what the Government wants. A rule, once made, takes effect immediately and the Government lady dietitians on a junket to London and other foreign cities must set up sections in their own departments to handle this far-reaching service for trade.
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 yield to Mr. COOLEY.

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 the 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 intentions.

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

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would not expect that the gentleman from Illinois would interpret my remarks as I did. Everything we can get for our goods. We were impressed with the committee’s willingness to work out a solution in these remarks, the industry has been hearing representatives of the canning industry.

Mr. COOLEY. 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 gentleman to turn into a nice way of expressing himself?

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

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand the gentleman 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 building windmills, but maybe it is Mother Nature.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. 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—namely thinking she will give them a good dinner, and she will buy a product canned by another canner to feed her dog.

In conclusion, 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 gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly wish to commend the gentlewoman for her 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, the potential danger that may be put 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, may in the long run do 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.
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 recognition to the fact that men, our own men and boys, are dying upon the fields of battle. It brings me to a great regret that we should find it possible to take the time to indulge in petty politics; we are Members of the great Congress of the United States of America, a country which is at war.

If we 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 was not allowed to publish 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 for the sake of 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, if he were there one happy occasion that it necessarily provides for some people.

Maybe a great deal of consolation would not be found in that realization to the visualization of 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?’ I would say (as one who has 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 something more; your mother and your mother have had something to eat and to wear, and I have a job.’

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

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

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 the Artillery-political uselessness and rise to the requirements of an American citizen, and remember the boys and the men who have yielded themselves willingly the laudable care 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 this same near battle that has taken place up to this time, unless it be the one that took place yesterday, was present in this great airplane flight 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

(Condemned from Battle for the Solomons)

(Out Ira Wolfert)

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

(Out Mr. DITTER.)

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression to the House that he endorses the statement of the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not see anything so bad in Mr. Wolfert’s article.

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 the one blessing, and that the blessing of the war is the sorriest thing of providing a job? Does he mean to convey the impression to the mother who has lost a boy at Batan, in the Philippines, or in the Solomons that the blessing to her, the solace to her heart sore, is the fact that somebody else got a job? If he does, then I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have the original declaration of 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 the Parliament-political uselessness and rise to the requirements of an American citizen, and remember the boys and the men who have yielded themselves willingly the laudable care 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 this same near battle that has taken place up to this time, unless it be the one that took place yesterday, was present in this great airplane flight 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

(Condemned from Battle for the Solomons)

(Out Ira Wolfert)

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

(Out Mr. DITTER.)

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression to the House that he endorses the statement of the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not see anything so bad in Mr. Wolfert’s article.

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 the one blessing, and that the blessing of the war is the sorriest thing of providing a job? Does he mean to convey the impression to the mother who has lost a boy at Batan, in the Philippines, or in the Solomons that the blessing to her, the solace to her heart sore, is the fact that somebody else got a job? If he does, then I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have the original declaration of 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 the Parliament-political uselessness and rise to the requirements of an American citizen, and remember the boys and the men who have yielded themselves willingly the laudable care 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 this same near battle that has taken place up to this time, unless it be the one that took place yesterday, was present in this great airplane flight 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

(Condemned from Battle for the Solomons)

(Out Ira Wolfert)

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

(Out Mr. DITTER.)

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression to the House that he endorses the statement of the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not see anything so bad in Mr. Wolfert’s article.

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 the one blessing, and that the blessing of the war is the sorriest thing of providing a job? Does he mean to convey the impression to the mother who has lost a boy at Batan, in the Philippines, or in the Solomons that the blessing to her, the solace to her heart sore, is the fact that somebody else got a job? If he does, then I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have the original declaration of 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 the Parliament-political uselessness and rise to the requirements of an American citizen, and remember the boys and the men who have yielded themselves willingly the laudable care 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 this same near battle that has taken place up to this time, unless it be the one that took place yesterday, was present in this great airplane flight 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

(Condemned from Battle for the Solomons)

(Out Ira Wolfert)

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

(Out Mr. DITTER.)

Mr. DITTER. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression to the House that he endorses the statement of the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not see anything so bad in Mr. Wolfert’s article.

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 the one blessing, and that the blessing of the war is the sorriest thing of providing a job? Does he mean to convey the impression to the mother who has lost a boy at Batan, in the Philippines, or in the Solomons that the blessing to her, the solace to her heart sore, is the fact that somebody else got a job? If he does, then I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have the original declaration of the Vice President that the blessing of the war can be the making of a job.
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 him.

Lieutenant Spitzer got burned on the legs five times by hot shells, not one of which broke the skin. It had all been deafened.

The three of us stood like that in the plane. Anyway, it seemed like silence. We could have been men or a smother of quiet, pressed against each other, and held him as we looked at the somber blue billows, flapping like a flag into clouds of debris were on the edge of the oval. They were either trying to get away from the flames or maybe just being swept away by the currents created by the heat.

We circled and came back at 500 feet. The smoke事がきれいな乌云雲層に覆われていた。火の様々な雲が飛んでいた。それらはすぐにまた空へと帰ろうとしていた。それらはまだ触れず、時間をかけて逃げようと試みていた。その状態を理解することは、委員会での計画を進めるのに不可欠だった。我々は@DataLakeで、それが何を示すかを理解できるように、データの配列を構築する能力を提供する。そのような情報を理解することは、プロジェクトの成功に不可欠だった。

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."
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 says, "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 position on that committee—is 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 function fully. Do the gentlemen of the committee, I believe, have known as 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 this 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 what I said, when the gentleman is on that same sort of 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 a full one says, but I do not know that the gentleman from North Carolina will correct me. I would like to hear what he has to say on that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think in all fairness I 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 sick, was absent for the year and just came back to the House the middle of this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. Let the gentleman from New Jersey explain. She has been ill all 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 we just could 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 from Michigan.

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” is going.

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—I would call it a dike that we have here. Whether it is on the committee or 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 the gentleman from North Carolina 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. 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 on thegentleman from Michigan, 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 questions 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 not interested in to be better paid for the work to be done 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 debts, take care of their families, go to church on Sunday and vote the way they please. The prospect of the Labor Committee 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 Ranking 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 other men that he is a very perfectly delightful gentleman. I do not wish to indict him 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 the potato. In a county in my district there are approximately one-half million bales of potatoes produced.

All around this country there are local defense boards, the food board. The formulation 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 amount. The 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 got so high that the 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, in the papers that the man who labor 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 commit 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, who 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 which are produced by labor will necessarily be increased in proportion, and that is true whether the product happens to be shoes or potatoes.

Mr. DITTER. 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 $5.50 a bag for 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 about it, and I do not know who they are.

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be too late in just a few days, not a few weeks, to start the program. The department is not going to do it. The people in charge are not going to do it. I think it is high time somebody began to take a hand, and put it out.
wagon with the county war board on December 10, 1942, I received a certificate for purchase of harrow and wagon on January 5, 1943.

I contacted the McCormick-Deering dealer here, but he didn't have a harrow or wagon in stock. He showed me old Army wagons from World War No. 1, but he didn't have a harrow or wagon in stock. He called by phone to 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 the same trip I located a tractor harrow, so returned for it the next day.

A few days later I wrote the Hackett Wagon Co., for a wagon body, but received a reply that they were only able to make 25 percent of their 1940 business and were only in a position to sell me the necessary number 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 very expensive locating this equipment.

We thank you for your inquiry dated January 10th, 1943, 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 the same trip I located a tractor harrow, so returned for it the next day.

A few days later I wrote the Hackett Wagon Co., for a wagon body, but received a reply that they were only able to make 25 percent of their 1940 business and were only in a position to sell me the necessary number 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 very expensive locating this equipment.

It is also expensive locating this equipment as we get their mules from other dealers: "We have had it ordered from 3 or 6 months," or "the company has gone out of business for the duration."

At the present time the manufacturers of farm equipment should be forced to make our implements, rather than be cut out of our business, rather than be cut out of our business, and to discontinue the practice of forcing the farmer to make his own gang plow or other implement.

Mr. BARDEN. According to the 1942 figures of the Department of Agriculture, the increase in the number of acres 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 costs which amounted to $71 hours on that 1 acre of potatoes, when they sold the potatoes off that acre they had $3.29 with which to pay for $71 hours of labor. He then made 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 for 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 these figures here.

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 and they are back in the field doing a good piece of work, but I do not want to go into that right now because cotton is going to be considered later.

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 section with that same 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 enough potatoes to the value of $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 unnecessary. 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 wear, the suit of clothes the gentleman yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.
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 give the facts of this.—

Mr. HARNESS 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 he said there was no plan for it, and he assured me 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 instead of 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 the Department of Agriculture to make the bakers practice paper if we are short of wax?

The cost of bread is a vital problem. The cost of 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.

May I also say that a vast majority of the people of this Nation are feeling seriouly of these tragic losses. They are appalling, and they are frightful. As we view these losses, today, we contemplate the view of some groups in this country who, regardless of this war, and regardless of the serious situation at the moment, would seek to inject the thought of personal gain—everyone to retain advantages hitherto enjoyed—would prefer the war, and the victory which must come to us, for the glory of personal aggrandizement. This is not the time to injec 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 be upon the same selfless motive and plan, and set 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 demands 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 the victory of 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—whether it be here or within, 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 they are doing 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 that should be used to help the war effort, and they want the leaks stopped.

Mr. DITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, a visitor to this war, and for a speedy and complete victory, 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 the victory of 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—whether it be here or within, 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 they are doing 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 that should be used to help the war effort, and they want the leaks stopped.
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Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, a visitor to this war, and for a speedy and complete victory, 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 the victory of 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—whether it be here or within, 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 they are doing 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 that should be used to help the war effort, and they want the leaks stopped.

Mr. DITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, a visitor to this war, and for a speedy and complete victory, 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 the victory of 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—whether it be here or within, 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 they are doing 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 that should be used to help the war effort, and they want the leaks stopped.
which had temporarily overcome the Democrats by reason of their large majorities in the past. The 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 the approval of the public must be repealed or drastically curtailed. They refused to appropriate money for the War Manpower Commission. The Government departments, including the War Department, denied even 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 Taft, a Republican stalwart, bade them to pause lest they impede the ordinary processes of government. And 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 the gentleman who elected 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 difference 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 exaggerated 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 or 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 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 even if the House is an American, he can 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 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 are told that Germany has become the Russia 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. If a legislative attackive defeat, therefore, even any campaign of criticism, must cause our allies and enemies both to question whether or not our whole policy is sound. This must have the effect of weakening 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 a manner which I have never had to face 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 awowed 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 behind the foot-pedion might well injure our effective ness both in fighting the war and in bar-gaining at the peace table for our own future security. We, as statesmen, of ours, however, can implement 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 all differences of opinion. It acquires a meaning and a squarely to the other. 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 partisan- ship 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 govern ment.

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 resources and efforts upon the 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 division between domestic and foreign affairs.

All our wealth, all our manpower, and all our energy must be concentrated upon victory. This nation places a great responsibility upon both the majority and minority 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 restrained by the expectations of the press and the public to get beyond our control. As we passed from a free economy to a war economy it was inevitable that our ad merities should be subjected to a pre śure. But we as a party must join in sincere elements of the minority to attempt to control its growth and keep it in proportion with our national needs. We must try to influence the public and we, 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 excesses 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 expressing the aspirations of those who are so politically zealous that they 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 ascendency, who are so politically zealous that they are unimindful 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 President Roosevelt in the peace-time, and a more recent and a curi­ous 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—when we had to preserve our peaceful relations and by this treacherous blow paralyzed our Pacific Fleet, our leader was not dismayed. Raising his people behind him, he held our great Committee which 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. Not one of our great projects have been immune to criticism. Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson all were cas­tigated by certain of their contempo­raries but with this wise judgment 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 long ago have given up their names to 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 the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will

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. Yet we have had blistering by governmental agents but I wonder if some of these slaps at so-called bureaucrats are not slaps at the administration for a polity of gentlemen.

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 turned, hundreds of key men upon whom the boys on our fighting fronts are depending for decisions, for supplies, and matériel, would be strangled. A day’s work lost in the War Department, the man who rides the tram, the 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 want to see 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 buses, 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 buses if the war effort continues to take more of their employees, because a few people refuse to handle the responsibility 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 industry nonessential to the war. It makes 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., 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.

In the last year the Capital Transit Co. has had many changes as it trained. This is a terrific turn-over, and this transportation has been declared by the National Selective Service System to be an essential industry. Last September it issued an occupational bulletin to make clear to the public 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. has been very helpful, 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.

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 who would make them likely to be called into service ultimately. Five hundred of these are like to be called into service in the near future. These 500 individuals are between the ages of 21 and 38 and are single, with collateral 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 work thrown on them by 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 Government agencies 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 employees should appeal to Government employees in Washington who find themselves with nothing to do after, or just before, they start or 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 only hard, and, as I understand it, they are paid while they are in training.

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 called into service ultimately. Five hundred of these are like to be called into service in the near future. These 500 individuals are between the ages of 21 and 38 and are single, with collateral 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 work thrown on them by 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 Government agencies 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 employees should appeal to Government employees in Washington who find themselves with nothing to do after, or just before, they start or 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 only hard, and, as I understand it, they are paid while they are in training.

In the last year the Capital Transit Co. has had many changes as it trained. This is a terrific turn-over, and this transportation has been declared by the National Selective Service System to be an essential industry. Last September it issued an occupational bulletin to make clear to the public 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. has been very helpful, 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.
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Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the New Haven Register.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New Haven Register.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include an address by Col. Robert R. McCormick on The Fate of the Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague 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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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 Rum Plan in Canada."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. Bradley may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. Bradley may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. Bradley may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. Bradley may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. Bradley may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. Bradley may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record.
To Mr. McGeeson (at the request of Mr. Brown of Ohio), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To the Governor of Nebraska, for 1 week, commencing March 5, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHEEPARD. 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. 1358, 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 Transcoastal Waterway from New York 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 and maintenance standards of fire and accident, and the 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. 1658, 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, pursuant to section 6 of 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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, Arizona, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

222. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill which would amend the statute (H.R. 39, 61 Stat. 755) for repayment to the Crow Indian Tribe of the revolving fund established by that act, and which 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 higher rates, 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. 206). 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. ALLISON of Indiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2076. A bill to authorize the deportation of aliens committed to custody of 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 XXIV, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to committees, as follows:

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 2077. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a harbor at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2078. An amendment (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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLBE 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 Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MACNUTON:

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. BLAIR:

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 Shipyards Board vessels in the World War in zones; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

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 money expended out of the principal funds of said Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNER:

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 Johnson, Tom Fitzpatrick, and John Adams Carpenter to address a joint session of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. MURPH:

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 and feed loans prior to 1927; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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 having to do with social security for all, including the military forces of our country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, 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 New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to the following:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of John Rhodes; 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. LAMKIN:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of C. N. Bunds, of Winchester, Kans., by reason of certain claims arising within the United States and in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gnidus M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alvon Greenleaf, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:
H. R. 2089. A bill extending an increase of pension to William E. McIntosh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELBY:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Roy L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGHT:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Rouze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Robert Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of Dominick Lefose; to the Committee on World War, Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:
H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of W. J. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and other 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 Mr. GREGORY: 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 production of basic commodities whose costs are increased by the war, so that the price ceilings will continue to have meaning; and (3) to extend the food-stamp plan for needy families, so that a well-nourished America may be produced; 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
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The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our shelter from the storm blast and our eternal home, in the stillness may we grow more sure of Thee. If for any cause we lose our high soli­darity, if the fires of devotion and a sense of the unseen have burned to faint embers because after fires have been un­tended, keep us in 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 been dashed to pieces, if the 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 merciful oil of joy for sadness and presence for asking. May our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought may our thought turn to dust, if tinted morning clouds of our memory. May our thought reverent again, may the eternal round be transfigured with an inner light as, with common busses 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 of the Senate, the Journals 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 to the Senate 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. 754. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard Rothereth, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.
S. 755. An act for the relief of Master Gun­ nery Sgt. Eugene M. Mead, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.
S. 756. An act to provide for the reimbursement of persons whose personal property lost as a result of the disaster at the Base East, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941; and

On March 1, 1943:
S. 758. An act for the relief of Charles F. Negel.
S. 759. An act for the relief of Emiliano Lopez and Elisa R. Lopez; and
S. 760. 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. Segil, one of its clerks, announced that the House had adopted the report of the committee 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. 389), by providing sub­stitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute an additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes.

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. 531. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant a loan of $25,000 for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California.
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, 1943, 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 elec­mosynary institutions, and was an inspi­ring example of good citizenship.

Hed was a man of high ideals, and he had the courage to do what was right. His memory will be fresh forever 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.

"May our thought turn to dust, if tinted morning clouds of our memory. May our thought reverent again, may the eternal round be transfigured with an inner light as, with common busses on fire with Thee, daily duties become sacraments of service and love. We ask it through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."