

821. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions adopted at the annual town meetings on March 2, 1943, in 10 towns in Vermont, pledging to help win at whatever cost the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of master races and of people who have the destiny and power to dominate and enslave other peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

822. Also, resolutions adopted in town meeting March 2, 1943, in 38 towns scattered over the State and 16 in Windsor County, pledging unstinting efforts to further food production, and petitioning the Federal Government to take necessary steps to provide sufficient labor, machinery, fertilizers, and other production factors, together with fair returns; to the Committee on Agriculture.

823. By Mr. ROHREBOUGH: Petition of the Association of West Virginia Live Stock Auction Markets, protesting against policies and regulations of Office of Price Administration relative to small packers and slaughterers as tending to discourage production of meats for the future and cause present slaughtering of cattle not ready for market; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

824. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of J. A. Burdette, commander, and S. W. Rife, adjutant, James C. Russell Camp, No. 11, Department of West Virginia, United Spanish War Veterans, Huntington, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2350, to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

825. Also, petition of Charles L. Kettler and a number of other residents of the First Congressional District of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

826. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from R. D. Bowden, head, department of sociology, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

827. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 152 of Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Claude Winkelman, president, and Dennis Moore, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1943

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

Father of our life, fountain of our being, we thank Thee for the light of Thy countenance which illumines our pathway with eternal splendor. Without that light we walk in darkness; without Thee as guide our boasted progress but leads to the quagmires of futility and oblivion; without Thee our science but whets the sword to a sharper edge and destroys us with our own wheels and wings; without Thee commerce cannot save us, for selfish trade but lifts the hunger of covetousness to a higher pitch; without Thee even education cannot redeem us, for we know now that the mere

sharpening of the intellect, the massing and mastery of facts and figures, may but fit men to be tenfold more masterful in the awful art of slaughter.

In all our ways may we not miss the way. Shatter our delusions, shine through our blindness, shame our pride, that we stray not in folly away from Thee. Bring us without fear to meet the flaming of eternal dawn. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 19, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 649. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; and

S. 1041. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

### APPOINTMENT OF CONFeree ON TAX BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as a member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate on the tax bill, in place of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

### NOTICE OF MEETING OF CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that there will be a meeting of the Congressional War Parents' Association at 4:30 p. m. on Monday afternoon, May 24, in the room of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in the Capitol Building. Members of the Senate and House who have sons in the service and are members of the association are invited to attend.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred as indicated:

### ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD (S. Doc. No. 46)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1943, in the form of an amendment to the supplemental estimate previously submitted for the War Production Board, amounting to \$100,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, AND OFFICE OF BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL (S. Doc. No. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior, and the Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$800,000 and \$16,000, respectively (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law (and making reference to his letter to the Congress dated January 7, 1942—H. Doc. No. 541), a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 412 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

### ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION (S. Doc. No. 48)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures, submitting an additional report of the joint committee relating to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures just laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred to the Committee on Appropriations be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and also printed as a Senate document. The report relates to the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report referred to by the Senator from Virginia will be printed in the RECORD, and also as a Senate document.

The report is as follows:

### REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORT ON THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION—REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250. Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In this report the committee will concern itself with the functions and activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. First the history of that corporation will be outlined. Then there will be presented the results of the committee's investigation and pertinent evidence adduced at the hearings on February 25 and March 29, 1943. Conclusions and recommendations will be made in the light of this evidence as it relates to con-

gressional intent when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created.

At the outset the committee wishes to commend those who have been charged with the duty of administering the Home Owners' Loan Act, because it is believed that had not those persons been imbued with the desire to act quickly in the face of a national emergency the American home owner would not be in as favorable a position financially as he is today. However, the committee believes that the Federal Government should respond to a period of national economic prosperity just as quickly as it did to a period of depression and, therefore, it now seeks to determine when, in the best interests of the people, the government should withdraw from the field of real-estate credit.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

1. That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation completely liquidate all of its holdings by the end of the fiscal year 1945 (June 30, 1945). Also, that such forced liquidation be legislatively guaranteed by an act of Congress, prescribing generally the manner in which it shall be effected.

2. That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation immediately plan, and for the next 2 years and 2 months execute, an intensive campaign among their mortgagors and lessees to induce them to increase their equity in their homes, to buy them outright, or to transfer their loans to a local home-financing institution.

Liquidation protects home owner: In making its recommendation for an early liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the committee was careful to provide that the home owner did not suffer. Under the proposed legislation, or through independent action of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the transfer of the mortgages and vendee accounts to private lending institutions will be accomplished so that the terms of the contracts are not changed in the least. In other words, under the method herein-after outlined the only change, insofar as the home owner is concerned, will be that the same payments now being made to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will thereafter be made to local home-financing institutions.

Also, under the proposed method of liquidation the present occupants of the properties owned by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation are given an opportunity to purchase them at current appraised values with down payments as low as 10 percent and terms not exceeding 15 years. Occupants who do not wish to take advantage of the offer will not be prejudiced, because these properties will be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration to be disposed of by that agency in the same manner as other properties held by that agency.

Liquidation will not increase Home Owners' Loan Corporation personnel: Under the proposed method of liquidation the Home Owners' Loan Corporation need not increase its personnel. Provisions may be made for the utilization of personnel of other departments and agencies who can assist in the sale and transfer of the mortgages and vendee accounts to local private home-financing institutions. Upon complete liquidation the employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be transferred to other departments and agencies of the Government more closely connected with the war program.

History of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Prior to the passage of the Home Owners' Loan Act, 1933, the Nation's home owners faced the imminent danger of great numbers of foreclosures, because of the absence of long-term real-estate credit at low interest rates. When the depression descended upon the country it was clear that

the average citizen could not afford to continue the high payments which were customary in times of prosperity. Therefore, Congress set up the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to enable the home owner to save his property by extending to him the type of credit he needed. The hearings on the original bill show that there was no intent on the part of the legislators to have the Government enter the real-estate credit field in competition with private enterprise. The United States was then faced with a condition, not a theory, which called for immediate action and a practical approach. It is believed that the same practical approach has been taken by the committee in this report.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board<sup>1</sup> under statutory authority given the Board by the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.<sup>2</sup> The Federal Home Loan Bank Board was authorized to create a corporation which would be an instrumentality of the United States; which would have authority to sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction; and which would be under the direction of such Board and operated by it under bylaws, rules, and regulations as the Board would prescribe for the accomplishment of the purposes of the act. The creating section also provided that the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board should constitute the board of directors of the Corporation.

The provisions of the original Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act of 1933 have been amended by the acts of Congress of April 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 643), guaranteeing the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and for other purposes; June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1264), defining the terms "home mortgage" and "real estate"; and August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1403), allowing the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was grouped with other agencies to form the Federal Loan Agency by Reorganization Plan I, part 4, section 402 (c), effective July 1, 1939 (4 Fed. Reg. 2730; 53 Stat. 1429), and later was transferred to the National Housing Agency under the immediate direction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,<sup>3</sup> also a part of the National Housing Agency, by the terms of Executive Order 9070, dated February 24, 1942.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act of 1933 expressly provides that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall operate under a board of directors composed of the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and that the "members of the Board shall constitute the board of directors of the Corporation and shall serve as such directors without additional compensation." However, under the direction contained in Executive Order 9070, of February 24, 1942, the exclusive functions, powers, and duties of the board of directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were given to the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, leaving the Corporation without a board of directors, whereas the language of the original enactment

specified and still requires that there shall be a board of directors for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Under the terms of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (Public Law 354, 77th Cong., approved December 18, 1941), the Presidential authority extended to the "redistribution of the functions among the executive agencies," including "governmental corporations"; however, a further proviso in the same act states, that "the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war." Prior to the present conflict the termination date of the activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation had been provided for by two provisions of law<sup>4</sup> specifically relating to its liquidation. It is difficult to conceive that the Corporation is connected with the conduct of the war in such a manner as to come within the provisions of the First War Powers Act with respect to the redistribution of its functions and duties. Subsequent Executive action had the theoretical effect of dissolving the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as such, because of the abolition of the board of directors.

Purpose of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: The general purpose of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was to grant long-term mortgage loans, at low interest rates, to distressed home owners who were unable to procure financing through normal channels, and to help stabilize the real-estate and home-mortgage field during the depression. Refinancing was accomplished by exchanging Home Owners' Loan Corporation bonds for home mortgages. Loans were made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation only to those who were otherwise unable to procure needed financial assistance and such loans were secured on dwellings valued at not more than \$20,000 and accommodating not more than four families. Originally, loans were written for a term not to exceed 15 years, but by an amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act, dated August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1403), this period was extended to a maximum of 25 years in cases where the borrower's circumstances and the condition of the security justified such an extension.

Interest rates: Practically all loans were originally made at an interest rate of 5 percent per annum. In 1939 the corporation made provisions to accept, until further notice, interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum on all payments due on and after October 16, 1939, on the indebtedness of home owners to the Corporation arising from any loan, advance, or sale of property. On all purchase-money obligations taken on or after October 1, 1939, in connection with the sale of real property by the Corporation, interest was to be charged at the 4½-percent rate until otherwise directed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner.

Lending operations: In accordance with law,<sup>5</sup> the Home Owners' Loan Corporation terminated its lending activities on June 12, 1936, at which time 1,071,824 loans had been made, which represented \$3,093,451,321 for mortgage-lending purposes.

Since June 12, 1936, the date when its lending period ceased, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has advanced approximately \$175,000,000 more to its borrowers to help them meet tax payments, and its work has been that of assisting borrowers to keep their homes, liquidating its own loans, and disposing of properties it has been forced to acquire.

<sup>1</sup> The Federal Home Loan Bank Board itself was created under the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1421, approved July 2, 1932, 47 Stat. 725).

<sup>2</sup> 12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1461, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 128).

<sup>3</sup> Formerly Federal Home Loan Bank Board; became Federal Home Loan Bank Administration under the terms of Executive Order 9070, dated February 24, 1942.

<sup>4</sup> 12 U. S. C. 1940 ed. 1463 (k), approved June 13, 1933, 48 Stat. 129; and 15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 712a, approved June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1647.

<sup>5</sup> 12 U. S. C. (1940 ed.) 1463 (d), (e), (f), and (g).



On March 31, 1942, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was collecting on approximately 820,000 accounts, comprising 628,000 original borrowers and 134,000 purchasers of repossessed properties. However, 140,251 loans had been paid in full, which represented receipts amounting to \$341,710,854.

Evidence adduced at hearings: On February 25 and March 29, 1943, Mr. John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, appeared before the committee and presented evidence showing the present activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to what extent it had liquidated since 1936.

Mr. Fahey stated that at its inception the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was authorized \$200,000,000 for capital stock, which later was legislatively supplemented by a bond-issue authorization of \$4,750,000,000. This allowed the Corporation to expand its investments to \$4,950,000,000. Of this, \$400,000,000 was authorized to be used in financing necessary repairs and reconditioning of homes securing the Corporation loans. Also, \$300,000,000 was set aside by Congress for investments in the shares and deposits of qualified home-financing institutions.

The Mead-Barry amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act passed in 1939, explained Mr. Fahey, was particularly timely, because it authorized the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend its loans under certain circumstances from the original 15 years up to as much as 25 years from the date such mortgage was written, and forestalled the necessity of great numbers of foreclosures. The extension of the amortization period of 253,565 borrowers under the Mead-Barry Act, and thus eliminating their delinquency, Mr. Fahey believed, operated to retard the rate of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, because the payments on their loans were reduced by about 40 percent over what was necessary to liquidate within the original 15 years.

It was pointed out that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation between June 13, 1933, and June 12, 1936, received a total of 1,826,491 applications, and approved 1,017,821 loans. However, by June 12, 1936, the Corporation had completed its lending operations, and had in its portfolio mortgages of distressed home owners secured by properties in every community with a population of 2,500 or more and in all but 64 out of the total of 3,072 counties in the United States, and in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, as well.

Liquidation: From 1936 until the present time, Mr. Fahey said the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has been engaged in an orderly process of liquidation. Original borrower and subsequent vendee accounts which amounted to \$3,278,000,000 had been reduced to \$1,567,000,000 by December 31, 1942, a reduction of 52 percent of the total loan amount, and the number of accounts had been reduced to 780,000 (appendix 1).

The present status of these accounts is as follows:

*Mortgage loan and vendee accounts, classified by amortization*

Percentage of principal reduced	Number	Estimated amount of balance
None.....	12,000	\$46,023,720
10 percent.....	28,600	103,918,100
10 to 20 percent.....	114,000	355,261,600
20 to 30 percent.....	132,000	351,017,200
Over 30 percent.....	462,500	588,779,380
Total.....	750,000	1,445,000,000

During the Corporation's existence it acquired 194,163 properties, but has sold 164,236 properties, which leaves 29,927 properties on hand. Fifty-one of these properties have been charged off for various reasons. On December 31, 1942, 1,745 properties were in the process of acquisition. The 31,621 properties

owned or in the process of being acquired by the Corporation on December 31, 1942, had a capitalized value of \$226,925,000.

Analysis by the committee: Mr. Fahey stated the crux of the problem when he said, "No one can foresee the future," in order to ascertain at what time the Corporation should liquidate its holdings. The committee agrees. The only purpose of this investigation is to determine when the most opportune time should be.

At the hearings Mr. Fahey submitted the Corporation's December 31, 1942, condensed balance sheet (appendix 1) and a projection of estimated losses from forced liquidation over a 5-year period (appendix 2). This projection was based upon current trends and present real-estate values. Mr. Fahey estimated that forced liquidation would result in the following losses for the years indicated:

*Net loss from forced liquidation*

1944.....	\$440,114,000
1945.....	351,214,000
1946.....	285,046,000
1947.....	229,913,000
1948.....	180,449,000

As shown in appendix 2, Mr. Fahey estimates that total net loss from forced liquidation at the end of 1945 would be as shown below:

1. Debtor accounts.....	\$212,654,000
2. Property.....	78,960,000
3. Bond interest.....	6,500,000
4. Total losses.....	298,114,000
5. Less net income.....	12,500,000
6. Net losses.....	285,614,000
7. Add previous net losses.....	65,600,000
8. Total net losses.....	351,214,000

The committee carefully reviewed the estimated losses from a forced liquidation (appendix 2). It was stated that approximately \$212,000,000 would be lost on debtor accounts if liquidation was within 2 years. Assuming that the Corporation is allowed 2 years and 2 months to liquidate as recommended by this report, and considering the fact that about 96 percent of the vendee accounts are current or less than 90 days delinquent, and the fact that the average loan balance is approximately \$2,000, the committee believes that liquidation by June 30, 1945, will not result in a loss of over \$100,000,000 on debtor accounts.

The Corporation estimates property losses in a 2-year liquidation period to be \$78,000,000. This appears reasonable if the property is disposed of at 30 percent off the book value of \$226,925,000. Recognizing, however, that the book value of this property is a highly controversial item, and cannot under any circumstances represent the market value, it is conceivable that the properties might be sold higher than at 30 percent off book value, particularly if the resident is given an opportunity to purchase the property with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation selling the paper (vendee account) along with the remainder of its assets.

The same table (appendix 2) shows that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimates a bond interest loss of \$6,500,000 if liquidation occurred within 2 years. It is pointed out that by June 30, 1943, the following un-matured bonds will be outstanding:

3-percent series A, callable for payment May 1, 1944.....	\$778,578,075
1½-percent series M, callable for payment June 1, 1945.....	754,904,025
1-percent series Q, callable for payment at any time.....	225,000,000

Thus by June 30, 1945, all bonds may be retired, and the Federal Treasury will benefit to that extent. The committee believes that insofar as the Federal Government as a whole is concerned this loss item should be

eliminated entirely, because at no time are these funds idle. From investments in mortgages the funds move directly to the United States Treasury. There is no loss to the United States Government. Further, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation does not carry this as a loss item if liquidation is assumed to occur in 1946.

The estimated loss statement carries an item of \$65,000,000 designated as "previous net losses." Since the 1944 column in the Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimate contains an item of \$63,000,000 opposite "previous net losses," it is illogical to assume that a \$85,600,000 loss will be sustained by liquidation in 1945 as compared with any other year. It distorts the true picture of the liquidation process to show past cumulative net losses as a part of the loss which will be sustained by liquidating on any date prior to the time such losses could be wiped out by a net profit as a result of shrewd business operation.

From the estimates furnished by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the committee was unable to determine which of the entries in appendix 2 included costs for operating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for each of the years during the 5-year period. However, if it is assumed that this expense is taken into consideration under "net income," then the true picture should include an additional item of \$10,000,000 (estimated annual operating expense), which brings the gross income up to approximately \$22,500,000.

From the foregoing analysis the following table shows what the committee believes is a more correct picture of loss to the Federal Government if liquidation is ordered by June 30, 1945:

*Estimated losses from liquidation by June 30, 1945*

1. Debtor accounts.....	\$100,000,000
2. Property.....	78,000,000
3. Bond interest.....	6,500,000
4. Total losses.....	178,000,000
5. Gross net income.....	\$22,500,000
6. Operation expenses.....	10,000,000
7. Less net income.....	12,500,000
8. Net losses from forced liquidation.....	165,500,000
9. Add cumulative net loss.....	65,600,000
10. Total net loss.....	231,100,000

In other words, the committee believes that possibly the estimated losses computed by the officials of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation are excessive by \$120,000,000. Therefore, it is clear that discounting the original \$200,000,000 appropriated by Congress the complete liquidation of the Corporation would result in a loss of only \$31,000,000.

Manner of liquidation: The committee has been aware throughout its consideration of this problem that the Government would sustain a loss, regardless of when liquidation took place, but agrees with Mr. Fahey when he said:

"The influence which the Congress exerted by the Home Owners' Loan Act has had far-reaching effects in revolutionizing the home-mortgage business in the United States. It gave a very definite impetus to the development of the sound, long-term, amortized mortgage, at a reasonable rate of interest. As a result, the amortized mortgage principle is now pretty generally accepted over the country and, when the Federal Housing Administration was set up, that organization followed the same principle.

"The immediate effect, of course, was to end the mortgage panic and to check promptly the threat of foreclosure on millions of homes. Real-estate values were stabilized, mortgage-lending markets were strengthened, and help was given to towns and cities which

found themselves financially mired because of excessive tax delinquency."

Mr. Fahey has said, and the committee agrees, that liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation presents a difficult problem. The real question, however, is whether the task will be any easier or any more advantageous to the Government at a later date than at present. The committee thinks not.

The committee believes that the time has come to put the liquidation machinery into full operation, and trusts that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will carry out the recommendations of the committee in the same courageous and intensive way in which the affairs of that Corporation have been administered in the past.

Therefore, a bill is proposed to be introduced which will facilitate the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation through the transfer and cash sale of its assets to individuals and to local banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and other mortgage institutions. Legal consideration for such transfer and sale shall be either cash or United States bonds. The Corporation, upon the effective date of the act, should list all pertinent data concerning their holdings, and accept bids thereon which are equal to or in excess of the present balance, and the terms and conditions of these contracts shall not be changed. The Corporation should allow the present occupants of Corporation properties the opportunity of purchasing at current appraised values upon reasonable terms. All properties not sold should be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration. The Corporation when expedient should utilize personnel from all Government agencies which could lend aid in the interests of a more orderly process of liquidation. The complete liquidation should be effected by June 30, 1945.

#### APPENDIX 1

##### Home Owners' Loan Corporation condensed balance sheet Dec. 31, 1942

ASSETS	
Mortgage loans and vendee accounts.....	\$1,567,366,913.24
Interest receivable.....	4,678,420.87
Property owned and in process of acquiring title.....	226,925,126.92
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,798,970,461.03</b>
Less reserve for losses.....	45,796,223.76
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,753,174,237.27</b>
Investments, at cost.....	252,311,210.00
Bond-retirement fund.....	13,923,872.16
Cash.....	64,430,494.99
Fixed assets, less reserve.....	2,642,806.83
Other assets.....	655,378.67
Deferred and unapplied charges.....	112,158.12
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,087,250,158.04</b>
LIABILITIES	
Bonded indebtedness.....	1,951,942,975.00
Accounts payable.....	25,757,855.35
Accrued liabilities.....	5,040,639.27
National Housing Agency home-conversion funds.....	13,263,383.93
Deferred and unapplied credits.....	3,778,090.35
Reserves.....	717,850.33
CAPITAL STOCK	
Authorized, issued, and outstanding.....	200,000,000.00
Less deficit.....	113,250,636.19
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>86,749,363.81</b>
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,087,250,158.04</b>

#### APPENDIX 2

##### Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimated losses from forced liquidation

	1944 1	1945 2	1946 3	1947 4	1948 5
1. Debtor accounts.....	\$242,514,000	\$212,654,000	\$185,706,000	\$157,993,000	\$127,949,000
2. Property.....	120,000,000	78,960,000	47,040,000	23,520,000	12,600,000
3. Bond interest.....	27,100,000	6,500,000			
4. Total losses.....	389,614,000	298,114,000	232,746,000	181,513,000	140,549,000
5. Net income.....	12,600,000	12,500,000	11,500,000	11,000,000	10,000,000
6. Net losses.....	377,114,000	285,614,000	221,246,000	170,513,000	130,549,000
7. Previous net losses.....	63,000,000	65,600,000	63,800,000	59,400,000	49,900,000
8. Total net loss from forced liquidation.....	440,114,000	351,214,000	285,046,000	229,913,000	180,449,000

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (and affiliated Chinese associations), New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.* That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested and urged to propose that the perpetual calendar be adopted by all nations at the peace conference and to propose to all nations that they now appoint a national committee to study the perpetual calendar with a view toward its acceptance at the peace conference.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

##### "Senate Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to deduction of earnings from agricultural labor from old-age assistance

"Whereas House Joint Resolution 96, as passed by the Senate of the United States, included, as subdivision (f) of section 5 thereof, provisions that no person should be deemed not to be a needy individual by reason of remuneration paid to such person for any agricultural labor performed by him from the enactment of the resolution until 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war; and that no State should be required, in determining need in the case of any individual, to take into consideration any income or resources derived by him from agricultural labor; and

"Whereas conference reports amending House Joint Resolution 96 were adopted by both Houses of Congress, whereby the benefits of the subdivision were withheld from any State which had increased the amount of aid payable to recipients of old-age aid since April 30, 1943; and

"Whereas the State of California has at the present session of the legislature increased the maximum monthly individual grant of aid to the aged from \$40 per month to \$50 per month; and the State of California is the only State which has increased the amount of aid payable to recipients of old-age assistance since April 30, 1943; and

"Whereas House Joint Resolution 96, in the form in which it was put by the amendments made by the conference report, is flagrantly discriminatory against the State of California, and penalizes this State for its action in in-

creasing the amount of aid to an amount more nearly adequate, under present conditions, for the maintenance of health and decency; and

"Whereas the farm-labor shortage in the State of California is no less severe than in other States whose contributions to the production of food and other agricultural products do not surpass, nor even equal, the contribution of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly).* That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby protest the action of the Congress of the United States in passing legislation so unfair and unjust to the State of California, and does most urgently request the Congress of the United States to take such measures as may be necessary immediately to correct their ill-advised and discriminatory action; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

##### "Senate Resolution 142

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact S. 971 or H. R. 2426, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, providing for Federal participation in financing of a post-war highway construction program

"Whereas two measures are pending in the Congress of the United States, namely, S. 971 and H. R. 2426, to authorize Federal assistance to the States in financing a post-war construction program on rural and urban highways; and

"Whereas such legislation is designed to, and will, provide useful employment for those returning from services in the armed forces, or released by war industries after the war, and will, accordingly, tend to prevent unemployment, and the necessity for unemployment relief; and

"Whereas necessary wartime restrictions on gasoline and highway transportation have resulted in curtailment of revenues received by the highway departments of the States, and restrictions on use of materials have curtailed construction and reconstruction of needed highways during a period in which many highways have been damaged by heavy wartime truck traffic, engaged in transportation for the war effort; and

"Whereas such legislation will assist the States in bringing their highway systems and their highway-construction programs back to normal, and in making up the time lost due to necessary deferment of highway construction during the war; and

"Whereas there will be particular need to provide employment in California, following



the war, due to the large number of war industries in this State; and

"Whereas there will be particular need in California for reconstruction of highways due to such war conditions: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly),* That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to enact either S. 971 or H. R. 2426; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the House Committee on Roads, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Resolutions in favor of the amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act

*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, an act amending the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to limit to actual producers and private carriers the exemption of vehicles transporting farm produce and fish and to make said Motor Carrier Act applicable to vehicles transporting such commodities for hire or compensation and to the owners and operators of such vehicles; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. BROOKS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 53

"Whereas it is essential to the successful prosecution of the war that the national morale be kept at the highest possible level; and

"Whereas this purpose can be achieved only if all parts of the population have an effective voice in the Government and are permitted to live free from fear of unlawful incursions upon their personal safety: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Illinois House of Representatives,* That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact into law House bills 7 and 51, popularly known as the poll-tax and antilynch bills, respectively; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a suitably engrossed copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately by the secretary of state to each Member of the House of Representatives and Senate of the present Congress now representing the State of Illinois."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Fourth District Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, praying for the enactment of pending legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens, members of the First Methodist Church, of Hays, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 1900. A bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1702. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1731. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 257).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2077. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 259).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 260).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1063. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 261).

#### EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably with an amendment House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of filing a report during the adjournment of the Senate, if it cannot be prepared before the Senate adjourns this afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know just what House Joint Resolution 111 is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. McNARY. What is the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I am merely reporting the joint resolution from the Finance Committee for the calendar, but the request was for permission to file a report during the adjournment, if the Senate shall adjourn before the report is ready for filing this afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. On the theory that the Senate might adjourn until Monday, the Senator desires to have opportunity to file a report?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. A majority report and minority views?

Mr. GEORGE. The request is for permission to file a report on the joint resolution, and I may file minority views for the minority. I should like to say that, according to previous announcement, the measure will not be called up in the Senate before Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I should not wish at this time to agree to have it called up Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall make a motion Monday to bring it up. I give notice that I will do that.

Mr. McNARY. If that is the attitude of the Senator, I do not know that I desire to grant the permission that the report be filed.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well, Mr. President; I withdraw the request, and I will either file the report or not file it during the afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. That is the Senator's privilege, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, for substantial reasons, I objected to the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to file during the adjournment of the Senate a report—either a majority report or minority views—from the Committee on Finance on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Georgia, and I think we have come to an agreement as to the date when the measure may be considered in the Senate. For that reason I withdraw all my objections, so that the report may be submitted at any time between now and the next session of the Senate, on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE subsequently, from the Committee on Finance, submitted a written report (No. 258) on House Joint Resolution 111, heretofore reported by him with an amendment.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably Senate Resolution 146, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to March 1, 1941, and Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to January 25, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program), is hereby increased by \$100,000.

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

Mr. McNARY. May we have some explanation of the nature of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a resolution submitted by the so-called Truman committee. They are asking for another \$100,000 to carry on the activities of the committee. I have conferred with the minority members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and they are favorable to the adoption of the resolution. I have also conferred with the majority members. There does not seem to be any question about furnishing funds to the so-called Truman committee, and that committee is now asking for the amount carried in this resolution, and the Committee to Audit and Control, think they should have this sum in order to continue the magnificent work they have been doing throughout the country.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee report unanimously after the matter had been fully considered?

Mr. LUCAS. I conferred by telephone with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], and I could not reach the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye]. The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Illinois agree that the work should go on, and that the amount asked for should be appropriated. I have enough proxies in my pocket on the majority side to handle that situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much has the committee had up to date?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure how much has been appropriated for the investigation, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Truman] is not present this morning.

Mr. HATCH. I think it is in the neighborhood of \$200,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is correct. I believe originally the sum of \$15,000 or \$25,000 was appropriated, and later perhaps \$60,000, I think \$200,000 all told.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 150) submitted by Mr. Truman on May 4, 1943, was considered and agreed to.

#### MARBLE PEDESTAL FOR BUST OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT GARNER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 150, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 150) submitted by Mr. Connally on May 14, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved* That the Architect of the Capitol hereby is authorized to procure a marble pedestal for the bust in the Senate wing of the Capitol of former Vice President John N. Garner, the expense thereof, not exceeding \$300, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library.

VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I

report back favorably Senate Resolution 144, which is a resolution recommended by our committee, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Vernon L. Talbertt, son of William B. Talbertt, late a laborer of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 144) submitted by Mr. Barkley on May 3, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Vernon L. Talbertt, son of William B. Talbertt, late a laborer of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1118. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, providing for loss of nationality; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1119. A bill imposing additional duties upon the postmaster at Lincoln's New Salem, Ill.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1120. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1121. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises):

S. 1122. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1123. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the honorary burial places of deceased members of the armed forces who are buried at sea, in foreign lands, or at unknown places; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BONE:

S. J. Res. 61 (by request): Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### COMPARISON OF MEAT PRICES IN CANADA AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have in my hand a photostatic copy of an advertisement in the Montreal Daily Star of Thursday, May 13, 1943. I also

have a copy of the Washington Post of the same date. In these newspapers are given meat prices in Montreal, Canada, and Washington, D. C., on May 13, when the new "roll-back" prices were established by the Office of Price Administration.

On May 13, the Office of Price Administration brought out a new price schedule on meats in Washington, D. C. As advertised in the daily press, the new O. P. A. meat prices were "roll-back" prices.

On the same day, May 13, the daily press of Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto, Canada, published the grocery advertisements for meat prices in Canada.

A comparison of these prices shows that O. P. A. "roll-back" prices on meats in Washington, D. C., overtop meat prices at 12 leading retail grocery houses in Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto by from 30 percent to as high as 90 percent.

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that meat prices are as much as 90 percent higher in Washington than they are in Canada?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; according to the advertisement of the grocery stores in Montreal and the announcement in the Washington Post for the same date, giving the new prices under the schedule of the O. P. A.

The average increase of O. P. A. meat prices over and above Canada approximates 50 percent.

Take porterhouse and sirloin steak and roast. In Washington, D. C., the O. P. A. ceiling price for porterhouse and sirloin was jumped from the former price top of from 50 to 59 cents a pound to 63 cents for choice steak at grocery chain stores and 70 cents at smaller independent stores, the advertised "roll back" being an increase or "roll up" of from 10 to 15 cents a pound.

But the true roll back appears in Canada. Of eight leading grocery houses or chains in Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto, advertising on May 13 in the daily press, porterhouse and sirloin, the average porterhouse price was 39 cents, or approximately 30 cents a pound below the O. P. A. roll-back price in Washington.

Now comes the big story. A. & P. Food Stores, the leading chain retail grocery of Montreal, advertised porterhouse, boneless sirloin, and boneless round, both steak and roast, at 35 cents a pound—and I have a photostatic copy of their advertisement—on the same day that the Office of Price Administration in Washington set the top price for porterhouse in Washington at the so-called roll-back price of 66 cents a pound, or 90 percent above the Montreal price.

The O. P. A. roll-back swindle not only jumps Washington prices by something like 20 percent over the former retail price level, but it climbs Mount Ararat with meat prices one-half again higher than in the cities above our northern border.

I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief tabulation of O. P. A. meat prices effective in Washington, D. C., beginning May



13, and, in parallel column, an average of Canadian retail prices as advertised in leading dailies of Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto, all on the same day, May 13, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

Meat cut	Washington price (Office of Price Administration "roll-back")	Price in Canada, average	Office of Price Administration excess	
			Cents per pound	Per cent
BEEF				
Porterhouse.....	66	39	27	70
Sirloin (boneless).....	62	38	24	59
Round (boneless).....	55	37	18	50
Chuck (bone in).....	35	24	11	45
Flank.....	46	28	18	64
Rib roast.....	45	32	13	45
Hamburger.....	23	22	11	50
VEAL				
Loin chops.....	51	40	11	29
Cutlets.....	56	42	14	30
Leg of veal.....	40	30	10	33
LAMB AND MUTTON				
Loin.....	70	42	28	65
Rib chops.....	54	40	14	35
Lamb leg.....	47	35	12	34

NOTE.—Independent store price given for Washington, choice grade.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate note that the O. P. A. meat price "roll back" in the District of Columbia rises upward of 40 degrees above the normal prices of Canada.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the advertisement from the Montreal Daily Star and the price list published in the Washington Post, to both of which I have referred, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement and price list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montreal Daily Star, May 13, 1943]

#### A. & P. HIGH-QUALITY STEAKS AND ROASTS

A. & P. guaranteed beef is all Government inspected—buy with confidence. One price—the low price. Special and commercial quality.

Porterhouse, wing sirloin, boneless round or boneless sirloin tip, 35 cents per pound.

Prime rib roast, first five ribs, 32 cents per pound.

Blade roast, meaty, 23 cents per pound.

Short-rib roast, 27 cents per pound.

Fresh haddock fillets, 33 cents per pound.

Halibut steaks, 39 cents per pound.

Brome Lake ducks, choice, 37 cents per pound.

Sauerkraut, 4 pounds for 25 cents.

#### FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

California seedless navel oranges, size 200's, 49 cents per dozen.

Florida Valencia oranges, large size 176's, 46 cents per dozen.

All-purpose B. C. fancy Newtown apples, size 198's, 25 cents per dozen or 11 cents per pound.

California carrots, original large bunches, three for 19 cents.

Imported selected tomatoes, 19 cents per pound.

Hot-house cucumbers, large size, 19 cents each.

Imported spinach, young and tender, 2 pounds for 29 cents.

New carrots, 3 pounds for 19 cents.

A. & P. Bokar coffee, custom ground, 35 cents per 1-pound bag, two coupons; 18 cents per ½-pound bag, one coupon.

Ann Page vitamin B bread (Canada approved). Ann Page white, whole wheat, cracked wheat, two 24-ounce loaves for 15 cents.

Butter, Silverbrook first grade, 36 cents per pound.

Sugar, fine granulated, 37 cents per 5-pound package.

Quaker muffins, two packages for 17 cents.

Corn flakes, Quaker, two packages for 15 cents.

Catelli spaghetti, macaroni, or vermicelli, two 1-pound packages for 17 cents.

Princess flakes, 24 cents per large package.

Quaker oats, 19 cents per large package.

Keen's blueing, 8 cents per package.

Old Nippy cheese, 37 cents per pound.

Cornstarch, Durham, 9 cents per package.

Beans, Van Camp's precooked, 14 cents per 12-ounce package.

Extra special—A. & P. special blend black tea, 17 cents per 4-ounce package, 31 cents per ½-pound package. A. & P. Nectar orange pekoe tea, 22 cents per 4-ounce bag, 39 cents per ½-pound package. Two coupons for 4-ounce bag, four coupons for ½-pound package.

Odex soap, two cakes for 11 cents.

Soap, Woodbury's facial, four cakes for 29 cents.

Soap, Jergen's carbollic, three cakes for 14 cents.

Soap, Many Flowers, four cakes for 17 cents.

Ivory gloss starch, 10 cents per package.

Nutrim, 29 cents per 9-ounce package 49 cents per 18-ounce package.

Mustard, Heinz yellow, 9 cents per 6-ounce jar.

A. & P. FOOD STORES,  
Owned and operated by the  
Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Ltd.

[From the Washington Post of May 13, 1943]

MAXIMUM PRICES ANNOUNCED BY THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION ON BEEF, VEAL, LAMB, AND MUTTON, TO BE EFFECTIVE MONDAY

The prices listed below are the ceilings which will go into effect Monday in all types of chain stores and in independent stores with an annual business of more than \$250,000 in the district of Maryland.

The maximum prices, appearing after each cut of meat are listed by Agriculture Department grades, which are indicated at the head of each column. The grade markings must be stamped on all cuts of meat except inside cuts. Also, retailers are required to post the grades sold in their stores and to segregate the different grades in their display.

Retail ceiling prices for beef, veal, lamb, and mutton—fresh, cured, and frozen (for stores in classes 3 and 4).

(AA—Choice. A—Good. B—Commercial. C—Utility. D—Cull. S—Prime, choice, and good. M—Commercial. R—Utility and culls.)

	BEEF				
	[Cents per pound]				
	AA	A	B	C	D
<b>Steaks:</b>					
Porterhouse.....	63	59	51	44	40
T-bone.....	63	59	51	44	40
Club.....	63	59	51	44	40
Rib:					
10-inch cut.....	38	35	34	30	26
7-inch cut.....	43	41	37	32	28
Sirloin.....	47	45	38	33	29
Pin bone.....	47	45	38	33	29
Sirloin (boneless).....	59	55	47	41	37
Round (bone in) (full cut).....	49	45	41	35	31
Round (boneless) (top and bottom).....	52	48	43	36	32
Round tip.....	52	48	43	36	32
Chuck blade (bone in).....	34	31	30	26	22

#### BEEF—continued

[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
<b>Steaks—Continued.</b>					
Chuck arm (bone in).....	34	31	30	26	22
Flank.....	43	43	43	43	39
<b>Roasts:</b>					
Rib standing (chine bone in):					
10-inch cut.....	38	35	34	30	26
7-inch cut.....	43	41	37	32	28
Round tip.....	52	48	43	36	32
Rump (bone in).....	33	30	27	23	19
Rump (boneless).....	52	48	43	36	32
Chuck blade pot roast.....	34	31	30	26	22
Chuck arm pot roast.....	34	31	30	26	22
Chuck or shoulders (boneless).....	44	41	39	34	30
English cut.....	34	31	30	26	22
<b>Stews and other cuts:</b>					
Short ribs.....	24	24	23	23	19
Plate (bone in).....	24	24	23	23	19
Plate (boneless).....	29	29	28	28	24
Brisket (bone in).....	30	30	27	27	23
Brisket (boneless).....	40	40	35	35	31
Flank meat.....	32	32	32	32	28
Neck (bone in).....	31	29	28	25	21
Neck (boneless).....	36	34	32	27	23
Heel of round (boneless).....	36	34	33	30	26
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore).....	22	22	22	22	18
Shank (boneless) (hind and fore).....	30	30	30	30	26
Soup bone.....	03	03	03	03	03
Suet.....	05	05	05	05	05
Ground beef.....	32	32	32	32	32
<b>Retail prices of wholesale cuts:</b>					
Round beef (whole).....	30	28	25	22	18
Sirloin beef (whole).....	34	32	28	25	21
Short loin beef (whole).....	45	42	36	31	27
Flank beef (whole).....	18	18	18	18	14
Rib beef (whole).....	32	30	28	25	21
Regular chuck (whole).....	26	25	24	21	17
Short plate (whole).....	19	19	19	19	15
Brisket (whole).....	22	22	20	20	16
Shank (whole).....	16	16	16	16	12

#### VEAL

[Cents per pound]

<b>Steaks and chops:</b>					
Loin chops.....	48	45	42	37	31
Rib chops.....	44	43	40	37	30
Shoulder chops (arm and blade).....	33	31	28	25	22
Round steak (cutlets).....	53	50	45	40	36
Sirloin steaks or chops.....	41	40	38	35	29
<b>Roasts:</b>					
Rump and sirloin (bone in).....	38	36	32	29	26
Rump and sirloin (boneless).....	55	52	46	41	37
Leg.....	38	36	32	29	26
Leg (rump off).....	38	36	32	29	26
Leg (shank half).....	38	36	32	29	26
Leg (rump half).....	38	36	32	29	26
Loin.....	48	45	42	37	31
Rib.....	44	43	40	37	30
Blade and arm.....	33	31	28	25	22
Round.....	53	50	45	40	36
Shoulder (bone in) (square cut).....	32	31	29	27	22
Shoulder (boneless) (square cut).....	40	39	36	34	27
<b>Stews and other cuts:</b>					
Breast (bone in).....	23	23	21	20	16
Breast (boneless).....	33	31	28	25	22
Flank meat.....	33	31	28	25	22
Neck (bone in).....	23	23	21	20	16
Neck (boneless).....	33	31	28	25	22
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore).....	23	23	21	20	16
Shank and heel meat (boneless) (hind and fore).....	33	31	28	25	22
Ground veal and patties.....	34	34	34	34	34
Kidneys.....	33	33	33	33	33
<b>Retail prices of wholesale cuts:</b>					
Hindquarters.....	31	29	26	23	21
Forequarters.....	25	24	23	21	17

#### LAMB AND MUTTON

[Cents per pound]

	Lamb				Mutton			
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R	
<b>Steaks and chops:</b>								
Loin chops.....	67	63	58	52	39	36	34	
Rib chops.....	51	49	45	42	27	24	21	
Leg or sirloin chops.....	51	49	45	42	27	24	21	
Shoulder chops, blades or arm chops.....	40	44	41	38	24	21	19	
<b>Roasts:</b>								
Leg (whole, half or short cut).....	44	42	38	34	28	26	24	
Sirloin roast (bone in).....	51	49	45	42	27	24	21	
Yoke, rattle or triangle (bone in).....	31	31	30	29	17	16	14	
Yoke, rattle or triangle (boneless).....	47	46	45	43	24	22	20	
Chuck or shoulder, square cut (bone in).....	41	40	40	39	22	20	18	

LAMB AND MUTTON—continued  
[Cents per pound]

	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Roasts—Continued.							
Chuck or shoulder, cross cut (bone in).....	33	32	32	30	18	16	15
Loin.....	67	63	58	52	39	36	34
Rib.....	51	49	45	42	27	24	21
Stews and other cuts:							
Breast and flank.....	24	23	22	20	13	12	11
Neck (bone in).....	24	23	22	20	13	12	11
Neck (boneless).....	36	36	36	36	22	22	22
Shank (bone in).....	24	23	22	20	13	12	11
Patties (ground meat).....	36	36	36	36	22	22	22
Kidneys.....	32	32	32	32	18	18	18
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:							
Leg.....	38	37	35	32	24	23	21
Loin.....	38	35	29	25	20	19	17
Hotel rack.....	42	39	34	29	22	20	17
Yoke.....	25	25	24	23	13	12	11

INDEPENDENT STORES, UNDER \$250,000 CLASS

The following prices represent the ceilings which will go into effect Monday in independent stores with an annual business of less than \$250,000 in the District and Maryland:

(AA—Choice. A—Good. B—Commercial. C—Utility. D—Cull. S—Prime, choice and good. M—Commercial. R—Utility and culls.)

BEEF  
[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks:					
Porterhouse.....	66	61	53	45	41
T-bone.....	66	61	53	45	41
Club.....	66	61	53	45	41
Rib:					
10-inch cut.....	40	38	35	31	27
7-inch cut.....	45	42	38	33	29
Sirloin.....	50	47	40	35	31
Pin bone.....	50	47	40	35	31
Sirloin (boneless).....	62	58	49	43	39
Round (bone in) (full cut).....	52	48	43	37	33
Round (boneless) top and bottom.....	55	51	45	38	34
Round tip.....	55	51	45	38	34
Chuck blade (bone in).....	35	34	33	28	24
Chuck arm (bone in).....	35	34	33	28	24
Flank.....	46	46	46	46	42
Roasts:					
Rib standing (ehine bone in):					
10-inch cut.....	40	38	35	31	27
7-inch cut.....	45	42	38	33	29
Round tip.....	55	51	45	38	34
Rump (bone in).....	34	32	28	24	20
Rump (boneless).....	55	51	45	38	34
Chuck blade pot roast.....	35	34	33	28	24
Chuck arm pot roast.....	35	34	33	28	24
Chuck or shoulder (boneless).....	46	44	42	37	33
English cut.....	35	34	33	28	24
Stews and other cuts:					
Short ribs.....	25	25	24	24	20
Plate (bone in).....	25	25	25	25	21
Plate (boneless).....	30	30	30	30	26
Brisket (bone in).....	32	32	29	25	21
Brisket (boneless).....	42	42	37	32	28
Flank meat.....	33	33	33	33	29
Neck (bone in).....	33	32	29	27	23
Neck (boneless).....	37	36	34	29	25
Heel of round (boneless).....	38	37	35	32	28
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore).....	24	24	24	24	20
Shank (boneless) (hind and fore).....	32	32	32	32	28
Soup bone.....	03	03	03	03	03
Suet.....	06	05	05	05	05
Ground beef.....	33	33	33	33	33
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:					
Round beef (whole).....	30	28	26	22	18
Sirloin beef (whole).....	35	33	28	25	21
Short loin beef (whole).....	46	43	37	31	27
Flank beef (whole).....	18	18	18	18	14
Rib beef (whole).....	32	31	28	25	21
Regular chuck (whole).....	26	25	24	22	18
Short plate (whole).....	19	19	19	19	15
Brisket (whole).....	22	22	20	20	16
Shank (whole).....	17	17	17	17	13

VEAL  
[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks and chops:					
Loin chops.....	51	47	44	39	36
Rib chops.....	46	45	43	39	32
Shoulder chops (arm and blade).....	35	33	29	26	24
Round steak (cutlets).....	56	52	47	42	38
Sirloin steaks or chops.....	43	42	40	37	30

VEAL—continued  
[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Roasts:					
Rump and sirloin (bone in).....	40	38	34	30	28
Rump and sirloin (boneless).....	57	54	48	43	39
Leg.....	40	38	34	30	28
Leg (rump off).....	40	38	34	30	28
Leg (shank half).....	40	38	34	30	28
Leg (rump half).....	40	38	34	30	28
Loin.....	51	47	44	39	36
Rib.....	46	45	43	39	32
Blade and arm.....	35	33	29	26	24
Round.....	56	52	47	42	38
Shoulder (bone in) (square cut).....	33	32	31	28	23
Shoulder (boneless) (square cut).....	42	41	38	35	29
Stews and other cuts:					
Breast (bone in).....	24	24	23	21	17
Breast (boneless).....	35	33	29	26	24
Flank meat.....	35	33	29	26	24
Neck (bone in).....	24	24	23	21	17
Neck (boneless).....	35	33	29	26	24
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore).....	24	24	23	21	17
Shank and heel meat (boneless) (hind and fore).....	35	33	29	26	24
Ground veal and patties.....	35	35	35	35	35
Kidneys.....	34	34	34	34	34
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:					
Hindquarter.....	31	30	26	24	22
Forequarter.....	25	25	23	22	18

LAMB AND MUTTON  
[Cents per pound]

	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Steaks and chops:							
Loin.....	70	66	61	55	40	38	35
Rib chops.....	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Leg or sirloin chops.....	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Shoulder chops, blades or arm chops.....	48	46	43	40	25	22	20
Roasts:							
Leg (whole, half or short cut).....	47	43	40	36	29	27	26
Sirloin roast (bone in).....	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Yoke, rattle, or triangle (bone in).....	33	32	31	30	18	16	15
Yoke, rattle, or triangle (boneless).....	49	48	47	45	25	23	21
Chuck or shoulder, square cut (bone in).....	43	42	42	41	23	21	19
Chuck or shoulder, cross cut (bone in).....	34	34	33	32	19	17	16
Loin.....	70	66	61	55	40	38	35
Rib.....	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Stews and other cuts:							
Breast and flank.....	25	24	22	21	14	12	11
Neck (bone in).....	25	24	22	21	14	12	11
Neck (boneless).....	38	38	38	38	23	23	23
Shank (bone in).....	25	24	22	21	14	12	11
Patties (ground meat).....	38	38	38	38	23	23	23
Kidneys.....	33	33	33	33	19	19	19
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:							
Leg.....	38	37	35	32	25	23	22
Loin.....	39	35	30	26	21	19	17
Hotel rack.....	43	40	35	29	22	20	18
Yoke.....	25	25	24	23	14	12	11

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has said on the subject of meat prices. I understand that in Canada the Canadian Government is subsidizing some of these set-ups, and I am wondering if the Senator has any information, for instance, as to how much a product costs a store, how much the farmer gets for his product in Canada and what he gets here, and what is the spread between what the producer gets and what the retailer gets. It seems to me, in order properly to judge the situation, one has got to take into consideration what we have generally been told, namely, that Canada and Great Britain both have put into operation a system of subsidies.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. On top of that there is the question also of wage control in Canada, which we have not had here. For instance, we have seen in this country that in certain areas as high as \$5,000 a year has been paid for milk delivery, whereas the milk-producing farmer in our section is getting about 6 cents a quart; and whereas a cheese-producing factory in our section sells its cheese at 27 cents a pound, we here in Washington are paying about 55 or 60 cents a pound for it.

If we took that picture, and put into it the subsidy, and the difference between the wages being paid, it seems to me it would be important.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILEY. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business has not been concluded. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is the present order.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Chair. I thought we had passed that order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is still in order. If there be no further bills or joint resolutions, the presentation of amendments and concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES  
APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 66, line 7, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes, except for cooking purposes; but if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds at any time that the procurement of an adequate butter supply is not feasible, this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes to the extent that such Administrator finds to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Veterans' Administration facilities for other than cooking purposes."

W. J. KING—REFERENCE TO COURT OF  
CLAIMS OF SENATE BILL 1017

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on April 19 I introduced Senate bill 1017, a bill for the relief of W. J. King. Mr. King has a claim, not exceeding \$100 in amount, arising out of a cotton certificate matter under one of the earlier agricultural adjustment acts.

At this time I desire to have the claim referred to the Court of Claims, in order that the Court of Claims, under section 151 of the Judicial Code, may consider the claim along with a number of other claims which have already been sent there, not with the idea of the court making any award of money to Mr. King, but only with the idea that the Court of Claims may make a report to the Senate on the character and nature of the claim,



so that the Senate may have the information for such action as it may see fit to take on the bill.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I now submit, which is a routine resolution for the reference of a bill to the Court of Claims, to obtain this information for the Senate.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 152) was read, considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 1017) entitled "A bill for the relief of W. J. King" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate, giving such conclusions as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, either as a claim, legal or equitable, or as a gratuity against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant; and the said court shall so proceed with the same and report to the Senate, irrespective of any statute of limitations bar, and irrespective of any administrative requirement as to filing claim therefor.

#### THE GLOBAL ALPHABET (S. DOC. NO. 49)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed as a Senate document a manuscript entitled "The Global Alphabet" by former Senator Robert L. Owen, of my State of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the manuscript presented by the Senator from Oklahoma will be printed as a Senate document.

#### REPORT OF BERMUDA CONFERENCE ON THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a release which has been agreed upon by the American and British Governments in the same general terms, in connection with the recent Bermuda conference on the refugee problem.

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

The delegates appointed by the American and British Governments to confer at Bermuda upon the refugee problem have now terminated their discussions and have submitted a report to their respective Governments. The two Governments have received this and are at present engaged in carrying out its recommendations. Throughout the discussions at Bermuda the United States and British delegations as well as the two Governments worked in complete harmony and in a spirit of mutual cooperation. The report was submitted as a joint report and contains no divergence of opinion.

While the details must be regarded as confidential so long as a knowledge of the recommendations contained therein would be of aid or comfort to our enemies or might adversely affect the refugees whom all are trying to aid, certain facts may now be made public.

The two delegations accomplished the useful task of dividing suggestions and proposals

for the solution of the refugee problem into two categories: (1) What was possible under existing war conditions, and (2) what was impossible under these same conditions.

All suggestions were measured by two strict criteria. In the first place, nothing could be recommended that would interfere with or delay the war effort of the United Nations, and, secondly, any recommendation submitted must be capable of accomplishment under war conditions.

The shipping problem was recognized to be of the utmost urgency and it was agreed that any plan looking to the diverting of Allied shipping from the war effort to remove or care for refugees would present considerations of a military character which would disclose almost insuperable difficulties. It was also agreed that no negotiations with Hitler could be undertaken since his entire record has left no doubt that he would only agree to such solutions as would be of direct aid to the Axis war aims.

The conference was, however, able to recommend measures both for removing refugees from neutral countries and, in those cases where such removal was not possible, for giving assurances of international cooperation in the future of the refugee problem so far as it affected them.

It also recommended a number of temporary refugee havens to which refugees could be transported and maintained if and when shipping should become available. At least one such movement has been effected.

Certain measures of a financial nature to cover necessary expenses and a declaration of intention to provide for repatriation upon the termination of hostilities were also recommended.

The conference also submitted a plan for an expanded and more efficient intergovernmental organization with increased authority to meet the problems created or likely to arise under war conditions.

Some of these measures are now being put into effect and others, it is hoped, will soon be possible. It is therefore believed that the practical results of the recommendations submitted by the conference will soon become apparent.

#### WORK, PEACE, AND HEALTH—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Work, Peace, and Health, delivered by the Vice President at an American Labor Party dinner held at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, Sunday, May 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ROADS TO LASTING PEACE AND THE RESOLUTION TO WIN THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Roads to Lasting Peace and the Resolution to Win the Peace," delivered by him in Columbus, Ohio, April 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT ACTS—SUMMARY OF STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of a statement on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act made by Senator O'MAHONEY before the Senate Finance Committee on May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, made by

Senator O'MAHONEY before the Senate Finance Committee, on May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EXCERPTS FROM DIARY OF WELSH SOLDIER AT GETTYSBURG

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the diary, written during the battle of Gettysburg, of a soldier of Welsh ancestry and correspondence relating thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### MR. CHURCHILL'S PLEDGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Churchill's Pledge," from the New York Times of May 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### UNITED NATIONS FOOD CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Washington (D. C.) News, dealing with the United Nations Food Conference now being held at Hot Springs, Va., which appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE RUMI TAX PLAN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Washington (D. C.) News dealing with the present status of tax legislation in Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### DISTRIBUTION OF GASOLINE IN THE SOUTHERN STATES

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator, and an advertisement appearing in the May 16, 1943, issue of the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., both on the subject of distribution of gasoline in the Southern States, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### CONDUCT OF THE WAR—LETTER FROM MRS. LOUISE H. MERRITT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mrs. Louise H. Merritt, of Mount Holly Road, Charlotte, N. C., under date of April 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### YES, WE HAVE NO POTATOES—ADVERTISEMENT FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Yes, We Have No Potatoes," published in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POLITICS NEEDS WOMEN—ARTICLE BY EVE GARRETTE

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Eve Garrette, on the subject Politics Needs Women, published in the May 1943 issue of the Woman's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WILL THE STATES STAND AGAINST FEDERAL POWER?—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will the States Stand Against Federal Power?" written by J. N. Heiskell, editor of the Arkansas Gazette, and printed in the Arkansas Gazette for May 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## SECOND ARMY MANEUVERS—EDITORIAL FROM MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial in the nature of a tribute to the Second Army, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for Sunday, May 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

## NAVY NIGHT—ADDRESSES AT MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the Navy Night addresses by Mr. Hamilton Owens, the editor of the Baltimore Sun; Hon. James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy; and Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, United States Navy, delivered before the meeting of the Maryland Historical Society, at Baltimore, Md., on May 10, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

## THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 208.

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

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, if I have the floor.

## FLOODS AND FOOD PRODUCTION— BUTTER AND OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments in relation to the matter of food production throughout the country. Senators may have noticed in reading the newspapers today that throughout Indiana and other sections of the United States floods are taking a tremendous toll. We heard the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, yesterday vividly describing the work of the Royal Air Force in attacking certain areas in Germany and destroying dams, thus flooding great acreages and driving some 150,000 persons out of their homes. During the present spring season all over the United States nature has gone on a rampage. In certain areas there have been serious droughts. In other sections we are now having great storms. The result is that the production of food-stuffs has been delayed, and the question is what the percentage of loss will be compared to the total production. This situation, Mr. President, calls for serious consideration on the part of everyone.

There came to my desk this morning a letter from one of our county agents saying that in the area he represents the farmers are in need of farm help and that many of the old folks on the farms who thought they could get through this period are now giving up. I sent that letter to one of the Government departments in Washington and hope that a remedy will be found.

Mr. President, today I received a letter from the Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association, at Plymouth, Wis. Plymouth, of course, is known all over the country as

one of the great centers for the production of that important food. My attention has been called to the fact that less milk is now being produced than was produced a year ago. Butter production is below the production of last year, and the trend of production is downward. The production of Cheddar cheese is 24 percent below the 1942 production. Some sections of the United States are showing as much as 63 percent less production of Cheddar cheese than a year ago. It has been estimated that Wisconsin will produce about 19 percent less Cheddar cheese this year than last. It is not simply a question of fields which should be in production, but we find a great production front—to wit, the cow—which is not producing as it should. This is a subject which merits consideration by Congress. I have said as much on previous occasions.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to something which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17 by a colleague of mine, Hon. REID F. MURRAY, Representative in Congress from the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District. He called attention to the fact that one Edward Sard, an employee of the O. P. A., a graduate of Cornell, 29 years of age, was going through the Middle West—think of it, Senators—this young man whom we are paying under O. P. A. was going through the Middle West using public funds to promote the idea or advisability of the people of the Middle West eating oleomargarine instead of butter.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have submitted to the Senate for action my unanimous-consent request that we proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky has made a request for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar beginning with calendar No. 208.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky yielded to me, and I shall take but a short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin had concluded.

Mr. WILEY. No. I shall not take very long. I expect the usual courtesy to which a Senator is entitled. I thought we had arrived at the point where, if a Senator obtained the floor, he was entitled to proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I propounded a unanimous-consent request to take up the calendar, but that request has not as yet been acted upon.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator let that request bide a wee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will let it abide; I do not know whether I will let it bide a wee.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I have already yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield so I may ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin is denouncing oleomargarine.

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is complaining that someone has to eat oleomargarine instead of butter from Wisconsin. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that scientific analyses and statistics show that oleomargarine does not have tuberculosis, nor does it catch it either in the form it is caught by the cow or the milk which comes from the cow. [Laughter.] The producers of oleomargarine contend that it has been discriminated against by the Government by reason of the imposition of discriminatory taxes in order to try to force butter down the throats of people who may not want it. So I want to express my resentment at the Senator's attack on one of the staple vegetable products of this land, healthful and invigorating. Those who try it usually prefer it to old, greasy, sour butter which has been retreated two or three times to make people think it is fresh. I wanted the RECORD to show that I resent this attack on a great industry of this country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am surprised at the distinguished Senator from Texas, who usually exercises much wisdom in his statements on the floor, but who now shows his ignorance in no small manner about the value of butter. I have not attacked oleomargarine. I am attacking a policy of government which will permit taking the people's money and using it to send out agents to propagandize one article which is produced in this country as against another article produced here. I say again that the Senator from Texas either was deaf or dumb, or simple; he did not hear what I said on the subject. What I said was that the O. P. A. sent out one of the little eastern boys who graduated from Cornell recently, one of the chaps who come out with initials after their names, but no experience in life, and no knowledge of the real problems which confront the people of the country, to instruct our people what to eat.

Mr. President, I do not have to apologize for butter. I say that when the Government sends one of its agents into the West, and pays his salary and permits him to become a propagandist in favor of one product which is made out of cottonseed and against the product that comes from the udder of the cow, then Government becomes a menace to society. That is the point I was making.

Mr. President, I am extremely sorry that the distinguished citizen from Texas interjected into this picture the element of filth—

Mr. CONNALLY. The element of what?

Mr. WILEY. Of filth, I repeat, at the time I spoke of the product of the cow. For centuries the cow has been the



mother of the race. Its product has nourished the babe and the man. And because I object to Government using the people's money, which you, Mr. President, and I and the people on the farm contribute, to send forth into the West for purposes of propaganda a little lad who recently came out of college, who probably never saw a cow—because I object to that procedure is no reason why the distinguished Senator from Texas should attempt to jump on the cow. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Wisconsin complains because the Senator from Texas was speaking in behalf of a product from his section. Yet this whole colloquy arose by reason of the Senator from Wisconsin reading from a letter he received from a cheese factory in his State of Wisconsin complaining about the situation that now exists. I was deeply touched by the Senator's reference to the cow as being the mother of the race, and in view of the Senator's speech I may also suggest that the cow is the mother of lots of "bull." [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to hear that bit of Socratic wisdom from the gentleman from down by the Rio Grande. If there is any place in the world where they handle bull, it is that section. Bull comes from that section, both literally and figuratively; and we have seen it here. In the last 4 years and 6 months I have seen no "bull" peddling exponent greater than my distinguished friend.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the bull factory is the range of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] where 19 bull calves came in quick succession and only 1 heifer calf. I say to the Senator that I need not defend that cow. I have many cows in my own State; and I think the Senator forgets one great truth about the source of both oleomargarine and butter—namely, that both have one common source of production. Oleomargarine comes from cottonseed which comes from green grass, and the milk in the udder of the cow also comes from green grass. They both come from green grass which comes from Republican air and sunshine; is not that true? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I will not disagree with that conclusion, and I am sure the Senator from Texas will not disagree. I want to make it clear, and I think the Record will demonstrate it, that I said nothing obnoxious or obscene about the State of Texas. I even like the "bull" which comes from the other side of the aisle. It is real "bull." Generally it is clear-sighted and goes to the point.

Mr. President, let us see just what the situation is.

Does the dairy industry want oleomargarine abolished? Decidedly not.

Oleomargarine has its place, but that place is not as an imitation of butter, which is simply—and I am speaking of butter—the fatty constituent of milk separated by agitation after a lactic fermentation in the cream. Oleomargarine is not butter. It has its own characteristics, just as butter has its own characteristics and color.

Even under the new standards, oleomargarine will not contain certain fatty saturated acids which, according to a widely known biochemist of the University of Wisconsin, are exceedingly important to the growth of human beings. What the dairy industry wants is to see that oleomargarine is definitely sold on its own merits, that it does not masquerade as butter, and that its sales are not promoted by government—I repeat, promoted by government—to the detriment of the post-armament dairy market. In this age of synthetics and ersatz products, that is a problem which may confront other segments of agriculture; and that is why all agricultural interests are concerned with this precedent, and that is why the public is also concerned.

Mr. President, millions of persons are engaged in the dairy industry, producing milk and butter and cheese, and millions more are engaged in handling the products thereof; and government, which is supposed to lend a helping hand, instead employs such standards and promotional methods as this to interfere with the established right of this segment of the farm industry.

Nothing that I said today can be interpreted as a personal attack upon any other industry.

We know that oleomargarine—whether it is fortified or not—does not contain certain specific saturated fatty acids which are important to growing individuals.

But, with Representative MURRAY, I say, "Why is O. P. A. using public funds for such a purpose?"

Mr. President, I now ask to have incorporated in the Record at this point and appropriately referred the resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, at Fond du Lac, Wis., on April 15, 1943. I shall leave the matter of "throwing the bull" to the Senator from Texas.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### I

Whereas subsidies have been, and are now being, paid to producers for a twofold purpose—first, to effect prompt increase in the production of essential products; and second, a means of preventing inflation; and

Whereas since December 1, 1942, a subsidy has been paid on all Cheddar cheese to the producers of milk used in the manufacture thereof; and

Whereas current reports indicate the failure of the subsidy to increase production and the amount involved insufficient to affect, much less prevent, inflation; Therefore

Resolved, That the cheese makers of Wisconsin, manufacturers of over half of the Nation's cheese, urgently recommend the immediate removal of the subsidy on Cheddar

cheese and raising the ceiling price to at least 28 cents per pound; and

That this recommendation be promptly forwarded to the proper Federal officials.

#### II

Whereas cheese in general, and Cheddar cheese in particular, have been projected into the spotlight of selected foods by this emergency because of their valuable food elements, advantages in shipping space, keeping qualities, palatability and potential production, and consequently subjected to regulatory measures intended to accomplish a variety of objectives—the subsidy to increase production, the set-aside order to assure Government requirements and equalize the obligation of sellers and rationing to insure equalization of consumer supplies, all of which require the preparation of separate monthly reports of production coupled with deliveries; and

Whereas these reports could be simplified and much valuable time saved the cheese maker if they were based on the month's production without affecting their accuracy; Therefore

Resolved, That we recommend revision of present cheese factory production reports by eliminating the deliveries during the month and report only the month's production.

#### III

Whereas it has become necessary in the conservation of critical materials to standardize and simplify all manufacturing equipment, and a committee of the War Production Board is now studying all types of equipment for the purpose of recommending the standardization thereof, including cheese factory equipment; and

Whereas it appears the standardization of certain cheese factory equipment will neither conserve materials nor labor in the manufacture thereof, and will directly interfere with the efficient and economic equipping of cheese factories; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the cheese makers of Wisconsin respectfully petition the Special Standardization and Simplification Committee of the War Production Board for opportunity to be heard before action is taken changing the present standards of cheese factory equipment, and that the proper officials be informed of the action taken at this conference; and further, that our sincerity of purpose and desire to aid the war effort be tested by examination of our record of production.

#### IV

Whereas producers delivering milk to cheese factories customarily get their families' cheese requirements at the cheese factory and records show such requirements in the past do not exceed 1 percent of the factories' total production; and

Whereas such factory patrons must hereafter surrender ration points for all cheese, thereby adding more clerical work to the cheese-makers' steadily increasing labors; Therefore

Resolved, That we recommend that cheese factories be permitted to sell or deliver cheese to patrons of the plant in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the total production without the surrender of ration points.

#### V

Whereas the Federal Government has authorized the purchase of cheese on the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange and is now buying thereon; and

Whereas there is doubt as to the policy to be followed in the future;

Resolved, That this conference of Wisconsin cheesemakers record its confidence in the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange and urge the Food Distribution Administration to continue buying thereon for the duration of their purchase program.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE  
CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has requested that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 208. The request calls for unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ellender	Overton
Andrews	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Gerry	Reed
Bailey	Gillette	Revercomb
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	Robertson
Barbour	Gurney	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Smith
Bone	Hill	Stewart
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Buck	Langer	Tunnell
Burton	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	Lucas	Vandenberg
Butler	McCarran	Van Nuys
Byrd	McClellan	Wagner
Capper	McFarland	Wallgren
Caraway	McKellar	Walsh
Chandler	McNary	Wheeler
Chavez	Maloney	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	White
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wiley
Connally	Moore	Willis
Danaher	Murdoch	Wilson
Davis	Murray	
Eastland	O'Daniel	

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

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, attending the funeral of the late Representative Englebright, of California.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent in Detroit, Mich., where he is attending to his duties as a member of the Truman committee.

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

## WAR LABOR BOARD DECISIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 130, directing the War Labor Board to furnish certain information respecting the decisions made by that Board. The information furnished, Mr. President, in my judgment, was totally inadequate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have written to Mr. W. H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, at Washington.

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

MAY 20, 1943.

Hon. W. H. DAVIS,

War Labor Board, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: With respect to your letter of May 10 and with reference to the report filed by the War Labor Board on that date responding to Senate Resolution 130, asking for certain information from the War Labor Board, I wish to state that by careful analysis of the report made to the Senate, it is clear to me that the information furnished was neither adequately nor properly submitted in compliance with the direction of the resolution. In addition to the information given to the Senate by your report of May 10, the following information requested was omitted:

First. A statement of the changes expressed in amounts in the basic hourly rates of wages and the average weekly earnings which have resulted from your decisions and orders in the case of each employer or industry affected thereby.

The Senate directed you to submit a list of all decisions and orders with the name and address of each employer or industry affected and a statement showing in each instance the changes that resulted from your order in the basic hourly rates and the average weekly earnings. Your report gives only the average change in basic hourly rates, while the resolution specifically requests the changes in the hourly basic rates for each industry or employee. It follows that with the change in the hourly basic rate of wages in each case decided by the War Labor Board, the average weekly earnings can be fairly accurately estimated, as you say.

Second. The Senate resolution requests a definition of policy upon which substandard wages and inequalities have been decided, together with illustrative examples of decisions made in conformity with such policy. The report submitted does not clearly give such a definition, which is of primary importance to establish the policy of the Board in such decisions.

Third, the resolution further requested a statement of each individual case, with reasons therefor, in which wage increases have been authorized or provided by the Board, which constitute a departure from the so-called Little Steel formula.

This was not given. Your report is not by any means adequate to provide the basis for a clear understanding of the effect of the decisions of the War Labor Board, nor does it enable a checking of the actions of the Board so as to determine the full effect of such decisions.

Your statement that the wage adjustments approved by the War Labor Board have had only a microscopic effect upon prices cannot be determined without full and complete information in each individual decision as made by the Board. It is, of course, true that a decision made by the War Labor Board establishes a precedent just as does a decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States, and that when such a decision is made, a number of voluntary wage increase requests by employers may follow, because the War Labor Board has already

given a decision in a case that may be on a comparable basis. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that the effect of the decisions of the War Labor Board are confined only to those instances when a controversy is submitted as between employees and employers.

Resolution 130 passed the Senate unanimously, and I ask that the information which was omitted in your report be promptly furnished in a supplemental report.

With best wishes, I am,  
Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

## CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Idle Acres Will Help Enemies, F. S. A. Head Says," published in the *Landsford (N. Dak.) Leader*; also, a letter from Arthur T. Boyd, secretary and treasurer of the Medora Grazing Association, of Medora, N. Dak.; and a letter from Engel A. Stafne, son of the former railroad commissioner of North Dakota, written from Hettinger, N. Dak., under date of April 20, 1943, together with an article entitled "FSA Has Successful Year."

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

[From the *Landsford (N. Dak.) Leader*]IDLE ACRES WILL HELP ENEMIES, FARM SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION HEAD SAYS

The patch of ground that could produce food but is not in production is doing its bit for the enemy, believes George E. Lawrence, county Farm Security supervisor for Bottineau County. Its failure to produce robs America and the Allies of just that much food energy and makes it just a speck easier for Japan, Germany, and Italy to fight us effectively.

Idle acres is a name applied to productive land not in production, or only in partial production due to "scrap farming" practices. Bottineau county has its quota of such acres, according to reports from farmers who are lining up to put these acres to work. Perhaps the farmer himself is the only one who knows about his idle acres. Maybe his neighbors know about them. Lawrence believes there are hundreds of idle acres in this county—acres wholly or partially idle. The State total runs into hundreds of thousands of acres. Every idle acre is a potential threat to the success of the war effort. Although idle acres constitute a national problem, they are first of all a local problem. Correction of the evil is entirely local, a problem for the home folks to take care of. The farmer himself has the best chance to change idle acres into fighting acres.

The Secretary of Agriculture has asked each community to help fight the idle acre menace. The county United States Department of Agriculture war board is directed to assist in mobilizing such land in each community for maximum productive use. County and community Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees are asked to keep a weather eye open for productive pieces of land in their own neighborhoods that need attention. They are using their own initiative to work out adjustments to put this land into full production. Cases they cannot handle are to be reported to the county war board, then the board will help locate people who will farm the acres. When necessary, the board can finance operations through available loan programs, and can help operators obtain labor or machinery if that is what it takes. All member agencies of the war board, the extension agent, Farm Security Agency county supervisor, and



others, are helping in the program. The county war board selects a member to serve as a clearing center for farmers with idle acres they cannot farm themselves and for those who could sell them.

The county Farm Security supervisor is expected to aid a great deal, Lawrence said, because he has much to do with tenure problems, group services, and loan supervision.

MEDORA GRAZING ASSOCIATION,  
Medora, N. Dak., May 6, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: It has been brought to my attention that the House has passed the agricultural appropriations bill, eliminating parity payment, incentive payments, crop insurance, and greatly restricted soil-conservation payments and loans on war-risk crops.

As I understand this bill, it restricts any one cooperator from earning through these various means more than \$500. In a broad sense, this appears justified, and no doubt it would eliminate continuance of some undesirable features of the program, but in our particular case, and no doubt in others similar to ours, it creates a different picture.

Two years ago we earned through compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act approximately \$2,500. This money was earned and spent for the construction of dams, well, springs, etc. This work was done on lands leased by the association from various sources, namely, railroad, State school, county, nonresident-owned, etc. We earned only \$720.20 last year, due to the shortage of labor and materials.

This summer we plan on drilling an artesian well, development of several springs, and the construction of as many dams as time, labor, and our allowance will permit. If we are restricted to the maximum amount of \$500, we will be unable to accomplish any of this. The water developments made through compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act are used in common by our 148 members and forty-odd temporary permittees.

It is for the above-mentioned reasons that we would like to see this bill amended making it possible for nonprofit cooperative associations such as ours to continue to improve and develop a sound conservation and utilization program and at the same time make any desired adjustments that may be needed to the agricultural program.

I do not wish to convey to you the idea that we are asking for special favors or privileges not granted to other citizens. I am writing to you only to explain how this restriction would affect us.

We fully realize the responsibilities placed upon you and Congress and the sacrifices necessary to ordinary operations for the successful prosecution of the war and realize that this matter is controversial in all respects, and we ask that you give this your usual careful consideration when this bill appears before the Senate.

With thanks and personal regards, I remain,  
Very truly yours,

ARTHUR T. EYD,  
Secretary and Treasurer.

HETTINGER, N. DAK., April 20, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have served on county committees of many different Federal agencies and have been on the Farm Security Administration Rural Rehabilitation Committee since 1936.

My observation has been that the local community, county, State, and Federal Governments have received greater returns from the Farm Security Administration loans than from the money spent by any other Federal or

State agency and respectfully ask your help and cooperation to have the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration continued.

Sincerely yours,

ENGEL A. STAFNE.

#### FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION HAS SUCCESSFUL YEAR

Obert Thorson, Chairman of the Farm Security Administration Rural Rehabilitation Committee, reports that since the beginning of the fiscal year July 1, 1942, 17 standard-loan borrowers and 21 emergency-loan borrowers have paid their loans in full. Total collections from July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, amount to \$67,860.35. From the beginning of the Farm Security Administration program to March 1, 1943, 286 nonstandard and 42 standard borrowers have paid their loans in full and 21 of the 42 paid-up standard borrowers own their farms, he stated.

From July 1, 1942, to March 15, 1943, seven new standard loans have been made to farm families who had no other source of credit. These loans were made largely for livestock and poultry, which will help to produce essential war foods. The standard borrowers, according to their 1943 farm and home plans, expect to produce the following percentages in comparison with 1942 actual recorded production:

	Percent
Calves to be dropped.....	116
Pigs to be farrowed.....	146
Eggs to be produced.....	113
Butterfat.....	115
Chickens to be raised.....	141
Cows to be milked.....	117
Acres of garden.....	129
Vegetables to be canned.....	145
Fruit to be canned.....	161
Potato acreage.....	136
Flax acreage.....	337

These borrowers, believes Mr. Thorson, will show the greatest gains in production—first, because they are on family-size farms and utilize their own labor; second, because in the past they have not been properly equipped with machinery, livestock, wells, and buildings; third, there has been lack of food reserves; fourth, the family labor was not fully utilized; fifth, because many are sharing equipment and labor and reducing cost by buying cooperatively.

Ninety percent of the low-income farmers, when properly assisted with equipment, livestock, and tenure, will not only repay their loans but will be substantial citizens of the community. Of the 42 standard paid-up loans, 24, or 57 percent, will be paying Federal income tax this March. Of the 90 present standard borrowers, 28, or 30 percent, will be paying Federal income tax this year.

This over-all picture, based on facts, remarked Mr. Thorson, speaks well for the usefulness of the Farm Security Administration.

#### I AM AN AMERICAN DAY CELEBRATION AT PHILADELPHIA—DANGER OF POLLUTION AND FLOOD FROM SCHUYLKILL RIVER

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on Sunday last I had the distinct privilege of addressing an I Am an American Day gathering of some 20,000 citizens in the great city of Philadelphia. On that day 1,500 men and women who stood among that throng received their citizenship papers—a clear title to the most precious of all possessions—citizenship in the Republic of America.

There in the city of Philadelphia, that historic landmark of American history, those 1,500 men and women, like those venerable men of another age who signed those immortal documents of human liberty, the Declaration of Inde-

pendence and the Constitution of the United States, turned their backs upon the oppression and tyranny of the old world and went forward to embrace a new world—a world of freedom, justice, and equality. There in the shadows of Independence Hall, which enshrines the Bell of Liberty which first pealed out its toll of freedom more than a century ago; there where such undying patriots as Jefferson, Franklin, Hancock, and Washington struck their great and resounding blows against compulsion and took up for themselves and for their fellows a citizenship in America—that land where liberty, tolerance, and growth still abide; there in the city of Philadelphia, the essence of America stands enshrined forever in the works and deeds of immortal men.

I have stood in the great square of Philadelphia on many another occasion; but truly, Mr. President, there has never been another occasion like that. All America was assembled there. Men and women of all races, creeds, and colors were gathered there—dressed in the garbs of the respective nations from whence they came to take up the mantle of citizenship in America. Those people were immigrants and descendants of immigrants. They were Catholic, Protestant, Jew, and gentile. They were old and young. They were merchant and banker, soldier and worker. They were at once the diversity and strength of an America united.

There in that crowd the courageous faith of those honored dead who built America was more than justified. There the productive powers of an industrious and thrifty people gave ample credence to the impassioned claims of Alexander Hamilton that only when enterprise is free, only when the paths of progress are open to all, will men achieve unto the utmost of their talents. Mighty are the blows which free enterprise has struck against oppression and regimentation. But none more mighty than those which are being struck today as the materials of war, produced by free labor and free management in the free economy of America, speed to the battle fronts of the world in ever-increasing numbers, there to rain blow after blow upon the distraught and harried forces of tyranny and aggression. This is a crisis for all men, but the free-enterprise system in America has shown that it can overwhelm the efforts of all other economies combined. The men and women gathered under the shadow of the flag stood grateful that those who founded this Republic founded with it an economy based upon free enterprise. For they know and we all know that the creations of free enterprise will sustain our liberty and redeem the world.

Those citizens felt the rich wisdom and high courage which men like Washington and Jefferson displayed when they proclaimed the majesty of the individual man. For here in this land, unfettered by the yoke of regimentation, the people of America remain sovereign and supreme. No power, no force, no issue can strike them down, nor depose them of the constitutional rights which

have helped them to a stature of attainment unequalled in all the world. Freedom of religion has kept them faithful and made them tolerant. Freedom of person has kept them independent and made them cooperative. Freedom of the press has kept them informed and made them vigilant; and all these together have kept and shall keep them free.

Mr. President, a man without a country is a man without a destiny. But an American is a man whose own destiny and whose country's destiny are unlimited. For, as the march of freedom is eternal, so, too, is the march of America and its citizens eternal. One had only to look out upon that throng of American citizens to realize this truth. For they are the apostles and defenders of mankind. They march in the cause of justice. Theirs is the destiny of triumph—such a triumph as shall extend to all peoples and encompass all lands.

The truth of these words is spoken in the fact that among that crowd were 1,500 men and women who had just become citizens of this great Republic. It was a proud day for them, and it was a proud day for America. I am sure that those new citizens felt as my own father felt when he received his citizenship papers more than 60 years ago—a citizenship of which I have been the proud and fortunate beneficiary. His eyes shining and his heart proud, he held those papers up for all men to see and said, "This is the greatest diploma in the world; it is the latchkey to freedom and to progress." Today there are 1,500 new American citizens in the State of Pennsylvania; 1,500 more latchkeys to freedom and progress.

Those who have come here to embrace this citizenship—one of whom was Eugene J. Houdry, that enterprising American of French descent, who has developed a revolutionary process for making rubber out of oil—have come here to accept the opportunities extended by free economic enterprise, the enduring heritage of constitutional government, and the full responsibilities of complete American citizenship. For they know and we all know that these truths are eternal: That freemen shall liberate the world; and liberated, the world shall go forth into the peace and progress of a new, inspiring day.

I was privileged on that occasion, Mr. President, to tap the historic Liberty Bell 13 times in commemoration of those Thirteen Original Colonies which, in high resolve and deep determination, first took up the struggle for American freedom and independence more than a hundred years ago. As I felt and heard the vibrations of that great bell, I felt and knew something of the deep inspiration which the tolling of the bell had given to those honored American patriots of another day when its mighty peals first sounded "to proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Mr. President, the privilege of tapping out the call to freedom on this time-honored Liberty Bell is indeed a signal honor—such an honor as I who am a foreign-born American

had never dared hope would ever come to me in my lifetime.

As I beheld this occasion, and as I listened to the inspiring remarks of Mr. Houdry and the other distinguished speakers, I was grateful to God that my parents had possessed the foresight and vision to leave the ways of the Old World behind and to take up their abode and secure their citizenship in this great land of freedom and opportunity which is America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the address which I delivered on the occasion of I Am an American Day in Philadelphia on Sunday, May 16, 1943—an occasion which was admirably presided over by Mr. Charles Grakelow, director of the department of supplies and purchases for the city of Philadelphia—and an occasion which was heightened by the memorable addresses delivered by the Honorable Bernard Samuel, mayor of the city of Philadelphia and the Honorable John Bell, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Pennsylvania.

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

It is with deep honor and abiding hope that I meet with you today—you citizens of America—you sons and daughters of freedom—who pause for a moment in this grave hour of crisis to pay homage to that greatest, most inspiring heritage that the minds of men have ever known—citizenship in the Republic of America.

The enduring history of this America is always brought home to me in all its awesome fullness whenever I come to the great city of Philadelphia. Here in this eternal monument to America, here where the spirit of the founding fathers still abides, here where the tolls of American liberty first resounded across the countryside, here where men and women alike first took up the fight for freedom and humanity, here in the very surroundings and spirit of the times the significance of America comes home to me.

More than a hundred years of human progress look down upon this citadel today—more than 100 years given to the building of hope and human decency in America. Here in those hundred-odd years people of every race, creed, and color have been welded together in an unshakable solidarity. Here under the empowering incentives of republican government, free enterprise, and productive competition this America has grown into the most powerful and enduring citadel of human rights and material progress that the world has ever known.

And well it has. For today that citadel stands imperiled—its principles, purposes, and validity challenged by the forces of tyranny and barbarism. Today, the American people are being called upon to vindicate democracy, to restore freedom, and to insure justice. Today, as in years previous, the American people have resolved to secure their freedom and to preserve their way of life.

The misguided and violent leaders of fascism have thrown down their gauntlet on the altar of war. They have cried out to the world: "America is doomed! Her people are soft. They cannot work. They will not fight. They grovel in the lap of luxury. They are decadent and dead. The forces of regimented power, under the unfailing leadership of one master shall destroy their world."

Oh, what travesty on prophecy were those words. What futile and aimless misconception of the power and purpose of free-

men. What was a love of peace was taken by our enemies to be a fear of force. What was an abiding tolerance was presumed to be a lack of decision. What was an inner confidence was presumed to be a pervading weakness. Swathed in a sea of misconception, these diabolical demons unleashed the force and fire of their hellish fury upon the people of America. In a dastardly stroke of treachery which was Pearl Harbor, they sank our ships, they killed our men, and they laid waste our creations. But that America which was to fall asunder and cry out for mercy did not fall asunder and it did not cry out for mercy.

In the face of this infamy, the power of freemen, the power of America was mustered into an unswerving unity. This land of freemen went forward as it has always gone forward in the cause of right and justice.

And so it was that our great industrial empire built up over the years by the inspired hands and hearts of freemen turned toward the tasks of war. And so it is that in this short time those same men and women who were too soft to work are producing more of the implements of war than all the rest of the world combined. These men and women who toil in America are freemen; they are not shackled; they are not driven; they need no Fuehrer. For theirs is the strength of freemen, theirs is the strength that has made and shall keep the world.

But it is not only on the production front that the power of freemen is being felt. Young American men from the field, the factory, and the forests have gone forward to meet the enemy. Theirs is not an army of professionals, schooled in the traditions of militarism and conquest; theirs is an army of the whole people, moving forward with the heartbeat of the Nation. They go forward to destroy the enemy, and they shall not fail.

Only this week in north Africa we beheld the force and power of freemen. There on the hills and plains of Tunisia a vast army of Hitler's supermen laid down their arms in abject surrender. When they were confronted with the righteous wrath of freemen, these German supermen, these Axis invincibles, quit cold. They surrendered. And they surrendered to that same generation of free Americans which the Axis had called poor weaklings.

Well, the Nazis and the Japs will meet more of these poor weaklings. They will meet them in Tokyo and Berlin. They will continue to meet them until those Axis brigands surrender themselves, their tanks, their guns, and all their war material. They will continue to meet them until the forces of America take that one thing—the only thing we want from our enemies—unconditional surrender.

These Axis leaders no longer question the ability of the American people to fight, for they have read the record—that glorious record written in the rock cliffs of Bataan, the steaming jungles of New Guinea, and the endless sands of north Africa. They shall continue to read that record until the final chapter is written with the outright capitulation of Tokyo and Berlin.

As the Axis leaders no longer question the ability of America to fight, neither do they doubt our ability to work. For they have seen the creations of Americans at work, and they have trembled at the sight. They have seen our aircraft overhead. They have heard the whistling of our bombs as they loose destruction on the war plants of the Reich. They have beheld and felt the power of our tanks, guns, and aircraft in Africa, in Russia, in Britain, and in China. They see our ever-increasing naval and merchant fleets moving endlessly across the seas. They see all these things, and they shall see more. For these are the works of freemen, and they are



limitless. Our enemies shall behold a constant flow of men, materials, and munitions which shall continue across the high seas of the world in an ever-ascending crescendo until the resultant force and power which shall be wrought upon them shall bring them down into an absolute, final, and overwhelming defeat. How can it be otherwise? Free-men have answered the challenge! Free Americans are in the fight.

It will not, it cannot, be otherwise. For this I Am an American Day finds all Americans standing, working, and fighting in one all-encompassing unity, and we shall stand in unity until the end. We shall each continue with high resolve at our appointed task. We shall let no issue, no grievance, no disaffection interfere with our great work even for a split second. For we Americans know that wars are not won and victories are not fashioned save on the anvils of unity and cooperation. We have that unity and we have that cooperation. And through them we shall redeem the world.

As we Americans stand in unity today, may we also highly resolve to stand in unity tomorrow. For in so doing we shall add immortal luster to the spirit and significance of this day. We shall make clear to the world that the skill, ingenuity, and determination of free Americans are united—to the end that this suffering, this injustice, this unbridled chaos shall never again rise up to plague the bastions of human liberty or the outposts of universal justice, and that all men shall go forward together in progress and in peace until the end of time.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania how much more time he expects to take. We have not even started the call of the calendar.

Mr. DAVIS. I shall take only 2 minutes longer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not take any longer. I wish to proceed with the call of the calendar. Senators are waiting to take action on the measures on the calendar.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it was only after leaving this inspiring American Day celebration that I had occasion to learn of another, less inspiring adjunct to the city of Philadelphia. I speak now of the deplorable state of the Schuylkill River, part of whose waters are used to power many of the important industrial plants in the Philadelphia area, and part of whose waters are used for domestic consumption by a great number of the good American citizens in this area.

Now, Mr. President, by reason of the fact that this stream has been necessarily used by certain large industrial concerns as a dumping and draining ground, this very strategic region is faced with two imminent and menacing dangers—epidemics and floods. First, by reason of the tremendous amount of filth already dumped into this stream, the dangers of pollution to this necessary water supply are both obvious and alarming. Moreover, the continued accretion of silt and refuse has almost completely destroyed the channel of the stream—a condition readily conducive to serious and damaging floods.

If either of these disasters should occur—and, if present conditions continue, there is strong likelihood that one or both of them shall certainly occur—the war effort of this Nation, not to mention the

safety and welfare of vast numbers of its citizens and many of its industries, would be in grave peril.

In this strategic area millions of dollars' worth of essential war materials are being produced every single day. Coal is being mined. Steel is being made. Ships are being built, and other war materials too numerous to mention are being fashioned in the many hundreds of industrial plants which mark this region. Should floods strike this area, the mine properties would be flooded; hydroelectric stations, which supply power to many war plants and buildings, would be damaged or washed away. Production would be halted, and the war effort of this Nation would be dealt a heavy and a serious blow.

Should an epidemic occur in this area, the effects would be very grave, indeed. It is a populous area. Homes are close together. Thousands upon thousands of people work side by side in great war plants. Schools, churches, and other public buildings, as well as all transportation facilities, are crowded to the utmost, bringing many thousands of people into close and almost constant personal contact. To fight an epidemic in such surroundings as these would constitute an almost insuperable task. Countless lives would be lost; homes would be broken; and the entire region clothed in a tragedy bordering upon complete ruin. Furthermore, the productive efforts of millions of skilled and ardent workers who reside in this area and produce the vast stores of war materials which flow from this area, would be threatened with a complete halt, and the war effort of the entire Nation would be seriously undermined.

While it is true that the Schuylkill River as such is completely confined within the borders of the State of Pennsylvania, and while, because of this fact, the control of the stream is regarded as purely a State matter, since the Federal Government concerns itself only with those streams which are interstate in nature, I should like to point out that the Schuylkill River has interstate ramifications of the first order, and that for the following reasons, the control and conditions of this stream should be subjected to the utmost scrutiny and concern of the Federal Government:

First. This river—the Schuylkill—flows into and is a tributary of the Delaware River, which, in turn, flows through three States—New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland—before it empties into Chesapeake Bay. It is obvious that any pollution of the Schuylkill River might very easily lead to pollution of the Delaware River. Such pollution would extend the probable danger of epidemic throughout the heart of one of the most populous and productive regions on the entire Atlantic seaboard—the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. An epidemic of those proportions would certainly be a matter of interstate concern, and a matter of concern to the Federal Government.

Second. The products which are fashioned by the power generated by the Schuylkill and the products transported

on that river are concerned not only with interstate commerce, but with international commerce as well, for many of the products which it carries are the very sinews of war which are finding their way across the oceans of the world to numerous and far-flung battle fronts where our citizens and allies are fighting the battles which shall liberate the world. These materials and these battles are certainly a matter of concern to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I submit that it is a sad and stinging commentary on the war effort of the United States that the Federal Government lifts not a hand to correct the grievous conditions which now attend the Schuylkill River, and which bid fair to undermine the health and welfare of the many millions of American citizens who are dependent upon this river for the very water which they drink. I submit also that it is neither wise decision nor legal necessity which permits these conditions to go uncorrected, for one day a raging flood may rise up from this very stream and black-out a considerable portion of this Nation's productive strength—a strength sorely needed by us and by our allies in this hour of peril.

Mr. President, these people and these industries are serving their Government to the utmost of their abilities in the present crisis. Their ingenuity, skill, and toil are given to the fashioning of the materials of war which are so necessary to the attainment of that complete and final military victory which their Government has pledged itself to attain in the great military struggle which now engulfs the world. Is it asking too much of that Government, Mr. President, to request that action necessary to protect the health and welfare of these American citizens, as well as to secure the continued productivity of these industries be taken—especially in view of the countless millions of dollars which have been appropriated to that Government for this and related purposes?

Mr. President, I ask that immediate action be taken by this Government to resolve the serious problems which the Schuylkill River in its present condition poses for the millions of patriotic American citizens in the Philadelphia area.

#### THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Pursuant to the order heretofore entered, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 208.

#### CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF THE PACIFIC SALMON FISHERIES

The bill (S. 74) to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this bill and the one which follows, which affect the crustacean resources of the country, were prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and recommended by the Special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources. They are bills to conserve the salmon industry on the

coasts and the crustacean resources along the Gulf, the Atlantic, and the Pacific coasts. I have filed a full report from the committee. A similar bill passed the Senate last year without any objection. It was too late, however, to be acted upon in the other House, though the House committee reported favorably upon it. That is the reason the bills are on the calendar at the present time.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 74) to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources, with an amendment, on page 3, line 18, after the words "license or permit", to insert a semicolon and the words "and may make such other regulations as may be found necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act shall be known by the short title of the Pacific salmon fishery law.

**SEC. 2.** That in order to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific consistent with the maintenance and reasonable development of such fisheries from year to year—

(a) It shall be unlawful at any time, by any means, or in any manner, to fish for, or catch, or attempt to fish for, or catch any salmon, or any species thereof, found in the offshore waters of the Pacific coast south of 50° north latitude, unless and except as permitted by regulations made, as hereinafter provided; and

(b) It shall be unlawful to land on or bring into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for any purpose whatsoever other than for personal use, any salmon, or any species thereof, taken in the waters of the Pacific Ocean south of 50° north latitude, unless and except as permitted by regulations made as hereinafter provided.

**SEC. 3.** That subject to the provisions of this act, and having due regard to the distribution, abundance, economic value, natural history, and the times of occurrence and recurrence of such salmon as are found normally in the waters heretofore referred to, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, is authorized and directed to conduct such investigations as may be necessary to determine when, where, to what extent, if at all, and by what means the fishing for, or capture of, any such salmon or species thereof may be permitted, and to what extent, if at all, the landing on or bringing into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States of salmon taken in the waters of the Pacific Ocean south of 50° north latitude may be permitted, and to adopt regulations from time to time permitting and governing the same in accordance with such determinations, which regulations shall be effective when published in the Federal Register.

**SEC. 4.** That the regulations herein provided for shall (a) divide the offshore waters of the Pacific coast into fishing areas; (b) require, without discriminating between those eligible, every person, company, corporation, or association engaged in fishing to obtain a license or permit prior to engaging in such operations; (c) require the owner of any vessel or boat employed or engaged

in the fishery industry to obtain a license or permit covering the use of the same; and may (d) specify the number and type of boats, nets, and other gear or apparatus that may be employed in each fishing area; (e) specify reasonable terms and conditions of such permits or licenses, including a provision for temporary suspension or revocation thereof for violation of the provisions of this act or regulations authorized hereunder; (f) require the payment of a fee of not to exceed \$5 for any such license or permit; and may make such other regulations as may be found necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

**SEC. 5.** That any person, company, corporation, or association establishing, in accordance with reasonable requirements to be prescribed by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, that he was actually engaged in fishing, during any of the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, or 1942 with any boat, net, or other gear or apparatus, the maximum number of which is specified by regulation authorized under this act, shall be entitled to file, prior to January 25, 1943, application for a permit or license to fish with such boat, net, or other gear or apparatus, and the Director, subject to the provisions of this act and any regulations authorized hereunder, shall grant such permit or license. If, subsequent to January 25, 1943, and in succeeding years, the Director shall determine that additional permits or licenses may be issued, he shall give public notice of such determination, and application for such additional permits or licenses may be received up to February 15 of that year, and shall be issued for each area by lot from among the applications complying with the requirements prescribed by the Director.

**SEC. 6.** That every person, company, corporation, or association engaged in catching salmon in the offshore waters of the Pacific coast shall make such detailed reports thereof to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, on blanks furnished by it, as the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service shall deem necessary to determine the distribution, abundance, economic value, and natural history of such salmon.

**SEC. 7.** (a) That within 20 days after publication in the Federal Register of any regulation adopted by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, any person, company, corporation, or association whose fishery operations, including employment, are affected directly by such regulation, shall be entitled to have the same reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with such reasonable procedure as the Secretary shall prescribe, including the right of both the applicant and the Director to appear in person or by representative to introduce pertinent evidence and to be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to affirm, set aside, modify, or refer back to the Director for modification in conformity with his decision, any regulation that shall be found unreasonable for carrying out the purposes of this act and his decision shall be final.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to render a written decision upon each and every matter presented to him in accordance with the provisions of this section within 20 days after the presentation thereof.

**SEC. 8.** (a) Any person, company, corporation, or association violating any of the provisions of this act or of any regulations made under authority of this act shall be fined, upon conviction thereof, for each offense, and each day's continuance of such a violation shall constitute a separate offense, not more than \$5,000 nor less than \$50, or shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or may be fined and imprisoned, or both.

(b) All fish taken or captured contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be forfeited; upon a second violation, any vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus used in capturing or taking such fish may be forfeited and all fish so captured or taken shall be forfeited; upon a third violation by any person, company, corporation, or association of any provision of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, any vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus used in the capturing or taking of such fish and such fish shall be forfeited.

**SEC. 9.** That any employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this act shall have power, without warrant, to arrest any person committing a violation of this act or of any regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of this act in his presence or view and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before an officer or court of competent jurisdiction; and shall have power to execute any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of this act. The several judges of the courts established under the laws of the United States, and the United States Commissioners, may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases. All fish taken or captured and any vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus used or which may be used in the capture or taking of fish, or any species thereof, contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulations made pursuant thereto may, when found, be seized by any such employee, or by any marshal, or deputy marshal, and subject to the provisions of subsection 8 (b) of this act, upon conviction of the offender or upon judgment of a court of the United States that the same were captured or taken, used, or capable of use, contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, shall be forfeited to the United States and disposed of as directed by the court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That any such fish, vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus seized as aforesaid shall be released upon the posting of a bond in lieu thereof in the value of the thing so seized as fixed by the court having jurisdiction.

**SEC. 10.** That it shall be unlawful for any person to deliver or knowingly receive for transportation, or knowingly transport, by any means whatsoever, from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to or through any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to or through any foreign country, any salmon or any species thereof, if such salmon has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported; and no person shall knowingly purchase or receive any such salmon which has been transported in violation of the provisions of this section; nor shall any person receiving any shipment of salmon transported in interstate commerce make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment.

**SEC. 11.** That the violation of any provision of this act may be prosecuted in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the defendant. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations made thereunder. It shall be the duty of the United States attorney to whom any violation is reported by any agent or representative of the Department of the Interior to institute proceedings necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.



Sec. 12. That there is authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and to accomplish the purposes of this act and regulations made pursuant thereto, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, out of such moneys, to employ in the city of Washington and elsewhere such persons and means as he may deem necessary for such purpose and may cooperate with other Federal agencies and with local authorities in the protection, preservation, and development of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Ocean and make the necessary investigations connected therewith.

Sec. 13. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect any existing treaty or convention to which the United States is a party.

Sec. 14. That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall, for any reason, be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Sec. 15. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### INVESTIGATION AND SURVEY OF CRUSTACEAN FOOD RESOURCES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and survey with respect to the life history and habits of shrimps, crabs, common lobsters, spiny lobsters, oysters, and commercial varieties of clams, their distribution in the coastal waters of the United States, the various methods by which they are caught or taken, their economic importance and value for food purposes, the causes of their depletion in recent years, and the most feasible and practical methods that may be used for their proper conservation in the public interest. The Secretary of the Interior shall report annually to the Congress the results of such investigation and survey, together with his recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SETTLE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 364) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the surrender of any lease issued pursuant to any of the provisions of

the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following), or any amendment thereof, where the surrender is filed in the General Land Office subsequent to the accrual but prior to the payment of the yearly rental due under the lease, upon payment of the accrued rental on a pro rata monthly basis for the portion of the lease year prior to the filing of the surrender. The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this act shall extend only to cases in which he finds that the failure of the lessee to file a timely surrender of the lease prior to the accrual of the rental was not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, but it shall not extend to claims or cases which have been referred to the Department of Justice for purposes of suit.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### PAYMENTS UNDER NONMINERAL LEASES OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 328) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "during the present national emergency" and insert "occurring prior to the end of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 1896) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### NOTICE OF INTEREST OF UNITED STATES IN REALTY OR PERSONALTY UNDER FACILITIES CONTRACTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 215) to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of the interest of the United States in realty or personalty under facilities contract, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a new section, so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That as used in this act the term "governmental agency" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation, created, owned, or controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, board, bureau, division, service, office, authority, or administration, in the executive branch of the Government.

Sec. 2. In order to protect the interest of the United States under certain contracts without incurring the danger of disclosing information pertinent to war or defense through recording or filing such contracts in full pursuant to local laws, the governmental agency which is authorized to enter into and to file of record any contract which provides for the construction, acquisition, establishment, enlargement, or extension of facilities for or in connection with the manufacture, construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, outfitting, processing, handling, storage, or repair of articles, supplies, materials, or equipment of any kind (including, but not limited to, buildings, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, watercraft, machinery, machine tools, any parts or components thereof, or any spare parts, plans, or equipment thereof) and by which the United States, through any governmental agency, acquires an interest in realty or personalty owned by, or in the possession of, the other party or parties to such contract, may file a notice of such contract, whether heretofore or hereafter executed, in the office of the clerk of the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the property is situated, or in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, if such property is situated within said District. Each such notice shall contain the names of the parties, the date and Government file number of the contract, and a description of the realty, and a summary or generalized description or identification of the personalty, involved in such contract. Whenever any such notice shall have been so filed, a like notice shall also be filed in the office of record prescribed by the law of the State, Territory, or possession in which such property is located. Notices of any amendment, alteration, or modification in any such contract may be filed in the same manner as in the case of original notices.

Sec. 3. The filing of such notices shall serve as constructive notice that the property referred to therein is subject to an interest of the United States, and such interest of the United States shall be valid as against any right, title, or interest in such property acquired by any person subsequent to such filing.

Sec. 4. Whenever the interest of the United States in any property referred to in any such notice terminates, the governmental agency which filed such notice shall immediately file notices of the termination of such interest in the offices in which the original notices were filed.

Sec. 5. The provisions of this act shall remain in force and effect only until December 31, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### EXPEDITION OF PAYMENTS FOR LAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 919) to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 3, line 2, after the words "December 31, 1944", to strike out ", or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of April 26, 1888, entitled "An act to facilitate the prosecution of works projected for the improvement of rivers and harbors" (25 Stat. 94; 33 U. S. C., sec. 591); section 2 of the act of August 1, 1888, entitled "An act to authorize condemna-

tion of land for sites of public buildings, and for other purposes" (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C., sec. 258); the act of July 2, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize condemnation proceedings of land for military purposes" (40 Stat. 241; 50 U. S. C., sec. 171), as amended; section 4 of the act of May 15, 1928, entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 536; 33 U. S. C., sec. 702d), or other provisions of law, in every case instituted in any court of the United States in the continental United States and Alaska, except the District of Columbia, for the condemnation of property, or any interest therein, by the United States, any department, agency, commission, or board thereof, or Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, except the Tennessee Valley Authority, the issues shall be determined only by the court: *Provided, however*, That any party may demand a trial by jury of the issue of compensation by filing with the clerk of the court a demand therefor in writing at any time after the commencement of the condemnation proceeding and not later than 10 days before the trial. In the event that a jury trial is demanded, the jury shall be selected and impaneled as in other civil actions.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval and shall apply in all cases hereafter instituted and in all pending cases except those in which the commissioners or other persons by whom the amount of compensation is to be determined shall have been appointed and qualified and shall have entered upon the performance of their duties.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act shall remain in force and effect only until December 31, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 875) to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### USE OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS IN TIME OF ACTUAL OR THREATENED WAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 676) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war," which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That effective from December 5, 1941, the act of April 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 90; 36 U. S. C. 10, 11), entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war," is amended to read as follows:

"That whenever in time of war, or when war is imminent, the President shall find the cooperation and use of the American National Red Cross with the land and naval forces to be necessary, he is authorized to accept the assistance tendered by the said Red Cross and to employ the same under the land and naval forces in conformity with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

"Sec. 2. That when the said Red Cross cooperation and assistance with the land and naval forces in time of war or threatened hostilities shall have been accepted by the President, the personnel entering upon the duty specified in section 1 of this act shall, while proceeding to their place of duty, while serving thereat, and while returning therefrom, be transported and subsisted at the cost and charge of the United States as civilian employees employed with the said forces, and no passport fee shall be charged or collected for any passport issued to such personnel so serving or proceeding abroad to enter upon such service, and the Red Cross supplies that may be tendered as a gift and accepted for use by the land and naval forces shall be transported at the cost and charge of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MEMORIAL DAY FOR DECEASED FIREMEN—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) authorizing the President to proclaim the Sunday before Memorial Day as a day for memorial services for deceased firemen was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, apparently Senate Joint Resolution 26 was called up in the Judiciary Committee at a time when I was necessarily absent. I know that there was considerable objection to it in the committee. The committee, as a matter of policy, has unanimously frowned upon the addition of new memorial days.

I have been informed by one of the members of the committee that when action was last taken in the committee on this joint resolution the words "as a memorial to deceased firemen" were stricken from the joint resolution. I do not know whether that is a fact. I do know, Mr. President, that if we are to have a special memorial day, and this joint resolution is to apply to deceased firemen, I should wish to be recorded as being strongly in favor of suitable recognition of all the magnificent services which are rendered by firemen during the performance of their duties. However, I should equally hope that we might amend the joint resolution to include policemen and detectives. I believe we should also make some mention of our loyal school teachers and our faithful nurses.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### PAY AND TRAVEL ALLOWANCES UNDER THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 966) to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to ask for an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who reported the bill [Mr. CHANDLER] is not now present in the Chamber, and the bill will be passed over for the time being.

Mr. CHANDLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Senate bill 966, which was passed over a few moments ago.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire what is the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 966.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may obtrude my opinion, I think it is more logical to complete the call of the calendar consecutively, then return to bills, consideration of which is desired.

Mr. CHANDLER. This will take but a moment. I wish the Senator would not object.

Mr. McNARY. I think I might wish to ask some questions about the bill. It disturbs the sequence of the order to leave the calling of the calendar and go back under unanimous consent to some bill which has been passed over.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will take but a moment.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator will not have to wait long. The moment the Senator is now occupying is only putting off the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Connecticut has concluded.

Mr. McNARY. I think the other practice is very much better, and I will cooperate with the Senator after a moment.

Mr. CHANDLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I repeat the request I made a few moments ago, that the Senate recur to Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 966.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the able Senator from Kentucky proposed returning to this bill a moment ago, I objected, and I shall always object to breaking into a call of the calendar for such purpose, but in this instance I am advised that the Senator is compelled to leave the Chamber on important public business, and that being an emergency situation, I shall not persist in my objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 966) to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, under such regulations as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, not to exceed pay for 3 months may be advanced to any person in or serving with the



military or naval service and to any civilian officers and employees in and under the jurisdiction of the War Department and the Navy Department when ordered to or from sea duty, or to or from duty at any place beyond the continental limits of the United States, and to and from Alaska. Any such person traveling under orders outside of the United States and entitled to expenses of subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof may be advanced an amount for such expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, as authorized by law and his orders, for a period equal to the estimated time of absence from the United States, not exceeding 1 year. Any excess advanced under this act over and above the actual amount legally due, if not otherwise refunded, may be collected from any amounts otherwise due or accruing from the United States to the person to whom the advance was made.

Sec. 2. Necessary adjustments of advance payments made under authority hereof shall be made on subsequent vouchers and pay rolls and any overpayments to persons no longer in the service of the United States and occurring solely by reason of payments made under authority of this act, if proper and timely efforts have been made to collect, or provide for collecting, any excess over amounts legally due, shall be passed to the credit of, or shall not be charged in the accounts of, the disbursing officers involved.

#### UTILIZATION FOR WAR PURPOSES OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself, I wish to make a statement.

I am sure that all Senators from the so-called silver States favor the passage of Senate bill 35 at the earliest possible date. However, some time ago the House passed what was called the Celler amendment to the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, which would practically repeal the present silver legislation. The Senator from Nevada is working with Members of the House leadership and is making fair progress in his efforts to have the Celler amendment stricken from the appropriation bill.

I have talked with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who is a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, regarding Senate bill 35, sponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and I understand that he has kindly agreed to allow the bill to go over for the present in the hope that during the day, or by tomorrow, the Senator from Nevada will know definitely what can be done with regard to the Celler amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to say that my acquiescence in the request of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] was given with great reluctance. This measure is one of much importance. The departments in Washington that are in need of the authorization to provide sufficient silver for the war effort have been constantly pressing the Senator from Connecticut, as have others. The

bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and subsequently by the full committee.

There is, as I understand, no objection to the bill; but, unfortunately, there is a situation particularly disturbing Senators from the so-called silver States. I am very hopeful that the Senator from Nevada will come to a realization of his hopes today, because I intend to try to move, not later than Monday next, that the Senate consider this proposed legislation which is very important to our war program.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, we are fully cognizant of the situation and are just as anxious as is the Senator from Connecticut to have the bill passed. I think, not later than Monday, that can be done.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in my opinion, one statement just made is not substantiated by the facts. I refer to the statement that the departments downtown are in need of this proposed legislation in order to make silver available to the war effort. That is not, as I understand, correct.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The statement I made is correct. Whether or not the departments need the silver I cannot be absolutely certain, but they have advised me and other members of the committee that they need it very badly and at once. So I assume the Senator is not saying that my statement is incorrect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I make the statement to this effect: That there is no legislation needed to enable the Treasury Department to make available to the War Production Board all the silver that is necessary for the purposes of that Board. The proposed law is not necessary, for the obvious reason that the Treasury Department has already made available to the War Production Board approximately a billion and a half ounces of silver, and every department of the Government that wants silver and can show a need for silver is getting silver. So there is no particular need for this bill, and there is no pressure being exerted upon Congress to pass it in order to get the silver, for the silver is already available.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has just stated that the departments of the Government are able to get all the silver they require if they can prove a need for it. I am not sure that covers the situation with which we are confronted. There are many industries engaged in the war work that have a great need for silver, and I am wondering if the Senator from Oklahoma is excluding that particular group?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; not at all. I understand that the silver industry are getting the silver they need. If they can make a showing that it is necessary in their business to have the silver they are getting it. Not only are

they getting the silver, but the War Production Board is getting the silver it needs for use in making and fabricating machinery, planes, and necessary war equipment. Not only that, but the foreign nations that need silver for coinage purposes are getting it, and foreign nations that want silver for use in the manufacture of equipment for war purposes are likewise getting it.

I am not objecting to the passage of this bill, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, but I did not want the Record to show that the failure to pass the bill was holding up any necessary use of our stock of free and unobligated silver.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I think technically the able Senator is correct, that up to this moment they are getting silver, but the supply of available silver is dwindling so very rapidly that in a matter of days, so I am advised, the situation, without the passage of this bill, might become very acute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, under the present policy the only silver the Treasury Department wants to retain is the silver which is used as backing for the outstanding currency in the form of silver certificates. We have in circulation now something over \$1,900,000,000 of silver certificates and the Treasury Department is holding as a backing for those certificates silver to the extent that is necessary on the basis of its monetary value of \$1.29 an ounce. That leaves free or unobligated silver in the Treasury that has heretofore been accumulated under the Silver Purchase Act of almost 1,500,000,000 ounces. The Treasury Department can use all that silver that it deems proper and in the public interest under existing law because it is free and unobligated. The silver that is being furnished to foreign governments is on a loan basis—that is, the silver loaned is to be returned ounce for ounce. The silver being used domestically is, in the main, in a nonconsumptive manner, hence the silver to be used will not be destroyed and will be reclaimed and returned to the Treasury.

I repeat, I am not objecting to the passage of this bill and shall vote for it upon final passage, but I wanted to make this statement for the Record.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are the departments able to get the silver at the prices fixed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana if I can do so by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oklahoma ask?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Merely sufficient time to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They are now able to get the silver at the prices and under the conditions specified in the bill.

**COMMISSIONED RANK FOR WARRANT OFFICERS IN THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD**

The bill (S. 973) to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that Calendar No. 256, House bill 2587, is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2587) to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, at that point I rise to ask the Senator from Massachusetts how long it is intended the operations of the proviso contained in the bill may be availed of?

Mr. WALSH. This bill is an amendment to previous legislation which permits warrant officers to apply for commissions in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard within a certain period of time if they come within the age limit prescribed. It has developed that certain warrant officers who are eligible to take advantage of the law are in remote sections of the world and have not been able to make application within the time specified. This bill simply permits such officers who have had the misfortune to be located where they could not make application or as to whom the age limit had been passed to make application as provided by the original law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As I read the proviso, it says that if such warrant officers are, because of service conditions, unable to present themselves or even to apply for appointment or examination prior to June 27, 1943, they would, under this proposed act, be permitted later so to apply. Having applied, let us say, in the fiscal year 1945, is it the intention of the Senator or the department which sponsors the bill that commissions granted in the fiscal year 1945 shall date back to June 27, 1943, and the men so commissioned shall be allowed to take rank as of that date?

Mr. WALSH. In my opinion, yes. If a warrant officer is stationed somewhere in the Pacific Ocean, away from the cen-

tral government, had no knowledge of the original law and was unable to communicate his wishes, the pending bill would permit such an officer, who would otherwise be denied that right, under regulations prescribed by the Navy, to make application, to be given the rank he was entitled to and would have had, if he had been in America and was within the age limit.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The bill is not limited to a certain period, but proposes permanent legislation. Assume a state of facts where, let us say, war has been concluded by July 1, 1945, would it then be the Senator's understanding that warrant officers who by virtue of service conditions were unable to present applications before June 27, 1943, should have their commissions date back to this year?

Mr. WALSH. It is my opinion that they would, and that they should. If, by reason of causes beyond their control, there was delay in making their application, they should not be denied the right as warrant officers to receive commissions providing they meet the requirements of age and of education.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 973 will be indefinitely postponed.

**PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF NAVAL REGULATIONS**

The bill (S. 995) to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That whoever shall enter, remain in, leave, or commit any act within or upon any vessel, harbor, port, or water-front facility, contrary to any regulation or order for the security or protection thereof, promulgated or approved by the Secretary of the Navy, pursuant to authority conferred upon him by any Executive order or proclamation of the President, shall, if it appears that he knew or should have known of the existence and extent of the regulation or order and that his act was in violation thereof, be liable to a fine of not to exceed \$5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

**REORGANIZATION OF THE MARINE CORPS**

The bill (S. 1064) to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I know nothing of this bill other than what is contained in the title printed in the calendar. I should like to have the able Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, discuss the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, first of all, we should have an identical House bill substituted. I move that House bill 2583, Calendar No. 258, be substituted for the Senate bill, and be now considered.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2583) to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill has for its purpose a coordination and consolidation of certain activities connected with administration in Headquarters, United States Marine Corps. It would abolish the Office of Adjutant and Inspector and the Adjutant and Inspector's Department, and transfer the functions of that department to a director of personnel, Marine Corps.

The bill authorizes the appointment of a line officer on active duty in the Marine Corps to be director of personnel. Funds now available to the Office of Adjutant and Inspector are transferred to the newly created director of personnel. It also authorizes necessary changes in the administration of the Marine Corps to streamline the functions into the newly created office. Inconsistent or conflicting laws are repealed.

By placing the activities of the existing Adjutant and Inspector's Department and of certain other independently operating divisions in Marine Corps Headquarters under one head, a redistribution of duties will be accomplished that will effect a saving in personnel and will eliminate duplication of certain records and files that are now necessitated by the existing administrative organization.

The various sections of the Adjutant and Inspector's Department will be re-grouped and reorganized with the existing Division of Recruiting, the Division of Personnel, and the Division of Reserve under one administrative head.

A study of the proposed reorganization by the management engineers of the Navy Department indicates that the proposed organizational change in headquarters will effect a saving in personnel.

The enactment of this bill will result in no additional cost to the Government.

Mr. McNARY. There is no over-all reorganization of the Corps intended?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1064 will be indefinitely postponed.

**ALLOWANCES TO MIDSHIPMEN OF THE NAVAL RESERVE**

The bill (S. 1067) to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment



Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), is hereby amended by adding after the period at the end thereof the following:

"Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted hereunder to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind."

#### PAYMENTS UNDER CONTRACTS FOR HEAVY ORDNANCE

The bill (S. 972) to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 7 (c) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

Sec. 2. Section 8 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1648), is hereby repealed.

#### EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask, out of order, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 253, House Joint Resolution 122, to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days. The joint resolution was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and, as I understand, there is no objection to it, and I ask for its consideration at this time because I have to leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFarland in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McNARY. The Senator's statement complies with what I believe to be the best practice. If the Senator can demonstrate to me that an emergency exists involving the public service, I shall be willing to accede to his wish.

Mr. WHEELER. I have to leave the Chamber immediately, since several persons are waiting for me right now in connection with a hearing, and I was wondering if we could not take up the joint resolution out of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is referring to a meeting before the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. WHEELER. No; a number of people are waiting in my office in reference to a hearing in one of the departments in this city on a very important matter.

Mr. McNARY. I think that statement takes the case out of my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the adjournment of the Senate following today, the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

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

#### LT. (J. G.) SVEND J. SKOU

The bill (S. 397) for the relief of Lt. (J. G.) Svend J. Skou, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the retired pay of Lt. (J. G.) Svend J. Skou, United States Navy, retired, shall be three-fourths of the highest pay of his grade: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this act prior to the date of its enactment.

#### SIMPLIFICATION OF NAVAL ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE

The bill (S. 1065) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 257, House bill 2584, is an identical bill and, without objection, will be substituted for the Senate bill and will be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to amend the bill by adding to the House bill section 3 of the Senate bill, and renumbering section 3 of the House bill to read section 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 19, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Commencing June 30, 1944, there shall be deducted from the pay of each person in the naval service on the last day of each fiscal year the sum of \$2.40, to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 20, after "Sec.", to strike out "3" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1065 will be indefinitely postponed.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AT ST. LAWRENCE, NEWFOUNDLAND

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to undertake the construction at St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, of a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, such authorization to include the acquisition of land necessary therefor, at a cost of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is authorized to present such hospital, dispensary, or other memorial to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, in token of appreciation of the United States of America to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, of their heroic action in saving the lives of officers and men of the U. S. S. *Pollux* and the U. S. S. *Truxtun*, wrecked near St. Lawrence in the year 1942.

#### REIMBURSEMENT OF ENLISTED MEN FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY ON THE "HUGH L. SCOTT"

The bill (S. 954) for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott*, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the aggregate sum of \$462.25, to reimburse certain enlisted men of the Navy for the loss of their personal property, as herein next provided, to wit: The sum of \$268.50 to reimburse Donald Robert Leighton, water tender, first class, United States Navy, and the sum of \$193.75 to reimburse Libero Quiero, machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property on board the *Hugh L. Scott* lost by them, respectively, as a result of the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott* on or about November 18, 1942, in the north African action: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

#### REIMBURSEMENT OF LT. COL. FRANK P. SNOW

The bill (S. 1086) to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel," was con-

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$1,333.33, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Lt. Col. Frank P. Snow, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Farris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

#### JACK LECHEL HAAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 391) for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Navy, their widows, children, and dependent relatives, Jack Lecel Haas shall be held and considered to have been discharged with a good discharge, under honorable conditions on April 27, 1928: *Provided*, That no pension, pay, bounty, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the enactment of this act by reason of its enactment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts tell us what a "good" discharge is? In line 7 of the bill it appears that this particular claimant would be held entitled to a "good" discharge. Is there something technical or descriptive about the use of that language?

Mr. WALSH. There are several forms of discharge, as the Senator knows. There is an honorable discharge, a dishonorable discharge, a discharge for the good of the service, a discharge for physical disability, a discharge at the request of the applicant in the service. This man was given an unsatisfactory discharge, and the Navy Department, feeling it made a mistake, has submitted this bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs to correct its own error, and to give this enlisted man a "satisfactory" or "good" discharge.

Mr. DANAHER. The man is not being reenlisted in the Navy, is he?

Mr. WALSH. No; he is not.

Mr. DANAHER. Apparently he was discharged for falsification of his enlistment record.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; he said he was not married, when in reality he was married.

Mr. DANAHER. He said that only a week after he had been married. Moreover, within a very short time thereafter he asked to be discharged on the ground that his wife was dependent on him. Yet the facts are that she was trying to get a job, and under the civil-service rules could not get a job unless her husband was not providing support for her. I

am wondering whether the term "good" discharge means that it is good for something special from the Treasury. I should not like to think that as a matter of policy we were making this man the only holder in the whole world of a "good" discharge.

Mr. WALSH. It means it is not a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. DANAHER. Does it mean that he is going to be entitled to benefits under the Veterans' Administration law?

Mr. WALSH. If he can make out a case; yes.

Mr. DANAHER. It is stated in the report that it is probable that the Veterans' Administration would be involved. What is the man's physical condition now that might entitle him to some special relief, perhaps?

Mr. WALSH. I personally do not know. The Navy Department, in reviewing this man's application and case, reached the conclusion that on all the facts he was entitled to a discharge of a different character from that given to him. It is their recommendation, and it is upon their recommendation that the bill has been reported.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### MAJ. GEORGE E. GOLDING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 426) for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 11, to strike out "\$2,175.76" and insert "\$2,161.31", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George E. Golding, major, United States Marine Corps, retired, who was relieved from active duty because of physical disability on August 2, 1941, and who was returned to active duty for the period from November 12, 1941, to April 1, 1942, for appearances before a board of medical survey and a Navy retiring board, the sum of \$2,161.31, representing pay and allowances for such period of active duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### CHARLES T. DULIN

The bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Charles T. Dulin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MEADOW BROOK CLUB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1001) for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Meadow Brook Club, of Westbury, Long Island, N. Y., for reimbursement of the cost of removing a 160-foot flagpole from its premises on or about December 20, 1941, at the request of the commanding officer at Mitchel Field, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed \$500. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### DR. DOUGLAS E. LAWSON

The bill (S. 929) for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of compensation to officers and employees of the Work Projects Administration, to Dr. Douglas E. Lawson, of Carbondale, Ill., the sum of \$134.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of the unpaid portion of the compensation agreed upon for the services rendered by him during the Wyoming Adult Education, Recreation, and Nursery School Workers Training Conference held at the University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., from August 18 to 30, 1941, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 897) to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask that the bill be passed over.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

# CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a House bill. Is it similar to the bill immediately following, Senate bill 1066? I notice that both bills provide for acquisition and conversion or construction of certain vessels.

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. President. House bill 1563 provides for authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels. The bill following on the calendar would authorize the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and special boats for the United States Navy. One bill provides for authorization in connection with certain auxiliary vessels and the other for a new type of landing boats which are used for invasion.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator discuss the two bills briefly?

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to do so. First of all, as the Senate knows, auxiliary vessels are vessels of various types which are auxiliary to the combat vessels of the fleet. They consist of auxiliary aircraft carriers, ammunition ships, refrigerator ships, mine sweepers, transports, evacuation transports, rescue tugs, tank landing ships, tankers, repair vessels, hospital vessels, and supply vessels which at sea supply the naval vessels with the fuel and necessities of transportation which they would receive from shore if they were in a harbor.

Bills of this nature frequently come before Congress. By the act of June 14, 1940, we authorized the construction of 75,000 tons of these vessels. Money has been appropriated under that authorization, and all the vessels constructed. On June 19, 1940, an act was passed providing for the authorization of 100,000 tons of vessels. By the act of May 24, 1941, we provided for 550,000 tons. By the act of December 17, 1941, we provided for 800,000 tons, and by the act of July 9, 1942, we provided for 1,200,000 tons.

Mr. McNARY. What is the authorization in money requested under House bill 1563, and also under Senate bill 1066, which immediately follows it on the calendar?

Mr. WALSH. Approximately \$1,250,000,000 for this bill and approximately \$1,700,000,000 for the next bill. Let me say a word about the type of vessels provided in the other bill, Senate bill 1066. In this bill landing craft and district craft are authorized. Landing craft are a new type now employed by the Navy. They are the vessels which have been designed and are being constructed for the purpose of landing soldiers upon foreign soil. They are of a particular type which can be run ashore on a beach, and the invaders, whether they be marines or of the Army, can land from them. They

also carry ashore the invaders' war paraphernalia. Already some of these vessels have been built. Heretofore they have been built under a general authorization, without any specific authorization being made for this particular type of vessel. This is the first time an authorization is asked of Congress for the Navy to pursue a program of building such landing boats.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to my colleague that quite recently I had the privilege of seeing the personnel that are manning the landing craft which are referred to in this bill. This is a new and adventurous service in which the Army and Navy work together in the most complete brotherly union. It embraces men from all the different States of the Union, and I am glad to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my compliments to them, and thank the Senator for giving me this opportunity to do so.

Mr. WALSH. As my colleague knows landing from boats against enemy opposition is one of the most hazardous undertakings of the war. I venture to say that possibly several Senators have received a few requests from enlisted men, and perhaps also from officers in this particular branch of the service, asking for transfers. The service of manning these small boats is not one which is particularly congenial to all officers and enlisted men, and it is considered to be very hazardous and dangerous. My colleague very properly commends the type and personnel who are undertaking this most difficult and most dangerous and most hazardous part of the whole war effort. The personnel, I agree, is doing a fine job and is entitled to high commendation. It is important that these vessels be built as speedily and quickly as possible, in view of the constant assertion that we are preparing to open up a new front in Europe.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, after the word "conversion" to insert the following proviso: "Provided, That the authority contained in this section shall be limited to the tonnage authorization contained in section 1 hereof and to similar authorization heretofore or hereafter enacted."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has an amendment to the bill which he desires to offer.

Mr. BAILEY. I send forward an amendment to House bill 1563, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "which", it is proposed to strike out the words "was heretofore or."

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to take a moment to explain the amendment. The effect of the amendment when we strike out the word "heretofore" is to strike out the retroactive effect of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am disposed to accept the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, because he raises a question on which there is a difference of judgment between the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department. I informed the Senator that I thought an effort ought to be made, if possible, to bring together these two Departments of the Government, and that therefore I would accept the amendment and allow it to go to conference, where it might be possible to hear both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which has just been passed, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] will have a chance to peruse later.

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

## THE NECESSITY FOR SECTION 2

Several months ago the Navy Department drafted a bill authorizing the President of the United States to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels for the Navy. This proposed bill was forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget with the request that the Navy Department be authorized to submit this bill to the Congress for its consideration. The officials of the Bureau of the Budget did not approve of the Navy Department's request. Senators know that the Navy Department is not authorized to request the Congress to enact legislation or to make appropriations without receiving prior approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

A Member of the Congress obtained a copy of the proposed bill and introduced it on his own initiative. This bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. The House also adopted an amendment which provided that the Navy should have the sole right to the possession of vessels built or acquired for it by the Maritime Commission.

The officials of the Bureau of the Budget were convinced that the Navy Department needed an additional million tons of auxiliary vessels for the effective prosecution of the war. Instead of following the usual procedure in authorizing the Navy Department to request the Congress for legislative authority to construct or acquire these vessels, they proposed that the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration transfer or loan vessels to the Navy Department, and

that additional funds be requested of the Congress to build additional ships for the Maritime Commission. It is understood that the decision of the officials of the Bureau of the Budget to follow this method of procuring additional vessels was based upon a proviso contained in an appropriation act approved July 25, 1942, which reads as follows: "Provided, That when vessels are transferred or assigned permanently by the War Shipping Administrator to other departments or agencies of the United States Government for operation by them, funds for the operation, loading, discharging, repairs, and alterations, or other use of such vessels may be transferred from the War Shipping Administration fund to the applicable appropriations of the department or agency concerned in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Senators know that the normal procedure established by the Congress is as follows: The legislative committees of the two branches of the Congress consider, and the two Houses then enact legislative authority to undertake certain projects. The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses thereafter recommend and the two Houses appropriate the necessary funds for the construction of these projects. The decision of the Budget Bureau to transfer or loan vessels built for or acquired by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration to the Navy Department circumvents the procedure established by the Congress. If the decision of the Bureau of the Budget is allowed to stand it will mean that the Naval Affairs Committees of the two Houses, the Navy Department, and the Congress itself will have little or no control over the Navy's auxiliary ship programs. It means, furthermore, that the control of naval auxiliary vessels will be to a great extent in the hands of the civilian officials of the Bureau of the Budget and the civilian officials of the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission.

The purpose of section 2 of the present bill is to reestablish the normal procedure giving Congress and the Navy Department control of the Navy's auxiliary ships by requiring that the Navy Department obtain legislative authority to construct auxiliary vessels and thereafter obtain the necessary funds to build these vessels from the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and by providing that the Navy Department shall have the sole right to possession of all vessels built or acquired for it by the Maritime Commission.

When hearings were held on the bill by the Senate committee the Chairman of the Maritime Commission requested that the word "heretofore," on page 2, line 2, be deleted from the bill. The Navy requested that this word be retained in the bill. If the word "heretofore" is deleted from the bill it will mean that the Navy Department may or may not have the right to sole possession of the vessels built for it by the Maritime Commission between the dates of July 25, 1942 (the date of the act under which the officials of the Bureau of the Budget deem that they have a right to control the Navy's auxiliary ship program) and the date of the approval of this act. If the word "heretofore" is retained in the bill it will mean that the Navy Department will have the right to sole possession of all vessels built for it by the Maritime Commission.

The committee recommends that the word "heretofore" be retained in the bill.

The amount of money required to be appropriated by the Congress will remain the same regardless of which method is adopted. If the method proposed by the Budget Bureau is adopted, the funds will be appropriated to the Maritime Commission and the vessels constructed or acquired by the Commission may or may not be transferred or loaned to the Navy Department at the discretion of the Bureau of the Budget. In other words, if

this method is adopted, the Navy Department will not have absolute control over its own auxiliary vessels.

If section 2 of the present bill is adopted, it will mean that the long-established procedure of the Congress is followed; that the money will be appropriated to the Navy Department; that the vessels will be transferred by the Maritime Commission to the Navy; and that the Navy will have full and complete control of its own auxiliary vessels. The committee is of the opinion that the Navy cannot operate efficiently unless it has auxiliaries in sufficient number and under the absolute control of naval authorities.

It recommends therefore that section 2 as now worded be retained in the bill and that the bill be approved by the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### LANDING CRAFT AND OTHER NAVAL VESSELS

The bill (S. 1066) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that House bill 2581, Calendar No. 251, is an identical bill. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, and will be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2581) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1066 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the interest in Senate bill 1066, Calendar 244, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, and in view of the fact that it is in the nature of an authorization of a new type of naval vessel, I ask that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs be printed in the Record in connection with the discussion of the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 241) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1066) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the comma after the words "landing craft" and strike out the words "and special boats," and insert the word "and" between the words "landing craft" and "district craft,".

Amend the title to read as follows: "A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the acquisition and conversion, or construction, of 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, of such size, type, and design as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary and best suited for the conduct of amphibious operations, for service to the fleet and shore-based forces, and for naval districts, stations, bases, and operating areas at home and abroad. Such craft are to be additional to all auxiliary vessels or craft heretofore authorized. The bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to effectuate its purposes.

The types of ships and craft covered by the bill are all required in the conduct of the war and are generally as follows:

Landing craft which include the various types designed for amphibious operations, except transports. They range in size from the small rubber boats to the landing ship dock. Transports are classified as auxiliaries.

District craft, including craft of various designs and types which are used in districts, stations, bases, and operating areas at home and abroad. Among such types are tugs of several sizes, oil, gasoline, and water barges, lighters, seaplane wrecking derricks, aircraft rescue boats, aircraft fuel boats, plane rearming launches, plane personnel boats, and bomb target boats, as well as other special designs of craft and boats which are required in war operations at many locations in the continental United States and at practically every advanced base location.

This is the first bill providing for the authorization of landing craft and district craft as such. Prior to the present war, the number of craft of the type covered by the bill was small. No large landing craft were built. Only enough landing boats were built to provide for training in landing operations. These boats, together with district craft and special boats, were generally built under authority of appropriations made available for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." With but a few exceptions, no separate authorizing authority for such craft and boats was secured, but the necessary authorization was incorporated in appropriation bills. This method worked satisfactorily in peacetime, because the number of such craft and boats and the amounts of money involved were small. In the case of district craft, construction was little more than sufficient to maintain the Naval Establishment, i. e., very little expansion of this type of craft took place.

With the commencement of the war the need for ships and craft of these types was large and immediate. They were required to mount our amphibious operations and to equip and supply services to our expanding bases, both at home and abroad. The number required was necessarily indefinite, depending as it does on losses in training, the number of operations undertaken in a year, the losses in these operations, the rate at which advanced bases are established and developed, and other factors. Other factors are that the Navy is the sole source of supply of amphibious craft to the Army and a partial source of supply thereof to our allies.

In the past year the Navy Department has constructed craft of the types authorized by the bill without authorization by legislation specially enacted for the purpose, its authority having been derived from various appropriations and authorizations. These types have been constructed under the general directive of the projects of the combined chiefs of staff, and as required by the tactical situation and the development of our bases, both land and air. Operations with which the Congress is familiar have been successfully



undertaken with craft so built. Most of the larger landing craft were charged against the 1,799 Vessels Program Act of February 6, 1942, which authority is now substantially exhausted. The small landing and special craft were constructed against maintenance appropriations for the Bureau of Ships, and placed on the moneys so appropriated an extremely heavy drain which was not contemplated when the appropriation was made. The construction of district craft imposed a similar heavy and unforeseen drain on the Bureau of Ships.

It was therefore necessary for the Navy Department, at the time the Supplemental Naval Appropriation Act, 1943, was before the Congress, to seek funds to recuperate the maintenance funds of the Bureau of Ships which had been expended for these craft. The committee is of the opinion that the procedure which has heretofore been followed in connection with the construction of this type of craft is not satisfactory and recommends that hereafter construction of this nature be undertaken only on the basis of authorization by legislation enacted for that purpose according to the regular procedure for naval authorizations preceding naval appropriations.

The type of boat under consideration is generally small and quickly constructed. The numbers required and the losses suffered are not subject to exact prediction. The Navy Department representative stated to the committee that requirements for the vessels contemplated in this bill, especially landing craft, are necessarily subject to change, in details, types, and other factors, as a result of war developments, including operations and losses. The committee is satisfied that such changes will occur and that it would therefore be unwise to fix at this time the particular types of craft or numbers of each type to be authorized.

The Navy Department has estimated, on the basis of experience so far in the war, that the total tonnage authorized by the bill will be sufficient through the next 12 months. This estimate is believed to be as satisfactory as the uncertainties of the general situation permit.

The speed and efficiency of naval operations, including operations of the joint services, depends upon the availability of all types of the marine equipment required at the different locations and for the different operations in which the Navy is or may be engaged. The effectiveness of such operations depends frequently upon the availability of the several types of craft authorized by the bill, to service the fleets, auxiliaries, and air arm, as well as the merchant shipping involved.

These craft are not substitutes for private craft which the Navy took over in large numbers following the outbreak of the war. Such private craft were taken because they were then available and needed, and could be used, in particular duties, mainly of the patrol type. While not specially designed for the purpose they were useful and filled a need at the time. Such craft cannot serve the purposes for which the craft authorized by the bill are designed.

The Navy Department has estimated that the aggregate cost of the 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft authorized by the bill would be \$1,700,000,000. This would be additional to approximately 1,100,000 tons of such craft previously authorized at an approximate estimated cost of \$1,900,000,000, substantially all of which has been committed.

The tonnage authorized by this bill is different from the tonnage covered by the bill H. R. 1563, authorizing the acquisition and conversion, or construction, of naval auxiliary vessels, which has also been approved by the committee.

The present bill provides for two additional types of vessels previously described and which are not included in H. R. 1563.

The committee is of the opinion that the authorization of the tonnage of landing craft and district craft provided for in the bill is necessary for the effective prosecution of the war.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives sets forth the views and recommendations of the Navy Department on this bill. This letter is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, May 1, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The general purpose of the proposed legislation is as stated in the title.

Up to the present time, the construction of district craft, smaller types of landing craft, and special boats has generally been undertaken under the authority of appropriations made available for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." With but few exceptions, no separate authorizing legislation has been secured, but the necessary authorization has been incorporated in the appropriation authority. The construction of the larger types of landing craft, e. g., LST's, LCI(L)'s, and LCT(5)'s, has been undertaken under the authority of the act of February 6, 1942 (Public Law 440, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), or the act of July 9, 1942 (Public Law 665, 77th Cong., 2d sess.).

The procedure which has been followed in the past with district craft, smaller types of landing craft, and special boats has proved to be especially difficult owing to the inability to determine the numbers of craft required sufficiently in advance to permit funds in adequate amounts to be set up in the annual appropriations requested from Congress. The Bureau of Ships, from time to time, has been given directives to procure large numbers of craft for which no appropriation authority had been requested. In order to meet these directives, the Bureau has been forced to utilize appropriation authority which has been set up to meet other items of the programs as originally outlined for which directives have not yet been received in full, or, in case such authority has not been available, it has been obliged to draw on funds which had been secured for some other phase of the Bureau's maintenance program.

In consequence of this action, taking into consideration all directives which have been received for the types of craft here under consideration, there is now remaining a total of only \$5,966,500 in funds available for future programs under 1943 appropriations for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." Of the program originally outlined in the justification presented to the Bureau of the Budget and Congress for funds which were made available under the 1943 maintenance appropriations (title IV), there still remain items amounting to \$94,985,000 for which directives have not yet been received. Since less than \$6,000,000 remains available, it is obvious that the remainder of the program as originally laid down cannot be undertaken without risking failure to secure the necessary additional appropriations from Congress.

A similar situation exists in the case of future directives for larger types of landing craft. As indicated above, the construction of such craft has previously been included under the act of February 6, 1942, or under authorized auxiliary tonnage. All but a small percentage of the authorization

under the former act has been fully allocated, and the slight balance still remaining has already been planned for allocation. As of April 7, 1943, a total of 421 vessels had been completed, 1,267 were building, 10 had been approved, but not yet awarded, and the balance of 101 had been determined by types but no directive had yet been issued ordering their construction.

A critical shortage of naval auxiliary tonnage is imminent as a result of the non-enactment to date of the bill H. R. 1563, which passed the House on April 21, 1943. This shortage makes it impossible to borrow on this source for any further authorizations of the larger types of landing-craft construction. Moreover, the enactment of H. R. 1563 will not solve the problem so far as it concerns future landing craft programs, since all but 99,000 tons of the 1,000,000 tons covered by H. R. 1563 have already been planned for various types of auxiliary-vessel construction.

It is believed that the principle involved in the bill H. R. 1563, authorizing auxiliary vessels by specific legislation, is applicable to the landing craft, district craft, and special boats, and that it will be equally insisted upon in Congress when additional appropriations for these types are requested.

The same circumstances which in the past have made it difficult to forecast requirements for landing craft and district craft, so as to make it possible to secure adequate advance appropriation authority, also make it difficult to determine tonnages in amounts which can readily be justified by Congress. Computations made of the programs undertaken during the calendar year 1942 and representing the total of the actual completions in 1942 plus the completions predicated for 1943, show for the various types of landing craft 14,400 units of an estimated tonnage of 813,240, and cost of \$1,422,976,000. For 1,000 district craft the tonnage will amount to 360,000 at a cost of \$390,000,000; while 4,000 special boats of a tonnage of 40,000 will cost \$80,000,000.

The above totals represent approximately the obligations made by the Bureau of Ships to carry out directives received from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations during the past year. In view of the foregoing, it is considered essential to orderly planning, and to an ability to remain within the limits of authorizations and appropriations, that the present uncertain condition be terminated and that the authorization requested be obtained.

The Navy Department considers the proposed legislation to be both necessary and urgent. The urgency is all the greater at this time because of the lack of authorization for the 1,000,000 tons of naval auxiliary vessels now pending in Congress.

The majority of the tonnage in the proposed legislation will probably be allotted to landing craft. A blanket tonnage for this purpose is imperative. The war moves at such a speed that the requirements a year from now cannot be decided. Consequently, no program can be furnished on which to base requests for tonnage by specific types of craft or fixed sums of money.

The Navy Department strongly recommends enactment of the proposed legislation at the earliest possible date.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, caused by military per-

sonnel or civilian employees or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the bill should be explained and discussed. If no Senator now present in the Chamber is able to do so, I ask that the bill be passed over.

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

#### VELMA PIKKARAINEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 332) for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$900", and insert "\$825"; and in line 6, before the words "North Dakota", to insert "Towner County", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$825 to Velma Pikkarainen, of Towner County, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the value of a Ford automobile seized by agents of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, on June 22, 1939, and sold on November 10, 1939, the basis for such seizure and sale being that such automobile allegedly had been used by O. V. Pikkarainen, the husband of the said Velma Pikkarainen, to facilitate a violation of the customs laws, although the criminal case against the said O. V. Pikkarainen was dismissed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

#### RELIEF OF DISBURSING OFFICERS OF ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1025) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, in section 13, on page 7, line 13, after the word "payments", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in

the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Lt. Col. L. M. Edwards, Finance Department, \$2.90; Lt. Col. H. G. Foster, Finance Department (now retired), \$150.97; Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), \$46.98; Lt. Col. K. S. Olson, Finance Department, \$67.03; Col. F. Richards, Finance Department, \$85.63; Lt. Col. H. B. Turner, Finance Department, \$37.95; Col. E. W. Wilson, Finance Department, \$7; Lt. Col. G. S. Woolworth, Judge Advocate General's Department, \$9.64; Lt. Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, \$35.60; and Col. L. H. Sims, Finance Department, \$123.11; the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in the computations of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former members of the Army of the United States, civilian employees, and commercial firms or individuals from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. Hendrik Dolleman, the amount of \$67; to Sgt. Anthony J. L. Morency, the amount of \$24; to First Sgt. Charles W. Sharbonneau, the amount of \$88.25; and to Staff Sgt. Clarence E. Steele, the amount of \$74.01; such amounts representing the value of personal effects lost by them when in the course of the evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's Antarctic bases it became necessary in March 1941 to resort to an emergency abandonment of East Base, in Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pvt. (1st cl.) Rex E. Dally the amount of \$6.57, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him from personal funds for the transportation of Government property.

Sec. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. W. T. Delihant, Finance Department, the sum of \$27, public funds for which he is accountable, which were lost by his agent officer, Capt. John J. Abbott, Medical Administrative Corps, when the car in which he was carrying the said funds skidded from the road and upset in a stream: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to the said Capt. John J. Abbott.

Sec. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. W. E. Harris, Corps of Engineers, the sum of \$19.25, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum represents the difference between per diem of \$5 erroneously paid to Master Sgt. Frank Zinn and the monetary allowance of \$2.25 per day to which he was entitled for a period of travel on duty under orders: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to the said Master Sgt. Frank Zinn.

Sec. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. C. B. Lindner, Finance Department, the sum of \$3,974.50; and in the accounts of Maj. F. J. Stagliano, Finance Department, the sum of \$1,487, public funds for which they are accountable and which were paid by them on fraudulent vouchers prepared by their deputy.

Sec. 7. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. T. G. McCulloch, Finance Department, the sum of \$14.09, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing the unrecovered balance of payments totaling \$64.34 made to civilian employees for periods of absence of annual leave, to which leave said employees were not entitled by reason of having been engaged for work in connection with Work Projects Administration projects: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be charged to Maj. Robert E. Cron, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

Sec. 8. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), the sum of \$182.31, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers prepared by a former employee of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 9. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Capt. H. L. Oldenburg, Finance Department, the sum of \$55.17, public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen from the locker of his agent officer, Second Lt. B. C. Halton, Coast Artillery, by a person or persons unknown: *Provided*, That the said Second Lt. B. C. Halton shall not be held pecuniarily liable for any part of such sum.

Sec. 10. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, the sum of \$32.40, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing commutation of furlough rations which was paid to an enlisted man and to which he was not entitled by reason of not having returned to his duty station when his furlough was terminated by sickness and subsequent discharge without such return: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to Maj. Charles L. Driscoll, Medical Administrative Corps.

Sec. 11. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. R. L. Scott, Finance Department, the sum of \$264.82, public funds for which he is accountable and which were lost while being carried for pay-roll purposes from one building to another in the custody of his agent officer, Capt. Ralph L. Wilkerson, Air Corps: *Provided*, That the said Capt. Ralph L. Wilkerson shall not be held pecuniarily liable for any part of such sum.

Sec. 12. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. Lee R. Watrous, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of \$1,268, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers.

Sec. 13. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Advertiser Co., Montgomery, Ala., \$8; to the Light Publishing Co., San Antonio, Tex., \$5.72; to the Houston Press Co., Houston, Tex., \$8.40; to the Houston Printing Corporation, Houston, Tex., \$11.33; to Carter Glass & Sons, Lynchburg, Va., \$12.32; and to the Evening Star Publishing Co., Inc., Radford, Va., \$8.79, which amounts are due to the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable



for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SAMUEL JACOBS, BERTHA JACOBS, AND HARRY JACOBS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 787) for the relief of Samuel Jacobs, Bertha Jacobs, and Harry Jacobs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$2,743.18; to Bertha Jacobs, his wife, the sum of \$4,000" and insert "\$1,743.18", and in line 9, after the word "damage", to strike out "and personal injuries sustained" and insert "medical and hospital expenses incurred", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Jacobs, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of \$1,743.18 and to Harry Jacobs, his son, the sum of \$900, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, medical and hospital expenses incurred by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, at the intersection of North Avenue and Mount Royal Terrace, Baltimore, Md., on December 6, 1941, at 12:05 a. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs."

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the bill, with a report from the Appropriations Committee, was laid on our desks this morning. I stated to the acting chairman of the committee, the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], that I desired to have an opportunity to study the bill, and I asked that it go over until Monday. My request was agreed to. So I desire that the bill not come up before Monday. As I stated,

I have no objection to its consideration on that date. However, at the present time I must ask that the bill be passed over.

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF COAST GUARD ACADEMY GRADUATES AS ENSIGNS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2436) to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is simply to insure that the present members of classes at the Coast Guard Academy who will not graduate until 1945 and thereafter will be appointed ensigns following their graduation. Otherwise, because of the limitation as to the number of ensigns who can be appointed in the Coast Guard, there is no assurance without this legislation that the midshipmen referred to, who will graduate from the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, will become ensigns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS FOR LAYING OF CURBS AND GUTTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2159) to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in order to clarify the RECORD as to this particular bill, I wish to point out that the title reads "special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters." The bill does cover that matter as it relates to the District of Columbia, but its primary effect is to relieve the owners of abutting property from the necessity of paying assessments for the paving of streets, with the exception of the assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters. The provisions of the bill are in accordance with the necessary trend in these days of shifting the burden of payment of assessments from the owners of abutting property to the users of the highways. In order that the record may be clarified in that connection, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee.

There being no objection, the report (No. 253) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2159) entitled "An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters," having considered the same, report favorably upon it and recommend that the bill do pass, without amendment.

The title of the bill is misleading in that the bill is concerned primarily with relieving abutting property from assessments for roadway improvements and deals only in a minor degree with the revision of the basis for the assessment of abutting property for the laying of curbs and of gutters. However, since

the body of the bill is clear and the title of it will not change the interpretation of it, and there is need for action on the bill, the committee does not request a formal change in the title.

Under existing law abutting property is assessed one-half of the cost of paving roadway improvements within the District of Columbia upon which the property abuts, subject to certain restrictions as to maximum assessments designed to prevent inequities. Curbs or gutters, if constructed in connection with a roadway improvement, are now treated as part of the roadway and the cost of them is assessed in the same manner as the cost of the roadway improvement. These include what are referred to in the bill as combined "curbs and gutters."

This bill recognizes that a roadway is primarily for the use of the general public. The bill, therefore, eliminates all assessments against abutting property for the construction of roadway improvements as distinguished from the construction of curbs and gutters. It retains the present plan of assessment for the cost of curbs and gutters with slight modifications to prevent inequities. Where a gutter is constructed as an integral portion of a permanent type of roadway, that portion of the roadway lying within 2 feet of the curb line is considered a gutter for the purposes of the act.

In effect the bill shifts from the owners of abutting property to those paying gasoline taxes, registration fees, motor-vehicle permit fees, and other special taxes into the general highway fund of the District of Columbia, that portion of the cost of roadway improvements now paid for by assessments on abutting property. While under existing law, abutting property in the normal case has been assessed on the basis of 50 percent of the cost of the roadway improvement, the net effect after applying the several limitations in the existing law and after deducting assessments that fall upon governmentally owned and other property which is exempt from taxation, is that abutting property has in fact paid for only about 22 percent of the cost of the roadway improvements.

In the early days when roadways were constructed primarily as a means of ingress to and egress from abutting property, the assessment plan was appropriate. Today, however, when roadways are constructed primarily for the use of the general traffic, the assessment of a substantial part of the original cost of the roadway upon abutting property loses much, if not all, of the equity originally characteristic of it. Road specifications today usually call for roadways that are much wider and pavement that is much heavier than would be required for a roadway to serve largely as a means of ingress to and egress from abutting property.

The District of Columbia, in particular, is so laid out that practically all parts of it are easily accessible. The residential, business sections, and Government buildings are so situated that most of the city streets are used for through traffic even though the abutting property may contribute little to that traffic.

Gasoline taxes in the District of Columbia were increased by Public Law No. 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress approved December 26, 1941, from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia at that time also recommended that if the increased revenues derived by the highway fund from this tax would permit it, provision should be made to pay from the highway fund the entire cost of the construction of roadway improvements such as is proposed in this bill. They recognize that this situation has now arrived.

The loss in revenue from special assessments for roadway construction in normal times which would be eliminated by this bill is estimated by the Director of Highways of the District of Columbia at \$225,000. The revenue from gasoline taxes from the current

fiscal year have been officially estimated at \$3,000,000, of which \$1,000,000 results from the increase in the gasoline tax from 2 cents to 3 cents. In normal years the revenues from gasoline taxes on this basis would be about \$4,000,000. The highway fund also derives revenues from other sources, and the Director of Highways estimates that it will be able to absorb without difficulty the additional cost of roadway improvements shifted to it by the elimination of special assessments for their construction. No part of the highway fund is derived from general property taxation in the District or from Federal taxation. It is all derived from special taxes relating to the use of the highways.

At present there is little roadway construction and, therefore, little burden would be placed on the highway fund now by this bill.

While the practice varies in different jurisdictions, there is a growing tendency elsewhere in the country to follow the policy of paying more and more of the cost of roadway construction out of funds derived from highway users as a whole rather than out of assessments against abutting property.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have approved this bill, as evidenced in the following letter:

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the District  
of Columbia, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit to you herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters."

At the last session of Congress the Commissioners, under date of June 17, 1941, recommended that the District of Columbia motor-vehicle tax be increased and that if this were done the existing law relating to assessments for roadway improvements should be modified. The first recommendation was adopted (see Public, No. 383, 77th Cong., approved December 26, 1941). However, no action was taken upon the second recommendation. The Commissioners are still of the opinion that the present paving assessment law is unjust. It levies, with certain exceptions, upon the abutting property assessments equal to one-half of the cost of paving the roadway of the street upon which the properties abut and also one-half of the cost of the laying of curbs and gutters. In the past the character of street paving has been determined primarily by the needs of the abutting properties. Today, however, the character of the paving is determined more by general traffic conditions. Formerly the cost of the paving bore a direct relation to the benefit received by the property from the paving. Today, in many cases, it does not. The Commissioners believe that with the increase in the gasoline tax property owners should be relieved of assessments for the paving of the roadway of a street. The situation with respect to the laying of curbs and gutters is different. They are laid primarily for the benefit of the abutting property and assessments should be levied therefor. The Commissioners append hereto a bill to carry their recommendation into effect.

Section 1 of this proposed bill provides that when any curb or gutter is laid or any curb and gutter are laid of a permanent type of construction in any highway one-half of the total cost thereof shall be assessed against abutting properties by the front-foot method but no assessment is to be levied on account of the replacement of any such curb or gutter.

Section 2 contains a formula whereby the assessments will be reduced in the case of shallow lots and lots of small value.

Section 3 of the proposed bill contains a formula to reduce the assessments in the

case of lots abutting two or more streets so that no undue hardship will result.

Section 4 of the proposed bill provides that no assessment shall be levied under the existing Paving Assessment Act of February 20, 1931, for any improvements completed subsequent to the passage of this bill.

The Commissioners consider this legislation desirable and recommend its enactment.

A similar report on H. R. 5308, Seventy-seventh Congress, was referred by the Commissioners to the Bureau of the Budget and returned without objection to its submission to the Congress.

Respectfully,

C. W. KUTZ,  
Acting President, Board of Commis-  
sioners, District of Columbia.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2115) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

**Mr. McNARY.** Mr. President, this bill and the following bill on the calendar are of some importance. I think they should be discussed. Is any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia now in the Chamber?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] reported the bill.

**Mr. McNARY.** Is the report from the committee unanimous?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The present occupant of the chair has no knowledge as to that.

**Mr. BURTON.** Mr. President, the Committee on the District of Columbia was unanimous in reporting both bills favorably. Both bills are important. Does the Senator from Oregon desire that I comment on them?

**Mr. McNARY.** Yes; I should like to have the Senator comment upon them briefly, if he will do so. I should like to have a notion as to what they contemplate.

**Mr. BURTON.** House bill 2115, which is Calendar No. 254, provides for a reenactment of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; and it proposes to insert in the Code of the District of Columbia a provision for recognition of the merit of the individual insurer, so that if there is an individual record of employment in his particular case, he will have the benefit of it in his insurance rating. Such a provision is in accordance with the trend throughout the country. I think over 40 States have such a provision. I know that the State of Ohio has a similar one, and it has proven satisfactory.

Hearings were held on the bill by the Senator from South Dakota and he recommended the change. I think the proposed step is a sound one in insurance policy; and it meets with the approval of the Committee on the District of Colum-

bia and, I understand, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

**Mr. VANDENBERG.** The bill is the so-called merit rating bill; is it?

**Mr. BURTON.** That is correct.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2115) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, under the heading "Definitions", in section 1, subsection (b) (5) (G), on page 6, line 3, before the word "service", to strike out "effective January 1, 1936"; in line 9, after the word "individual", to strike out the comma and the words "and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation"; and in line 14, in subparagraph (H), after the word "under", to strike out "an", and insert "any other", so as to make the subsections read:

"(G) service performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(H) service with respect to which unemployment compensation is payable under any other unemployment compensation system established by an act of Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Disqualification for Benefits", in section 10, subsection (g), on page 44, line 3, after the word "under", to strike out "an", and insert "any other", so as to make the subparagraph read:

"(g) An individual shall not be eligible for benefits for any week with respect to which he has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under any other unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States: *Provided*, That if the appropriate agency of such other State or of the United States finally determines that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits, this disqualification shall not apply.

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. BURTON.** Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD the committee report on the bill, so that the bill may be fully explained in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 250) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill H. R. 2115, an act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass, with the following amendments:

On page 6, line 3, strike out "effective January 1, 1936."

On page 6, beginning on line 9, change the comma after the word "individual" to a period and strike out "and no substantial part of



the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

On page 6, line 14, strike out "an" and insert "any other."

On page 44, line 3, strike out "an" and insert "any other."

This bill if enacted would replace the present District Unemployment Compensation Act and result in a District unemployment compensation law similar to those in effect in most States. By its provisions the coverage of employment is made to conform as nearly as possible with the coverage of employment under the Social Security Act, thus minimizing confusion and promoting uniformity of coverage under the District act and the Social Security Act.

This bill changes the contribution rate from the present flat rate of 2.7 percent to an experience-rating system under which the rate of contributions will range on a sliding scale from 2.7 percent down to one-tenth of 1 percent. It provides that each employer's total current contributions paid since June 30, 1939, less the total benefits paid to his former employees, will be compiled by the Board and will be called the employer's reserve. The percentage which each employer's reserve bears to such employer's average annual pay roll for the preceding 3 years then will determine the employer's contribution rate. By thus basing each employer's contribution rate upon his individual unemployment risk, unemployment compensation costs are more equitably distributed among employers.

Individual employer reserve accounts are created. When an employer's reserve account reaches a certain percentage of his annual pay roll, he becomes entitled to a reduction of his contribution for unemployment compensation.

#### EXPLANATION OF EXPERIENCE RATING

Experience-rating systems are provided for in the unemployment-compensation laws now in effect in 37 States and in the unemployment compensation law to become effective January 1, 1944, in Nevada. (For two studies of the operation of experience rating in the various States of the Union, see exhibits A and B, attached hereto and constituting a part of this report.)

Under this bill the standard contribution of all employers is fixed at 2.7 percent of the annual average wage. If the employer continues to make this contribution for a period of 36 consecutive calendar months and his individual reserve has not been depleted, then he is entitled to the reductions provided in the bill.

If his reserve is less than 1 percent of his average annual pay roll, the rate of contribution shall be 2.7.

It shall be 2 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 1 percent but is less than 1.5 percent of his average annual pay roll.

It shall be 1.5 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 1.5 percent, but is less than 2 percent of his average annual pay roll.

It shall be 1 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 2 percent but is less than 3 percent of his average annual pay roll.

It shall be 0.5 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 3 percent but is less than 3.5 percent.

It shall be 0.1 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 3.5 percent of his average annual pay roll.

If as of any computation date the total amount of benefits paid out and chargeable to the employer's account is more than the total contributions credited to his account with respect to employment subsequent to May 31, 1939, then his contribution rate for the ensuing calendar year or remaining portion thereof shall be 2.7 percent.

Under this bill the employer's contribution rate normally would be computed as of June

30 each year. However, for the balance of the calendar year which remains after the enactment of this act, should the effective date be any date other than January 1, the computation date will be the last day of the third calendar quarter immediately preceding the effective date of the act. With this computation date settled upon, the act may be made effective during the course of the year in which enacted, without causing any complications.

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Contributions provided for, by this bill, are made a lien upon each employer's assets. The Board is made a body corporate, and, as such, is given authority to sue and to be sued. Substituted service of process on nonresident employers is provided for. Provisions for refund of contributions are changed to permit employers to file application for refund within 3 years from the date upon which the contributions were paid, instead of within 1 year from the date upon which the contributions became due, as provided by the present law. The Board is given authority to determine to what extent its decisions shall have retroactivity, and authority to compromise tax obligations, on the same basis on which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue determines such matters for social-security tax purposes. The bill authorizes the Board to enter into reciprocal agreements, with other State unemployment compensation boards or with the Federal Government, in connection with benefit rights and coverage.

#### SOLVENCY OF FUND PROTECTED

To protect the solvency of the fund, two provisions are made. (1) If the balance in the fund as of the computation date is less than 5 percent of the total taxable pay rolls for all employers (the equivalent of approximately 2 years' contribution under the present rate) the contribution for each employer will be increased by the percentage differential between said 5 percent of such total pay rolls and said fund's percentage of such pay rolls, but in no event shall the contribution rate for any employer be more than 2.7 percent. (2) If, on December 20 of any calendar year, the amount in the fund becomes less than 2.4 percent of the total annual pay rolls subject to contributions for the 12-month period ending the preceding June 30, each employer's rate for the succeeding calendar year will be 2.7 percent.

#### RESERVE IN FUND

At the end of 1942 the amount in the District unemployment-compensation fund was \$32,196,075.26, which represented an increase of \$7,595,911.57 in the reserve fund during the calendar year. As of February 28, 1943, this reserve had increased to \$34,320,397.49. On May 15, 1943, the reserve was up another \$2,285,000, and stood at \$36,605,256. Even in 1941, when unemployment-compensation benefits paid totaled \$2,128,329.10, the highest amount of benefits paid in any calendar year, the District unemployment-compensation fund accumulated an additional reserve of almost \$5,000,000. By the end of the present calendar year the report undoubtedly will exceed \$40,000,000.

It is clear from the record of benefit payments heretofore made, together with the annual contributions received into the fund (see table below) that the fund has now reached such proportions as to be beyond threat of depletion by reason of any expected depreciation. There is enough in this reserve fund at the present time to carry the District for over 15 years at the present rate of payments without taking any contributions from employers. Your committee, therefore, believe that experience rating as incorporated in this bill should be adopted to lighten the load of the employers within the District of Columbia.

#### Receipts and payments under District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act

For the year—	Receipts	Payments
1938.....	\$6,362,353	\$1,673,208
1939.....	6,763,150	1,437,104
1940.....	5,753,786	2,117,375
1941.....	6,493,570	2,128,329
1942.....	8,248,788	1,157,521

#### CEILING ON BENEFITS RAISED

The ceiling on benefit rights of unemployed individuals is by this bill raised from \$18 per week for 19 weeks to \$20 for 20 weeks, and the waiting period is reduced from not more than 2 weeks to 1 week. The "dependent relative" group, from which benefits are paid, is enlarged to include a spouse and any child, regardless of age, whom the claimant is morally obligated to support. These benefit provisions are extremely liberal in comparison with those in other States. In fact, laws in most other States provide for a lower benefit amount and shorter duration.

#### BENEFIT RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS IN ARMED FORCES

Unlike the present law, this bill preserves benefit rights of individuals in the armed forces of the United States. An individual who entered or enters the armed forces after March 31, 1940, has at least 90 days of continuous service, and is discharged from such forces within 6 months after termination of the present war will have his benefit rights preserved as of the time he entered the armed forces.

#### NEW EXEMPTION

The bill provides a new exemption for services of real-estate salesmen, solicitors, and agents, if compensated for solely by way of commission. This is the same basis upon which insurance agents are exempted under the present law.

Authority to recover, recoup, or waive recovery, under certain circumstances, of benefits erroneously paid to unemployed individuals, is vested in the District Unemployment Compensation Board by this bill.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Subdivision G of section 5, page 6, reads as follows:

"(G) Effective January 1, 1936, service performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

There is no valid reason for making this provision retroactive. By it the contribution requirement would be moved back 7 years. It is of doubtful constitutionality in the opinion of your committee, who therefore recommend deletion of the words "effective January 1, 1936."

The final clause of this subdivision G, "and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation," is, in the opinion of your committee, unnecessary and inadvisable. In the case of *International Reform Federation v. Unemployment Compensation Commission of District of Columbia*, decided September 2, 1942, in which the ruling of the Social Security Board that the above-named complainant was liable for the contribution, the United States court of appeals for this district made the following statement:

"In the case now under consideration as we have seen the statute, in precise terms ex-

cepts from its provisions service in the form of a corporation operated exclusively for religious, charitable, literary, or educational purposes. Nothing is to be found in this paragraph which pronounces the group less charitable, less religious, or less educational because it seeks to accomplish its purpose in corridors of the Congress as well as in the homes or churches of the people, nor can any such interpretation be implied with any degree of reason."

Likewise the Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered a decision in the case of *Roscoe Jones v. City of Opelika*, holding that a tax upon the distribution of religious literature is unconstitutional.

Your committee does not know the origin of the above clause attached to subdivision G, nor why it was attached, but in our judgment it is inappropriate and should be eliminated. We therefore recommend that the final clause of the above-named subsection as printed in italic and reading as follows: "and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation," be eliminated from the bill.

Subdivision H of paragraph 5 reads as follows:

"Service with respect to which unemployment compensation is payable under an unemployment compensation system established by an act of Congress."

Use of the word "an" is misleading, because we already have an unemployment compensation system within the District. Your committee recommend that this subdivision be amended by striking the word "an" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any other."

In subdivision G of section 10 we recommend a similar amendment by striking the word "an" in the third line thereof and inserting the words "any other."

Those approving the enactment of this legislation include practically every business enterprise within the District. Letters from more than 200 business houses and industries within the District were filed in support of this bill and in particular in support of the experience rating provision. Also your committee received letters from many employers both within and outside of the District supporting the bill.

The only organizations or individuals opposing the bill so far as your committee has been able to ascertain are the American Federation of Labor, represented by Frank J. Coleman, who presented a statement at the hearings held by your committee; Sidney R. Katz, representing Congress of Industrial Organizations; Willie Arnheim, representing Road, Highways, and Heavy Construction Laborers Union Local No. 546; William G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint conference against merit rating, secretary of Building Employers Association; and the National Association of Contractors.

Each of these opposing organizations presented objections to the experience rating provisions of the bill. Their ground of objection may be stated briefly as demanding a continuation of the piling up of the reserve fund without let-up. In the judgment of your committee, such objections are not well founded.

Full and complete hearings were held upon this bill in the District committee room in the Capitol. Everyone desiring to be heard was given an opportunity. With the exception of those specifically above-mentioned there were no objections to the provisions of the bill as here reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 777) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 9, after the words "during the", to strike out "existence of the present war in which the United States is engaged and 6 months thereafter" and insert in lieu thereof "period ending June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may determine."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "or more than 6 days."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

#### NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had desired to take up the independent offices appropriation bill today; but it has been agreed that the bill shall go over until Monday.

There is one item in that bill with which I am concerned, and with which I hope the majority of the Senate will be concerned when it comes up. I refer to the item regarding the National Resources Planning Board. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations recommended to the full committee an appropriation of \$534,000 for the next year, which is practically half the sum which the Board had available last year, or \$1,100,000.

In the full committee, on a tie vote, the amount was reduced to \$200,000. I am informed that when the bill is taken up the Senator from Tennessee will offer an amendment restoring the figure favorably reported by the subcommittee, that is, \$534,000. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

However, that is not what I rose to discuss. In a conversation with Dr. Charles E. Merriam, who is Vice Chairman of that Board, my attention was called to certain misunderstandings with respect to the attitude of the Board toward two subjects. One is the subject of an expanding economy, and the other is the subject of deficit financing. The impression seems to have been created that the National Resources Planning Board had advocated and was in favor of deficit

financing, and was opposed to what is called an expanded economy.

I have before me a very brief memorandum from Dr. Merriam, which I should like to read into the Record for the benefit of the Senate, before the bill comes up on Monday, because while it has nothing to do with the amount of the appropriation, it is desirable that the attitude of the Board be clarified on these two subjects, as the misunderstanding might be transmitted to the floor of the Senate.

I read the memorandum regarding one of these subjects, the expanding economy:

It has been suggested that the National Resources Planning Board believes that we are no longer in an expanding and dynamic economy. For 10 years the Board members individually and collectively have been preaching the doctrines of an expanding economy. It was this Board which established goals of national income 20 percent above anything previously achieved. We were called idealists and dreamers because we talked expansion and were unwilling to be limited by the levels of living previously attained. We published volumes such as *Technological Trends and National Policy* as far back as 1937 in our push for an expanding economy and higher living standards.

In its most recent report the Board stated, "accordingly we plan for a dynamic expanding economy on the order of one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five billion dollars national income." (P. 4, National Resources Planning Board development report for 1943, pt. I.)

I now read the memorandum on the subject of deficit financing:

It has been charged by those who apparently misunderstand the National Resources Planning Board's attitude that the Board advocates so-called deficit financing as a continuous policy of the Federal Government. The National Resources Planning Board has advocated, and who has not, Government borrowing at certain times. When and how much the Government shall borrow is not something which can be settled in advance for extended periods of time, but will be determined by various situations, such as war, depression, or other national need. This is the position of the Board. (See National Resources Planning Board Development Report for 1943; Part I: Post-War Plan and Program, p. 13.)

In connection with this matter, Mr. President, Mr. Beardsley Ruml, who is a member of the National Resources Planning Board, and whose name has become famous in the past year or so in connection with taxation, found it necessary to issue a statement to the press on last Tuesday, May 18, which reads as follows:

Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co. and adviser of the National Resources Planning Board, in the course of remarks on Business Organizations Look Ahead, made today before the American Association of Planning Officials, stated, "Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, writes in his book, *New Philosophy of Public Debt*, that the National Resources Planning Board advocates a new conception that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the Nation."

"Dr. Moulton's reference to the Board is an uninformed misstatement of the Board's recommendations on fiscal policies. These



are clearly set forth on page 13 of part one of its recent report for 1943, in part as follows: "It is our national policy (as it has been since the beginning of our history) to accept as a suitable role of government, positive effort to foster and encourage the free activities of private individuals and agencies in advancing their well-being through productive enterprise."

"Accordingly the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government should be conceived and administered to complement and supplement these activities of private enterprise in the maintenance of adequate effective demand."

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which I received from Dr. Merriam transmitting the memorandum regarding the Board's attitude on the two subjects to which I have referred. I am sure Senators will be interested because it clarifies the situation, and some Senators seem to have been laboring under a misapprehension with regard to the matter.

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

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD,  
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1943.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,  
United States Senate,

MY DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Referring to our telephone conversation this morning, I am sending you a brief memorandum regarding the topic we discussed, namely An Expanding Economy and Deficit Financing.

I am also enclosing a release of Dr. Ruml's speech in New York City on Tuesday, May 18.

I hope that these statements will clarify the position of the National Resources Planning Board, which is evidently misunderstood in certain quarters.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. MERRIAM,  
Vice Chairman.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Ensign Leslie G. Haverland to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast Guard, to rank from May 29, 1942.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### THE ARMY—BEN LEAR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD several telegrams which have come to me relative to the nomination of General Lear. One comes from Stuart H. Perry, publisher of the Adrian Daily Telegram, of Adrian, Mich. Another comes from Mr.

Roane Waring, national commander of the American Legion. Mr. Waring's telegram was sent from New Orleans, La. Both telegrams relate to General Lear, whose nomination is now before the Senate. I ask that the telegrams and also a copy of General Lear's military record be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ADRIAN, MICH., May 16, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Effort to block confirmation of General Lear is amazing and unworthy. It reflects personal rancor and lack of understanding of proper Army discipline. General Lear's action was absolutely sound. Refusal to confirm or even a large vote against confirmation would be discreditable to the Senate and prejudicial to the morale of both officers and soldiers.

STUART H. PERRY,

Publisher, Adrian Daily Telegram.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., May 16, 1943.

HON. ROBERT REYNOLDS,

Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee,

United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I understand that there is opposition to confirmation of General Lear. I deeply regret this. I have observed and admired the ability with which he has commanded the Second Army during the time that his headquarters were in Memphis, my home. I am very familiar with the "yo-ho" incident. I have talked to a number of gentlemen who were with General Lear when it occurred. I have not discussed it with him. I know that the action of these soldiers was far more serious and reprehensible than simply yoo-hooing. The newspaper stories did General Lear a great injustice, but whether right or wrong in the severity of his punishment of them, this is no time, when our Army needs discipline, and strict discipline, to question a disciplinary act of a superior officer except that it be done in proper channels. If these soldiers were unfairly treated, which I understand, they have said they were not, then there is a proper method of redress. I regard this effort to now punish General Lear as unfortunate, wrong, and a very serious blow to the proper administration and disciplining of an army.

ROANE WARING,

The National Commander of the American Legion.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
Washington, April 30, 1943

MILITARY HISTORY OF BEN LEAR (0-1179) LIEUTENANT GENERAL (CAVALRY), FROM OCTOBER 1, 1940. BORN MAY 12, 1879, AT HAMILTON, CANADA. SERVICE: 45 YEARS

Present Assignment: Commanding General, Second Army, Central Defense Command, Memphis, Tennessee, since October 20, 1940. Assumed temporary command of the Army Ground Forces, April 26, 1943.

Manner of Performance: "Superior" Rated by Lieutenant General L. J. McNair.

1. Schools Attended: Graduate: Mounted Service School, 1911; School of the Line, 1922; General Staff School, 1923; Army War College, 1926.

2. Decorations, Awards, and Ratings: Silver Star, October 9, 1899; Distinguished Service Medal, March 28, 1943.

3. Efficiency Record:  
(a) Annual Efficiency Rating: 1926, Excellent; 1927, Excellent; 1928, Excellent; 1929,

Superior; 1930, Excellent; 1931, Excellent; 1932, Excellent; 1933, Excellent; 1934, Superior; 1935, Superior.

(b) General Efficiency Rating: None.

(c) Efficiency Reports as General Officer:

Chief of Staff, 9th C. A., from May 1, 1936, to June 19, 1936. Rated "Superior" by Brig. Gen. C. H. Conrad, Jr.

C. G., 1st Cav. Div., from Oct. 1, 1936, to June 30, 1937. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees.

C. G., 1st Cav. Div., from July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1938. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees.

C. G., 1st Cav. Div., from July 1, 1938, to Nov. 21, 1938. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees.

C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept., from Dec. 9, 1938, to June 30, 1939. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. David L. Stone.

C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept. from July 1, 1939, to Jan. 7, 1940. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. David L. Stone.

C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept., C. G. Ft. Clayton, C. Z.; C. G., Panama Mobile Force (Provisional) from Jan. 8, 1940, to June 30, 1940. Rated "Excellent" by Maj. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis.

C. G., Pan Mobile Force; C. G., Ft. Clayton, C. Z., from July 1, 1940, to Sept. 19, 1940. Rated "Superior" by Lt. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis.

Comdg. 2d Army, from Mar. 20, 1942, to Dec. 31, 1942. Rated "Superior" by Lt. Gen. L. J. McNair.

#### 4. Previous service:

(a) Grades held: 1st Sgt. Colo. Inf., May 1, 1898; 2d Lt., Colo. Inf., Apr. 1, 1899; 1st Lt., U. S. Inf., July 5, 1899; 2d Lt., Cav., R. A., Feb. 2, 1901; 1st Lt., Dec. 9, 1901; Capt., Aug. 10, 1912; Maj. (temp.), Aug. 5, 1917; Lt. Col. (temp.), Jan. 26, 1918; Col., Cav., U. S. A., Aug. 31, 1918; Lt. Col., R. A., July 1, 1920; Col., Sept. 19, 1929; Brig. Gen., May 1, 1936; Maj. Gen., Oct. 1, 1938.

#### (b) Assignments:

On duty with Co. C, 2d Regt., N. G. of Colo., Apr. 1898 to June 1898.

On duty with the 36th Inf. U. S. Vols., P. I., July 1898 to Apr. 1903.

Post Adj. and Adj., 15th Cav., Ft. Mason, Calif., Sept. 1903 to Nov. 1903.

Post and Sq. Adj., 15th Cav., Ft. Ethan Allen, Vt., Nov. 1903 to Sept. 1906.

Int. Off. and Post Adj., 15th Cav., Province of Santa Clara, and Post of Cienfuegos, Cuba, Oct. 1906 to June 1908.

On D. S. with the Army Cav. Rifle Team at various stations in the U. S., July 1908 to Feb. 1911.

Stu. and later Instr., Mtd. Serv. Sch., Ft. Riley, Kans., Mar. 1911 to Dec. 1912.

On duty with the 27th Inf., Ft. Sheridan, Ill., Jan. 1912 to Feb. 1913.

Sq. Comdr., 15th, 8th, and 3d Cav., Big Bend and Fabens Cav. Patrol Dists., and Ft. Bliss, Tex., Feb. 1913 to Apr. 1916.

Instr., Army Serv. Sch., Ft. Leavenworth, Kans., Apr. 1916 to Oct. 1917.

G. S., War Plans Div., Wash., D. C., Nov. 1917 to Aug. 1918.

Instr., Cav. Tr., Camp Stanley, Tex., Oct. 1918 to Dec. 1918.

Dir. and Instr., the Cav. Sch., Ft. Riley, Kans., Jan. 1919 to Aug. 1921.

Instr., the G. S. S., Ft. Leavenworth, Kans., Sept. 1921 to Aug. 1925.

Stu., A. W. C., Wash., D. C., Aug. 1925 to June 1926.

C. O., 1st Sq., 14th Cav., Ft. Sheridan, Ill., Aug. 1926 to Oct. 1927.

Chief, Inspections Div., Wash., D. C., Nov. 1927 to Dec. 1930.

Post Comdr., Presidio of Monterey, Calif., Jan. 1930 to June 1933.

C. of S., 9th C. A., Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., July 1933 to June 1936.

C. G., Hq. 8th C. A., Ft. Bliss, Tex., July 1936 to Nov. 1938.

C. G., Pacific Sector, Panama Canal Dept., Quarry Heights, C. Z., Dec. 1938 to Sept. 1940.

#### 5. Recommendations:

In November 1938 Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees, C. G., 1st Cav. Div., said, "A man of decisive views and action. Positive in his views, works hard for his command. Very active and in excellent physical condition."

In January 1940 Maj. Gen. David L. Stone, C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept., said, "An able officer, very active, and has fine judgment and initiative. A very valuable general officer. Absolutely loyal in all things."

6. Court martials, reprimands, and derogatory remarks: None.

#### 7. Efficiency record:

(a) Annual efficiency rating: 1926, Excellent; 1927, Excellent; 1928, Excellent; 1929, Superior; 1930, Excellent; 1931, Excellent; 1932, Excellent; 1933, Excellent; 1934, Superior; 1935, Superior. (No numerical ratings available.)

(b) General efficiency rating: None.

By authority of the Secretary of War:

J. A. ULIO,

Major General,

The Adjutant General.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate unduly in taking action upon the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States. I desire, however, to make it a matter of record that my vote will be cast against the confirmation of the nomination of General Lear, and I deem it incumbent upon me to make a brief statement of the reasons which impel me to take this action and the reasons why I believe General Lear to be unfit to hold the high rank of lieutenant general in the United States Army.

Mr. President, in the 10 years during which I have been a Member of this body, so far as I recall I have never before had occasion to vote against or raise my voice against confirming the nomination of any man to be an officer in the Army or Navy of the United States. I do so at this time with great reluctance, particularly as it occurs at a time when the country is at war.

My observation of the record of General Lear leads me to believe that his promotion to the rank of lieutenant general would not be justified by anything in his record. On the contrary, the oppressive character of some of his actions as commanding general of the Second Army should militate against his promotion.

Let me say, Mr. President, as forcefully as I know how to express myself, that I would be the last to interfere with proper discipline or proper training of the armed forces of the United States. Discipline is not only necessary but absolutely imperative in any military or naval organization. However, Mr. President, in order to be effective and fair, the discipline to be administered should be equitable. It should be in accordance with the Articles of War and the Army regulations, under which the officer is supposed to exercise his authority.

I do not believe it can be successfully controverted, that in his capacity as commanding general of the Second Army, General Lear has in many instances been oppressive to the extreme and, in some instances, one of which I

am about to relate, has proceeded in violation of the Articles of War in administering discipline. To a large extent his effort was directed toward discriminating against National Guard divisions, National Guard organizations, and unfair treatment of National Guard officers and enlisted men.

Because it has received a great deal of publicity, I desire to call attention particularly to an incident which occurred adjacent to a country club at Memphis, Tenn., while the Thirty-fifth Division was returning from the Army maneuvers of 1941. For many weeks the troops had been engaged in those maneuvers under most adverse conditions of weather and terrain. They were being conveyed back to Camp Robinson at Little Rock, Ark. In passing by the most prominent golf club near the city of Memphis, it has been alleged that as they were rolling along in trucks returning from these very arduous maneuvers, some of the men saw some young ladies in shorts playing golf on the golf links. It was also alleged that some of the soldiers made remarks to the young ladies. It is said they called to them. It has been alleged in some quarters that they gestured to the young ladies.

An elderly gentleman in civilian clothes, wearing no mark or insignia, but who, it subsequently developed was General Lear, happened to be playing golf on the links of the country club on that Sabbath morning while the Second Army as a whole was marching back from maneuvers. He ran over and began to shout at the soldiers who were returning in the trucks. Most of them, of course, had never seen General Lear, the Army commander. Many of them had never heard of him. They apparently did not receive the shouted orders of this apparent civilian with the reverence to which he thought he was entitled. It is possible that when he yelled out, "I am General Lear; I am General Lear," one of the irreverent young men may have replied, "Yes, and I am Julius Caesar" or, "I am Napoleon Bonaparte." It is quite possible that one of these young men said, "Oh, go roll your hoop, Grandpa," or words to that effect. Certainly there was nothing to impress upon these young men the fact that General Lear was the lieutenant general in command of the Second Army.

General Lear took very grave offense at this lack of recognition of himself and his sacred person, even though he was in civilian clothes, and apparently he became determined to punish the whole organization.

Mr. President, if any members of that organization were guilty of misconduct—if it was misconduct to hail a group of pretty girls as the truck train rolled along the road, which I have never heard was a military offense—there were means at General Lear's disposal for correcting the situation and punishing the guilty men. He was on the ground. He could have made himself known. As commanding officer of the Army he could have required the officer in charge of the truck train to ascertain the guilty parties and bring them to punishment. He

could have stopped the train, and if the train did not stop at his order, he being in civilian clothes, he could have sent a staff guard to stop the train, made an investigation of the matter, and brought about the punishment of the guilty parties. He could have pursued the ordinary course dictated by military policy and military custom and ordinary military courtesy. He could have directed the commanding general of the Thirty-fifth Division to conduct an investigation and bring the guilty parties to punishment. He did not see fit, however, to do that. He was anxious to get his name in the newspapers; he was anxious to show his great authority; so, instead of stopping the truck train and making an investigation on the ground, or instead of proceeding through military channels, as is the universal practice and custom in the Army, he proceeded to let the train roll on to Little Rock, 125 miles away, and then, in the most flamboyant fashion, he ordered the truck train to retrace its course 125 miles back, and then ordered the men out in the hottest weather of the summer to march a portion of the distance on foot, in order that he might be given more publicity as a stern disciplinarian.

Mr. President, that is in violation of the one hundred and fourth article of war. It was General Lear's duty, if he thought that punishment should be administered, to ascertain the guilty parties and punish them. Instead of that, he saw fit to punish a whole organization, the innocent with the guilty, and to put a stigma on the whole organization in order to bring publicity and glory to himself.

I call attention to the one hundred and fourth article of war particularly, because that article specifies what summary punishment can be administered by a commanding officer or a commanding general. It does not include punishment of a whole organization, of the innocent as well as the guilty, for derelictions if there were derelictions, on the part of a few men. I say that a general officer who would pursue such a course as that demonstrates unfitness for the exercise of the high command to which he has been appointed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator object to reading the one hundred and fourth article of war? I am not familiar with it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am somewhat familiar with the incident which occurred at the time, but I should like to know just what the one hundred and fourth article of war provides.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to read it. The one hundred and fourth article of war is as follows:

Disciplinary powers of commanding officers: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command may, for minor offenses impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his



command without the intervention of a court martial, unless the accused demands trial by court martial.

There is no evidence at all in this case that General Lear ever advised men of this command that they were being subjected to punishment, or that he advised them of their right not to permit punishment without being tried by court martial, in order that the innocent might have a chance to establish their innocence.

The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not exceeding 1 week, extra fatigue for not exceeding 1 week, restriction to certain specified limits for not exceeding 1 week, and hard labor without confinement for not exceeding 1 week, but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard; except that in time of war or grave public emergency, a commanding officer of the grade of brigadier general or of higher grade may, under the provisions of this article also impose upon an officer of his command below the grade of major a forfeiture of not more than one-half of such officer's monthly pay for 1 month. A person punished under authority of this article, who deems the punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority, shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court martial for a crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty.

The point I make, Mr. President, is that if these men were guilty of dereliction of duty, they were subject to court martial or they were subject to summary punishment, if they did not object to summary punishment and demand a court martial. But what General Lear did was to make no effort whatever to ascertain the guilty parties and punish them. He made no effort whatever to get a statement from the commanding officer of the truck train or the commanding officer or non-commissioned officer of any particular truck, but he punished the whole organization and forced them to countermarch and waste many gallons of Government gasoline at a time when the Government was urging people to save gasoline, for he allowed the train to proceed to Little Rock, then ordered its return from Little Rock, and then to go back again to Little Rock, in order to satisfy his pique.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if there is any evidence that the soldiers who were thus punished as the Senator says ever complained of their punishment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have had complaints, I may say, from some of the men in the organization.

Mr. McKELLAR. But they made no official complaint.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The sentence had already been carried out; they had already been forced to undergo the punishment, and they had no opportunity of complaining.

Mr. McKELLAR. They could have complained at the time, it seems to me. May I say to the Senate that I had never met General Lear—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have never met him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Until he came to Memphis; indeed, I never met him until after this incident occurred, and the incident, as the Senator recalls, was extensively advertised by the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That evidently was General Lear's purpose in administering that form of punishment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think so. I think, so far as the publicity angle is concerned, it came about particularly because, as the Senator suggested a few moments ago, pretty girls, dressed in shorts were brought into the picture and the soldiers took notice of them as they passed along. Whatever may have been the facts about that, General Lear was there; he heard and saw the whole performance; and I have no doubt in my mind from what I learned at home and from what I have learned since that the incident was greatly exaggerated by the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The countermarch was not exaggerated, was it, and forcing the men to march in extremely hot weather was not exaggerated?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but it was never stated that the soldiers themselves had complained of the summary punishment which was visited upon them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator must realize that it is difficult for enlisted men in the Army to complain of the conduct of a lieutenant general.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator, of course, is familiar with Army matters because he served with distinction in the Army of the United States in the past, and I am one of his greatest admirers for the service he rendered in the first World War. But I want to say a word for General Lear. Since that incident occurred I have been introduced to General Lear and I have met him a number of times; in fact, I think perhaps every time I have gone to Memphis since the incident occurred. I have known a great many generals of the Army, among them many of the highest rank and filling most important positions, but I think I never knew a more dignified or kindlier general or one who seemed to be more careful in the discharge of his duties, more alive to the obligations of his high position, more courteous, and more determined to perform faithfully his duty as an officer than General Lear.

At first I had the idea that the incident referred to by the Senator from Missouri was a newspaper flare-up, one of those things which frequently occur, and that General Lear might have been remiss in some way. But from everything I have heard and have since learned in the city of Memphis concerning the incident I do not think I recall a single solitary criti-

cism of General Lear on the part of the people of Memphis or the people of that section of the country whom I met. I do not think I ever heard the general criticized in the slightest degree because of the incident. Most people thought it was largely a matter of glaring and tremendous headlines in the newspapers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I realize that General Lear was very popular in the city of Memphis, particularly with the country club element, with whom apparently he spent a good deal of his time. I have had many letters from prominent citizens of Memphis, members of the country club, familiar with General Lear's high character and conduct on the golf links, who deplored any criticism of the General. I have not received communications from any of the men who served under him, I have not had any from any member in the Thirty-fifth Division.

I think the Senator is bound to agree that if General Lear had wanted to handle that matter in an entirely adequate way, without getting his name in the newspapers and stirring up a great deal of trouble, the natural thing for him to have done, the normal thing for him to have done, the customary thing for him to have done, according to Army regulations and Army custom, would have been to notify the commanding general of the Thirty-fifth Division, General Truman, as to what had taken place. First, he could have stopped the truck train and admonished the commanding officer of the train to make an immediate investigation on the ground, in order to ascertain the men guilty, and to place them under arrest, or punish them, or, if he desired, to let the truck train proceed on to Little Rock. The customary thing for him to have done, the proper thing for him to have done, would have been to notify General Truman, commanding general of the Thirty-fifth Division, and officer of long service, certainly as distinguished service as that of General Lear himself, and let General Truman, well known as a disciplinarian, entirely competent to run his own division, make the investigation, let him fix the guilt as to the men who were in dereliction, and administer adequate punishment to them, instead of punishing the whole organization, at considerable Government expense, innocent men along with the guilty, for what a few in a whole command may have done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not been at the office constantly lately, but so far as I know I do not recall receiving a letter concerning this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and let me say that I have received a number of letters from Memphis, some of them from people the Senator and I both know very well, and for whom we have a very high regard.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be that letters have come to my office, but I have not

seen any such letters. I am one of those who associate with all classes of people in my home city and my home State, and I have heard General Lear discussed by all classes of our people. I have heard him discussed by the ex-service men of the First World War; I have heard him discussed by businessmen; I have heard him discussed by some members of the country club to which the Senator refers. But from none of these have I heard any criticism of what the general did at the time spoken of. None have written me about it, and as I have talked with them, none have told me about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never suggested that the members of the country club ever wrote about the countermarching of the battalion.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have a very large World War veterans' organization in Memphis, one of the largest in the country, I think, and, so far as I recall, from the head of the veterans' organization, Col. Roane Waring, on down through all its members, I have never had any request to take any action against General Lear because of the incident referred to. I am wondering whether the Senator has heard from any of the veterans. The Senator is a veteran himself, and has many friends among the veterans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have had many telegrams and letters from veterans, not veterans of Memphis, but veterans of Missouri, the sons and kinsmen of some of whom were in the long, arduous countermarch which General Lear ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my judgment, from what I heard of General Lear in Tennessee he certainly stands very high.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand General Lear was exceedingly popular with the civilian population of Memphis.

Mr. McKELLAR. He certainly was.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know General Lear, never saw him—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know him, either, and never saw him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I never knew much about him until this episode took place about the girls.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never heard of him until he got command of the Second Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me to be admitted on all sides that over a long period of years General Lear has been a good officer. Prior to this time, I never heard anything against his record, and never heard of anything since.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I intend to refer in a moment to some other things in relation to General Lear.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to ask the Senator if it is true that since General Lear has been in the Army, which has covered practically his whole adult life, he has had a good record, and admitting that in connection with the episode about which the Senator has been talking General Lear's conduct was arbitrary and capricious, that it was a mis-

take on his part, would we be justified in rejecting his promotion on that account assuming that he had a good record generally?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I intend to refer to some other conduct of General Lear in a moment.

General Lear was relieved of his command of the Second Army, of course, and lost the automatic status of lieutenant general, which he had occupied by virtue of being commander of the Second Army, and was ordered for retirement, I think, in about 3 weeks. The promotion we are considering merely restores him to duty as a lieutenant general, promotes him to the rank of lieutenant general. I do not know whether it affects the time of his retirement or not.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to some other conduct of General Lear with regard to National Guard organizations which were under his command. I am particularly interested, of course, in the Thirty-fifth Division, which is the division to which the Missouri National Guard belongs, and the division in which I myself served during the last war, and in which I put in a good many years after the war in the National Guard.

In the particular instance I am about to cite, I shall choose an example from the Thirty-fifth Division of a man I happened to know very well, to show General Lear's attitude of oppression and arbitrariness, his overbearing and insulting attitude, applying not only to the Thirty-fifth Division, but all the other divisions under his command.

I do not blame General Lear personally for the effort which has been made and is being made to disorganize the National Guard, an effort made by the War Department to disorganize the National Guard, relieve all the senior National Guard officers, and encompass the destruction of the National Guard organization, so that it cannot be reconstituted after the war. General Lear is not responsible for that policy. That is a War Department policy, and that policy has been carried out in all armies. The Department has broken up most of the National Guard divisions. They have relieved practically all the senior officers of the National Guard, and that is the same mistake they made in the last war, which was responsible for much of the trouble the Regular Army had after the war. They never seem to learn anything from experience. As I have said, Mr. President, I do not blame General Lear for that personally, because apparently it happens to be the universal policy of the War Department. What I do blame General Lear for is the peculiar, arbitrary sort of way in which he carried out that policy with regard to the National Guard.

I do not desire to detain the Senate unduly, but I do wish to cite the case of one officer whom I happen to know, because he and I served in the same regiment during the last war. I know he is a good officer, as good an officer as ever stood in shoe leather. He happens to be a first cousin of my colleague, the

junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. It so happens that I know General Truman's military record, at least as well and probably better than does his cousin, the Senator from Missouri, because while all three of us served in the same division in the last war, Senator TRUMAN was in the artillery, and General Truman and I served in the same infantry division. I wish to take time simply to tell the Senate something about General Truman's record.

A great deal was said about the fact that General Lear started in as an enlisted man back in 1898, and is today a general officer, having come up through all the grades in the Army. So did General Truman. Both entered the Army in May 1898. Lear was an enlisted man in a Colorado volunteer outfit. Truman enlisted in the Regular Army in 1898. Truman served at Santiago, Cuba, as a private in F Company of the Twentieth United States Infantry from May 21, 1898, to May 20, 1901. He fought at San Juan Hill. He was in the trenches before Santiago until Santiago surrendered. From February 23, 1899, to May 20, 1901, he was in Luzon. He served in the Philippine Islands as a corporal of the same company in the campaign of the Philippine Insurrection.

The dates I shall now give overlap, but they cover the complete period of his enlistment:

Cuba campaign before Santiago, June and July 1898.

Battle at San Juan Hill, July 1898.

Served in the trenches until the Spanish surrender, 1898.

Philippine Islands, served in the trenches, battle of La Loma Church, February 1899.

The battle at San Pedro McCapi, March 12 and 13, 1899.

Battle of Guadalupe, March 13 and 14, 1899.

Battle of Pasig City, March 15, 1899.

Patrol of northern Luzon, February to May 1900.

In the Philippines General Truman was wounded in action. He made an excellent and commendable record.

General Lear served in the Philippines either as a volunteer or as a Regular during very much the same period. Unlike General Lear—and I am not criticizing General Lear for it, because a man in the Army goes and serves where he is told to go—but unlike General Lear, General Truman was a distinguished combat officer in the First World War. General Lear has been so situated, through his orders, that he has not heard a gun go off in anger for 40 years. General Truman was an excellent combat officer in the One Hundred and Fortieth Infantry of the Thirty-fifth Division during the last war, entering as a second lieutenant and coming out a major. He rendered excellent service on the Mexican border. He has risen through all the ranks from lieutenant to major general, including chief of staff of the Thirty-fifth Division. He is a graduate of many Army schools. His efficiency, his integrity, his loyalty, and his ability have never been questioned. As commanding general of the



Thirty-fifth Division Truman was early slated to be "rolled." While all the National Guard officers were slated for it, Truman was early slated to be "rolled" because there was a general feeling in the Regular Army that General Truman played too rough and he did not cooperate in maneuvers as much as he might have been expected to do, and that, Mr. President, came about in this way:

The Thirty-fifth Division was ordered to Minnesota on maneuvers at that time, before we got into the war. The division was to take part in certain maneuvers which the War Department had planned to prove the tremendous efficiency of the armored forces, to show how easily they could roll up and cut in two an ordinary infantry division. In such maneuvers the commanders of the opposing forces will receive at about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning information which is assumed to be equivalent to what would come in through organization commanders in the field, and then the commanders must make their own dispositions and take care to protect themselves or carry out their missions in this assumed warfare.

Being in Minnesota and being deployed, Truman received information as to the enemy at about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. He immediately recognized from the information which was furnished him from the umpires and the corps headquarters that his division was about to be rolled up by the armored forces and cut to pieces. So instead of tamely sitting by and permitting this demonstration to take place at the expense of his division, and thinking that they were simulating war conditions, he did what any sensible, energetic, aggressive, confident division commander would do. Seeing what was about to happen to him, he aroused his men in the middle of the night, left a rear guard to maintain the appearance of still being in camp, to lull his opposing forces into a trap, and fell back 4 or 5 miles, where he placed his troops in an impregnable position, with one flank resting on a deep lake and the other flank resting on an impenetrable swamp, so that the next morning, when the two armored forces came in to roll up Truman's division and cut it in two, they met head-on in front of Truman's division, and were theoretically annihilated.

The War Department did not like that. They did not like to think that Truman would do such a thing as he would naturally do if he were in actual combat. From that time on everyone knew that Truman's number was up, and no one was surprised when he was relieved of his command in the fall of 1941.

Mr. President, I am not blaming General Lear for that. That happened before Truman fell under Lear's command. Everyone who followed the situation knew that Truman would undoubtedly be relieved as soon as those in authority could get a chance to relieve him, in spite of the fact that he had, according to the Army's own report, one of the

finest and most efficient divisions in the Army.

What I complain about is the way Lear proceeded in the relieving of General Truman. Truman came back from the Army maneuvers to which I have just been referring, and proceeded to Camp Robinson, Little Rock, which was the headquarters of his division, and was about to proceed on his way to Jefferson City, Mo., where he was scheduled to appear on October 6, by permission and under orders from the commanding general of the Second Army and from the commanding general of the Air Corps, to make an appearance and an address at a large patriotic gathering at the capital of Missouri.

I may say that I am familiar with these facts, not because my colleague has called them to my attention and not because General Truman has asked me to take any action about the matter, but the case was called to my attention originally by General Lear himself at the time of General Truman's resignation, and I investigated it and obtained these facts and am speaking from my own original memorandum.

When Truman arrived in Little Rock he discovered that a message had just been sent over the telephone to the officer who happened to be in charge of division headquarters, a lieutenant colonel. It was simply a telephone message notifying Truman that he had been relieved as division commander. There was not the ordinary courteous procedure of Army routine of sending General Truman an order relieving him. There was not even the courtesy of calling General Truman himself on the telephone. It was simply a message delivered to a lieutenant colonel notifying Truman that he had been relieved and ordering him to proceed to Memphis on the next day to become head of a reclassification board of the Second Army.

General Truman communicated with Army headquarters, called their attention to the engagement he had made by authority and instructions of the commanding general of the Second Army and of the Seventh Corps to appear at Jefferson City on the 6th, and further called attention to the fact that for the 10th of October a large celebration had been arranged by the city of Little Rock, in the State of Arkansas, to celebrate the homecoming of the Thirty-fifth Division to its home camp. He asked that he be permitted to remain in command of the division—he had had a great deal to do with the arrangements for the celebration—until the 10th, to attend the celebration in honor of the division, of which he had been the only commander during his tour of Federal service, and that he might have the privilege of receiving the customary final review given to an outgoing division commander. That request was refused, and he was ordered to report to Memphis on the 9th of October, the day before the review was to take place. He did so. He then asked if he could be permitted—mind you, he was a major general in the Army of the United States—to take his aide with him to

Memphis. He was told that he did not need an aide, and not to bring one.

When he appeared in Memphis on the 9th of October, he discovered that General Lear was out of town. He was told that General Lear had sent two representatives from his own headquarters to attend the celebration, the homecoming and review of the Thirty-fifth Division, in Little Rock, the celebration which General Lear had refused to permit General Truman to attend.

On the 10th of October, General Truman reported to headquarters and asked as to the duties of the reclassification committee of which he had been appointed the head, by orders; and he asked who the other members of the committee were. He was informed that the other members of the committee were holding a session at Little Rock, the headquarters of the Thirty-fifth Division, but that they did not desire him, as the head of the reclassification committee, to proceed to Little Rock or to attend the hearings of the committee of which he was supposed to be the head.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to inquire who issued the order relieving General Truman of his command.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. General Lear.

Then, Mr. President, having been baited and insulted—and, mind you, that was some time before Pearl Harbor—and it being perfectly evident that not only was he relieved of his command of the Thirty-fifth Division, but it was not the intention of General Lear to permit him to render any further service, and it was the intention of General Lear to humiliate him and bait him, General Truman resigned.

Mr. President, I do not ask the Senate to take my word or the word of my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], General Truman's cousin, as to the efficiency of General Truman. I call as a witness as to the efficiency and satisfactory record of General Truman, Major General Ben Lear, the commander of the Second Army. After General Lear had finally baited General Truman into resigning, General Lear voluntarily sent me the following telegram—and the first time I knew that General Truman had resigned was when I received it—and also sent a similar telegram to my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri, General Truman's cousin. In the telegram General Lear said:

Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman has just tendered his resignation to be effective after leave of absence beginning October 29. General Truman has done splendid and outstanding service with his Thirty-fifth Division and his departure will be regretted by Second Army Headquarters.

That statement was made in the face of the record I have just recited. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram and my response thereto may be printed in the Record at this point.

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

MEMPHIS, TENN., October 11, 1941.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK:

Maj. Gen. Ralph T. Truman has just tendered his resignation, to be effective after leave of absence beginning October 29. General Truman has done splendid and outstanding service with his Thirty-fifth Division and his departure will be regretted by Second Army Headquarters.

LEAR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 11, 1943.

Lt. Gen. BEN LEAR,

Headquarters, Second Army,

United States Army, Memphis, Tenn.

I am in receipt of your telegram. I am not in the least surprised that Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman has done splendid and outstanding service with his Thirty-fifth Division. Well acquainted with General Truman as I served in the same outfit with him overseas during the World War. If his services were as satisfactory as you indicate why did you personally relieve him of command. It is of course the old Army game which does not intend to leave a National Guard officer, no matter how efficient, in command of National Guard division. You are trying to blame the tactical defeat which your army suffered on Truman and various other National Guard officers which is exceedingly unfair. You should retire yourself rather than make General Truman the goat.

CLARK.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as I say, I do not blame General Lear, and cannot hold him responsible for the general policy of breaking up the National Guard and relieving the senior officers of the National Guard. I spoke of only one illustration of the application of that policy. I could speak for a long time with respect to other instances of a similar character. I do say that a man who has done such arbitrary and unfair things does not deserve to have his nomination to a higher rank confirmed. While I do not desire to delay the Senate in the matter, I do desire to make my opposition a matter of record.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator does not blame General Lear for the order relieving General Truman of his command, who would be responsible for it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say I do not blame General Lear. I cannot hold General Lear personally responsible for a policy of relieving National Guard division commanders—a policy which extended throughout the Army. I do blame General Lear very severely for the manner in which he executed that policy and for the manner in which he baited General Truman into resigning. The blame for the general policy is hard to lay at anyone's feet; but General Lear was responsible for the arbitrary and unfair way in which the policy was carried out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator say who is responsible for the general policy?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I take it that the General Staff of the Army is responsible for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Missouri if he has the military record of General Lear before him, and if he will lend it to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I have it before me, and I am glad to lend it to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in rising at this time I feel that I should say a few words—a very few words—about this nomination. First let me say that I owe the Senate an apology. I had heard that the nomination was before the Senate, but I did not know when it was coming up; and I was surprised, when I walked into the Senate Chamber a few minutes ago, to hear the distinguished Senator from Missouri talking about it, because I did not know it was on the calendar for consideration at this time.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest notion where General Lear came from. If any other Senator knows, I wish he would tell me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to tell the Senator. General Lear was born in Canada, came to the United States as a youth, and enlisted in the Colorado volunteers in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. As I said, Mr. President, I had not the slightest idea where General Lear came from. He has never mentioned the matter to me directly or indirectly, either by letter or through friends or in any other way, so far as I know. My only reason for rising a while ago and for rising now is to say that in my very brief associations from time to time with General Lear I formed a very high opinion of him as a man and as an officer. He certainly looked the part; and his dignity and his good sense, apparently, and his fairness and his judgment seemed to betoken the kind of man whom we would expect to find at the head of an army, known as the Second Army, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

I was greatly impressed with his ability, carefulness, good intentions, and practices. I saw nothing about him that was unbecoming. I had a number of conversations with him, which were purely personal in nature, and not official in any way. I do not know that I ever made a request of him of any kind, and I am sure he never made a request of me of any kind, nature, or description.

So far as his relation with General Truman is concerned, I have nothing in the world but the highest confidence, esteem, and admiration for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Truman] and I have no doubt that General Truman, his cousin, a member of the same family, is of the same high character that we all know Senator Truman to be.

As to what the differences were between General Lear and General Truman I could not say. Men high up in the Army have differences of one kind or another. If they did have such differences, I do not know that that would be a reason

for voting against the confirmation of the nomination of this distinguished soldier of the American Army. So far as I am concerned, from what I know of him, and my observation of his work as head of the Second Army in Memphis, Tenn., and his conduct in every particular while he was there, I feel that his nomination should be confirmed, and I hope the Senate will confirm it.

The Senator from Missouri has very kindly given me General Lear's military record. I should like to read portions of it in the very short time I shall be on my feet.

Ben Lear was born at Hamilton, Canada, on May 12, 1879. He enlisted in the First Colorado Infantry Volunteers and served as sergeant in Company C from May 1, 1898, to March 30, 1899, during the Spanish-American War.

Certainly that shows a fine spirit. He had made this country his home. He was born in Canada. Soon after he came here he enlisted in the Army of the United States and was a sergeant in Company C of the First Colorado Infantry Volunteers during the Spanish-American War.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant, First Colorado Infantry Volunteers, on April 1, 1899.

He earned a place in the commissioned ranks after having served as a noncommissioned officer.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant, First Colorado Infantry Volunteers, on April 1, 1899, and first lieutenant on July 5, 1899. During his service in the Volunteer Infantry he served in the Philippine Islands, where he participated in the following engagements during the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection: Capture of Manila on August 13, 1898; at Mariquina on March 31, 1899; at Guadalupe Hill on June 7, 1899; at Bacolor and San Antonio on August 9, 1899; at Porac on September 23, October 17, and November 2, 1899; at Floridablanca on October 9, 1899; at Mabalacot on November 8, 1899; and at Banban on November 11, 1899. He was mustered out of the service on June 11, 1901, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of Cavalry in the Regular Army on February 2, 1901.

Surely, if that is not an honorable record in the Spanish-American War, I have never read one.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will not understand that I said there was anything dishonorable about General Lear's service in the Philippines or anywhere else. I think I pointed out that General Truman had a parallel record during the Spanish-American War, except that General Truman served in Cuba and was at the Battle of San Juan Hill, while General Lear was not. Of course, a soldier goes where he is ordered to go. I certainly did not reflect on General Lear's record in the Philippines or anywhere else. What I objected to was his arbitrary action as commanding general of the Second Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct; he has not criticized General Lear's record. This is the first time I have ever



seen it. It is a splendid record of a young soldier and officer in the Spanish-American War.

Reading further from General Lear's military record:

#### PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant on December 9, 1901; to captain on August 10, 1912; to major (temporary) on August 5, 1917; to lieutenant colonel (temporary) on January 26, 1918; and to colonel (temporary) on August 31, 1918. He reverted to his permanent rank of captain on September 25, 1919; and was promoted to lieutenant colonel on July 1, 1920; to colonel on September 19, 1929; to brigadier general on May 1, 1936; to major general on October 1, 1938; to lieutenant general on October 1, 1940.

#### SERVICE

His first service in the Regular Army was in the Philippine Islands where he served with the Fifteenth Cavalry at Davao until April 17, 1903 participating in the engagement at Bacalod, Mindanao, on April 8, 1903. He returned to the United States on May 20, 1903, and was stationed at Fort Mason, Calif., where he served in various capacities until November 20, 1903, when he rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry which was stationed at San Francisco, Calif. He accompanied his regiment to Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., in December 1903, remaining at that post until July 12, 1906, when, together with his regiment, he was transferred to the camp of instruction at Mount Gretna, Pa., where he served until September 27, 1906.

He sailed for Cuba in October 1906, and upon his arrival there was stationed at Santa Clara to November 8, 1906; and at Cienfuegos, to July 21, 1908. He returned to the United States and competed in the rifle and pistol competition at Fort Sheridan, Ill., from August 4 to 13, 1908. He returned to Habana, Cuba, on September 5, 1908, and rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Cienfuegos, where he served until February 5, 1909. He returned to the United States with his regiment, and was stationed at Fort Myer, Va., to June 4, 1909, when he was transferred to Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., in connection with the selection of the Army Cavalry team in the national matches, where he remained until July 17, 1909. He then competed in the Atlantic rifle competition at Fort Niagara, N. Y., until July 26, 1909, and served at Boston, Mass., in connection with the field exercises of the National Guard from August 11 to 22, 1909. He rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Fort Myer on August 23, 1909, where he was stationed until June 3, 1910. He served with the Cavalry rifle team at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.; Camp Perry, Ohio; and Sea Girt, N. J., to September 7, 1910.

After attending the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., until June 30, 1911, he was in charge of Training School for Farriers and Horseshoers there to June 7, 1912. He participated in the Olympic games at Stockholm, Sweden, from June to July 21, 1912. Upon his return to the United States he attended the second-year class at the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., to December 15, 1912. He served at Fort Sheridan, Ill., with the Fifteenth Cavalry to November 10, 1913, part of which time he was with Troop I, Fifteenth Cavalry, at Camp of Instruction, Winchester, Pa. He was stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., to December 11, 1913; at Presidio, Tex., on border patrol duty to August 5, 1914; at Fort Bliss, Tex., to January 3, 1915; and at Fort Hancock, Tex., to June 15, 1915.

He rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Fort Bliss, Tex., serving at that post until August 3, 1915, when he was placed on detached service for duty with the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco, Calif., where he remained until October 22, 1915. He was then transferred to the Eighth Cavalry and

stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., to January 15, 1916. He accompanied his regiment to Fort Hancock, Tex., remaining there until March 13, 1916, when he was ordered to Ysleta, Tex., in connection with purchasing horses for the cavalry and artillery. Upon completion of this duty on April 22, 1916, he attended the Army Service School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to October 4, 1917, and then served with the War Department General Staff at Washington, D. C., to September 6, 1918.

He was instructor, Cavalry Training Camp, Camp Stanley, Tex., to December 12, 1918, and inspector-instructor, Texas National Guard, Austin, Tex., to January 15, 1919. He was acting commandant, Mounted Service School, Fort Riley, Kans., to July 7, 1919, and Director, Department of Horsemanship, at the Cavalry School there until August 19, 1921. He then attended the School of the Line at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and after graduation, on June 20, 1922, served at Camp Lewis, Wash., until July 25, 1922. He returned to Fort Leavenworth, and attended the General Staff School from which he was graduated on June 17, 1923. He served at Camp Knox, Ky., to July 24, 1923, and as instructor, the General Service Schools, until June 29, 1925. He attended the Army War College in Washington, D. C., until June 30, 1926, and after graduation assumed command of the First Squadron, Fourteenth Cavalry, at Fort Sheridan, Ill., where he remained until October 17, 1927.

He was Chief, Inspections Division, in the Inspector General's Office at Washington, D. C., until November 10, 1930. He then commanded the Presidio of Monterey, Calif., to June 30, 1933, and was inspector, headquarters, Ninth Corps Area, at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., to November 3, 1934. On November 4, 1934, he became chief of staff, headquarters, Ninth Corps Area, in which capacity he served until June 24, 1936. On July 2, 1936, he assumed command of the First Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. He sailed on November 29, 1938, for the Panama Canal Zone, where he assumed command of the Pacific sector at Balboa.

On October 1, 1940, he was assigned to command the Second Army. In April 1943 he was ordered to Washington, D. C., to take temporary command of the Army Ground Forces.

#### DECORATIONS

He has been awarded the Silver Star, and Swedish Medal commemorating the V Olympiad at Stockholm which was conferred on him by the King of Sweden.

In April 1943 he received the Distinguished Service Medal, with the following citation:

"Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, United States Army. For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility as commanding general, Second Army, from October 1, 1940, to April 1, 1943. To his excellent judgment, forceful leadership, untiring efforts, and high professional attainments are largely due the success and efficiency of the Second Army." (War Department, May 5, 1943.)

Mr. President, I did not know of that remarkable record of this distinguished soldier who came up through the ranks and reached a position next to the highest in the Army of the United States. A short time ago he attained the age of retirement, and by confirmation of this nomination he would remain on active duty as a lieutenant general. It seems to me that under the circumstances, the incident to which reference has been made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri is not sufficient, whatever people may think of the facts, to warrant rejection of the nomination of General Lear on that account alone.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has stated that the record of General Lear is a remarkable record. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the most remarkable part of it is that a man is able to serve 42 years without hearing a shot fired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; he took a very active part in the Spanish-American War in 1898.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is not denied. I was merely calling attention to the fact that there was a period of 41 years during which this remarkable record was being compiled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, and a great many persons work 42 years without so much success. I think I, myself, am one of those who have worked for about that length of time without achieving anything like the success which has attended this distinguished Army officer.

Mr. President, I again apologize to the Senate for taking time to read the record of General Lear, as well as taking the time of the Senate in expressing my own views. I have done so only out of a sense of duty to a man whose residence I did not know, whose birthplace I did not know, whose State I did not know, and whose record, which I have just received, I did not know. I believe the incident of which so much was made at the time by the newspapers of the entire country—an incident which would naturally bring about publicity—was not sufficient to justify us in rejecting the nomination of this distinguished officer of the United States Army to be a lieutenant general. I shall vote for confirmation, and I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not acquainted with the several incidents to which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has referred, and so I shall not discuss them. But what is involved here today is the question of whether or not we shall confirm the nomination of General Lear, and I believe to that subject I can make one or two contributions which, indeed, I feel I should make.

I participated in the Louisiana maneuvers in 1941, as well as the maneuvers which were held during the same year in North and South Carolina, in which maneuvers, indeed, most of the American troops who have since distinguished themselves in north Africa received their field training. So in that sense I was one of the many who served under General Lear. I had only a glimpse of him once or twice from a distance, and I do not wish to give the impression that I was in any way in Army headquarters, because I was not. But I was in an ideal position, as were thousands of others, to tell whether or not the exercises were well conducted, and to know whether or not the officers and the enlisted men derived benefit from them.

I think there is no question that those maneuvers were well conducted. That does not mean that many mistakes were not made, for a great many mistakes

were made. One of the objects of the maneuvers was to develop mistakes and correct them in Louisiana or the Carolinas instead of having them develop in Africa.

When General Lear was opposing General Krueger in those maneuvers, first one side made mistakes, then the other side made mistakes. As I have said, to correct mistakes is what we have maneuvers for. Parachutists would drop in and threaten one general's command post, and tanks would come around and threaten the command post of another general. There were numerous incidents of that kind. But the fact of the matter is that everyone who took part in those maneuvers came out of them a much better soldier than when he went in. He learned by the mistakes which he made. He learned by the mistakes which he saw others make. There is no doubt that those maneuvers were a tremendous asset to the country, and that General Lear deserves recognition for the part which he had in making them successful. He had an important part in them. He had very broad supervision over the exercises, and to my mind he showed qualities of energy, organization, thoroughness, and drive, all of which are vital in a job of that kind. It is an administrative job. It is an instructing job. It is not, of course, a combat job.

The fact, as my good friend, the Senator from Missouri has alleged, that General Lear has not been under fire for a good many years does not in the least disqualify him for a big training job of this kind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course I stated that I did not in any way criticize General Lear for the fact he has not been engaged in any wars in which the United States has been engaged since about 1900, because any soldier goes wherever he is ordered to go. It is no reflection on any officer in the Army that his service has not been utilized in field combat, and I did not wish to be so understood.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a very fair statement of the Senator, and I am glad he has made it.

The manner in which the present maneuvers are conducted is that the knowledge and experience gained on the battlefields where the war is now being fought are brought back to the troops on maneuvers by means of observers and often by general officers who have returned to this country for that purpose. Throughout all these units that are now having maneuvers there will be found sprinkled officers and enlisted men who have had combat service overseas and who come back and give the other men that actuality of war which is so essential.

General Lear's role in that scheme has been the broad supervisory, administrative, instructional role. As one who had first-hand participation in the maneuvers which he conducted, I felt it incumbent upon me to say to the Senate that I think he did an extremely efficient job, and, on the basis of my own personal experience, it is my belief that his nomination should be confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States comes to the Senate with the approval of the Committee on Military Affairs. I desire to make a brief statement of General Lear's qualifications and the esteem in which the Army holds him because of his services. Then, I desire briefly to answer the two cases to which my friend from Missouri has referred, and then to permit a vote, if there is no objection.

General Lear has had a long and illustrious career, first entering the Federal military service as an enlisted man with the Colorado Infantry in 1898. Since that time, 45 years ago, he has risen from the ranks to one of the highest positions in our Army by virtue of outstanding ability and leadership. Throughout the years he has been given ever-increasing responsibilities, and has discharged these responsibilities in a most superior manner.

General Lear served with the Colorado Infantry during the Spanish-American War, and in the Philippine Islands during the period of their pacification. He has been stationed in Cuba, Hawaii, and on the Mexican border. During the last war he served with distinction on the War Department General Staff. He is a graduate of the Cavalry School, Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College, and has been instructor at two of these schools. From 1936 to 1938 he commanded the First Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, Tex., and later the Pacific sector in the Panama Canal Department. For the past few years, he has been the commanding general of the Second Army, training numerous divisions for overseas duties. In each succeeding assignment he has produced results, and the effect of his guiding hand in the training of our Army is being, and will continue to be, felt on the battlefields of the world. General Lear has always been known as a strict, but wholly just and fair, disciplinarian, and his success in training our citizen Army is partially due to this worthy characteristic.

Of the two incidents mentioned by my friend from Missouri, I shall first advert to the relief from active duty of Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman in January 1942. On October 10, 1941, General Truman voluntarily tendered his resignation from his commission directly to the Secretary of War, effective December 1, 1941; later requesting that the effective date be changed to January 15, 1942. The resignation was accepted by the Secretary of War, and General Truman was ordered to his home on terminal leave of absence and to await separation from active service, as he had requested.

Immediately upon the outbreak of war, however—it will be recalled that the resignation was tendered prior to the outbreak of the war—General Truman, prompted by patriotic motives, requested withdrawal of his resignation and immediate reassignment to duty. Withdrawal of his resignation was approved, but as there was no appropriate vacancy to which General Truman could be assigned, he reverted to an inactive status

as a major general, National Guard of the United States, on January 15, 1942, the date his resignation was to become effective.

Acceptance of General Truman's resignation, approval of its later withdrawal, his relief from active service and non-assignment to active duty, were all acts of the War Department, with which General Lear had no connection.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's statement, I understand, is from a memorandum furnished by some fellow in the War Department which is more or less anonymous.

Mr. CHANDLER. It was furnished by the War Department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Furnished by some one in the War Department, and sent to the Senator. It is not official, I take it, and is not signed by anybody in the Department who is responsible for it. It is substantially in line with the facts which I stated, except that, of course, it does not include the fact that, after the orders relieving General Truman were issued, more or less informally by General Lear that Lear deliberately tried to bait, insult, and humiliate Truman until he brought about his resignation. It is also true, is it not, that the request for a change in the effective date of the resignation was made by Truman at General Marshall's own request? I have a copy of General Marshall's letter if it is material.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no information about any conduct of General Lear.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I stated the facts with some detail—I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber—and I do not think that General Lear or anybody else will deny them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I heard the Senator's statement, and, of course, I would not be a party to approving any conduct on the part of one officer toward another which was not gentlemanly and in good faith. I do not approve such conduct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is familiar with the fact, is he not, that under the ordinary practice and military courtesy when an officer is relieved of the command of his regiment he is permitted to turn the command over to his successor, and to be able to transmit to him any information he may have? In this particular case Truman, as I say, was relieved by telephonic communication to a junior officer and was not permitted to turn the command of the division over to his successor. He was instructed to leave the camp immediately and turn over the command of his division to a junior brigadier, who, later, turned it over to his successor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope my friend from Missouri understands that I do not approve of any discourtesy upon the part of one officer toward another.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure that what the Senator says as to his own attitude is correct. I merely desire to call attention to the fact that the author



of this anonymous communication is hardly stating the facts accurately when he undertakes to make it appear that Truman voluntarily resigned. Truman did resign voluntarily, of course, when it was made apparent to him by the conduct of General Lear and Lear's headquarters that he was to be insulted and humiliated and not permitted to perform the duties to which he had been assigned.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in what the Senator from Missouri repeatedly stated as to an anonymous communication. I thought the Senator from Kentucky was giving us his own views and thoughts and information.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am giving the facts as I understand them to be from the War Department in a communication which I have from the War Department, and which is presumed by me to be accurate because the statement was taken from the records of the War Department.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Kentucky has no personal information?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no personal knowledge or information. I asked for the facts, and the statement purports to be a statement of the facts. Personally I do not know the circumstances which brought about General Truman's resignation.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Kentucky will excuse me for saying so, anything the Senator might state on his own initiative as his own statement, I would accept—

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HATCH. But I do not accept what the Senator passes on second-hand.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, I would not know the circumstances under which General Truman wanted to submit his resignation, and I would not know whether General Lear had brought it about. I was not a member of the Army in that sector at that time, and the event did not pass under my observation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. Wait a moment. My friend from Missouri has indicated that General Truman did voluntarily tender his resignation because somebody wanted it brought about and he was going to be squeezed out. I do not know about that. The record shows that he voluntarily tendered his resignation from his commission directly to the Secretary of War, effective December 1, 1941. That was before the war, and he later requested that the effective date be changed to January 15, 1942. On December 8, 1941, we became involved in the war, and meanwhile he got patriotic again. He was prompted by patriotic motives, and I have no disposition to deny that perhaps he did not know we were going into the war, and he decided, for some reason not known to me, voluntarily to tender his resignation, which he did, and he asked for it to be made effective on a certain date, and

the Department agreed to do it, and then, when the war came, he said, "I want to be back in." I do not know why.

Mr. HATCH. It is very laudable, when war comes, for a man to want to get back in.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; he was prompted by patriotic motives, just as every other Missourian is. My father came from Missouri, and all Missourians have patriotic motives. I would be the last man to infer that a Missourian had any other than a patriotic motive.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator think that for a man who has put in over 40 years' service in the Army, who started as an enlisted man, and served with great gallantry in Cuba and the Philippines, in the Mexican border service, and in France, it is the most natural thing in the world, when his country becomes engaged in war, to want to get back on the active list? But that does not indicate he was not forced out of the service before the war by the harsh and arbitrary conduct of General Lear, which I stated to be the fact.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator does that, and it is all right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly know more about it than does the Senator from Kentucky, although I was not personally present at the interview between General Lear and General Truman.

Mr. CHANDLER. I take it that the Senator knows to be correct what he has stated, but I say that the War Department states that the acceptance of General Truman's resignation, approval of its later withdrawal, his release from the active service, and nonassignment to active duty, were all acts of the War Department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I stated that.

Mr. CHANDLER. With which General Lear had no connection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I stated that in my original remarks, and I said I did not hold General Lear responsible for relieving General Truman, or the other National Guard division commanders who were relieved. What I do hold him responsible for is his insulting and harsh treatment to force their resignations after they had been relieved of command.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course I do not approve on the part of any officer any conduct that is harsh; I do not approve any discourtesy or any attempt to "roll" a man out without any cause at all, but as I understand, what I have just stated is a statement of the facts.

Now let us get to the Memphis Country Club "yo-ho" incident.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that same point?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In view of the statement the Senator has made as to the request submitted by General Truman to change the date of his resignation, let me say that was done at the

suggestion of General Marshall himself. General Marshall wrote a letter on October 11, 1941, to General Truman, as follows:

DEAR GENERAL TRUMAN: I have just seen your telegram of October 10 to the Secretary of War tendering your resignation effective December 1, and requesting "my 32 days of leave of absence due me" beginning on October 29.

I am sending you this note by air mail to find out if you might possibly prefer to be either given immediate orders to your home on detached service without specific duties, or possibly have you change the date of your resignation from December 1 to say January 15, and your being ordered on detached service now, or October 29, to your home or other point that you might prefer.

As to the date of the resignation, the suggestion came from the War Department, through General Marshall himself.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I now come to the Memphis Country Club "yo-ho" incident. The detachment of troops involved in this incident consisted of a provisional battalion of the One Hundred and Tenth Quartermaster Regiment, a detachment of the One Hundred and Tenth Medical Regiment, and the Thirty-fifth Military Police Company. These troops were proceeding from a maneuver area in the vicinity of Manchester, Tenn., to their home station at Camp Robinson, Ark., by motor convoy. General Lear noted that as the convoy passed the Memphis Country Club the soldiers in practically every truck were waving and shouting at people on the streets and golf course. The remarks made by the soldiers were seriously objectionable, and give evidence of a deplorable lack of discipline, in marked contrast to that of a majority of the troops of the Second Army.

Prior to this time other similar incidents had been brought to General Lear's attention, and he had found it necessary in one case to reprimand a regiment for shouting vulgar remarks at people in Manchester as it passed through that town. Therefore, when this incident at Memphis occurred within his sight and hearing, it was incumbent upon him to take immediate action to curb any tendency toward rowdiness or lack of discipline.

General Lear had the convoy intercepted, and the officers and noncommissioned officers assembled at his headquarters. That is not quite the understanding of my friend the Senator from Missouri, I think, but I am informed General Lear had the officers and noncommissioned officers assembled at his headquarters. He spoke to them concerning the necessity of each one doing his part to maintain discipline, and informed them that the conduct of their soldiers, which he had just witnessed, was a reflection on their company, their regiment, and division. I wish to emphasize that; they did not return immediately, as I think has been believed by some. The convoy remained at Memphis that night, and was directed to proceed to Camp Robinson the following morning; the officers and men to march a total of 15 miles the following day, using the shuttle method; that is,

alternately riding in a truck and marching on foot.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to a dispatch from Memphis written by Clark Porteus, and published in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, May 15, 1943. It is an eye-witness account of this "yo-ho" incident. It says:

No one here—

That is, in Memphis—

No one here holds the "yo-ho" incident against General Lear.

It was peacetime—July 1941—when the incident occurred. General Lear, in civilian clothes—not in shorts, as Senator CLARK said—was golfing at the Memphis Country Club.

Three hundred and fifty soldiers of the Thirty-fifth Division were returning from maneuvers in middle Tennessee, riding trucks. The convoy passed the golf links, and what General Lear saw caused him to make the 350 men return to Memphis later from Camp Robinson, Ark., and march 15 miles in temperatures that topped 100.

As I recall, the country club is just on the outskirts, and the general made the soldiers go back into town.

However, the men marched no more than 5 miles without riding a while.

Much ado was made of the matter then. Now that the war has come, however, citizens here understand why the general would not let unsoldierly conduct pass unnoticed.

But another reason citizens here support General Lear is the evidence, brought out by a businessman 11 days after the incident, that the soldiers indulged in more than mere "yo-hoing" at pretty girls. There was some lewdness and "obscene gesturing" on the part of the soldiers, said Raynor Allen, the Memphis businessman. This story, perhaps, was seen by fewer people than read the original story.

Mr. Allen, who served 2 years with the Three Hundred and Eighth Combat Engineers in the First World War, had this to say after the "yo-ho" incident had brought criticism of General Lear:

"I did not see the exact circumstances which aroused the general's ire, but I know him, and I know he is the type of officer who will stand for a reasonable amount of tomfoolery.

"I had been following the convoy in my car, and quite a few of the men on the trucks ahead of me were acting in a manner that passed the limits of even mildly good taste. I do not mean to say that they were all doing this—some were behaving in an entirely proper manner—but there was an appreciable group who had got into very high gear.

"The young ladies were not amused. I do not think their fathers, even if they had been ex-Army men, would have been pleased."

The soldiers who had to march did so in good spirits. I walked part of the way with them.

Many of the men who had to make the march expressed resentment at the criticism by Congressmen and others concerning their punishment promenade.

General Lear himself never discussed the incident publicly, though he did send a telegram to Representative KILPAT (Democrat, Texas), who had criticized him. The general explained in his wire that "loose conduct and rowdiness cannot be tolerated among the personnel of the Army. I am responsible also that members of the Second Army treat the civilian population with respect and consideration."

Mr. President, I submit that while mistakes may seem to have been made in

connection with these two incidents, I do not believe they should seriously affect this man's very fine record, which covers 45 years, from the position of an enlisted man in the National Guard of Colorado to the rank of lieutenant general in the United States Army, a record so fine that he has been recently called, because of the serious wound suffered by the chief of the ground forces, to one of the most important positions in the Army of the United States. General Lear is considered by the War Department to be an excellent soldier, and is highly recommended for the important position to which he was called. I hope the Senate will approve the recommendation of the Military Affairs Committee, and that the nomination of Gen. Ben Lear to be lieutenant general will be confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, since General Lear began his very remarkable military career in the State of Colorado, I think it is no more than proper for me to add something to the debate on his confirmation. General Lear came up the hard way. He went into the Army as an enlisted man, as has already been stated. He went through two wars. He went through all the different ranks in the Army from the very lowest. He came to Colorado when he was a young man, and at the age of 19 went into the National Guard, and then served in the War with Spain.

As I have said, he came up the hard way. He did not have the opportunity to go to West Point, as many other young men have. He had a fine military education, but he received it in the Army. The Army was his schoolmaster. The Army itself was his West Point. The fact that he is highly regarded and enjoys the esteem of all Army officers, so far as I know, from the top to the bottom, ought to prove his worthiness.

General Lear has many relatives in the State of Colorado. These relatives are my close personal friends, so I have a somewhat personal interest in this matter.

Mr. President, a day or two ago I received a telegram from Roane Waring, from New Orleans, which reads as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,  
May 16, 1943.

Hon. EDWARD C. JOHNSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that there is opposition to confirmation of General Lear. I deeply regret this. I have observed and admired the ability with which he has commanded the Second Army during the time that his headquarters were in Memphis—my home. I am very familiar with the yo-ho incident. I have talked to a number of gentlemen who were with General Lear when it occurred. I have not discussed it with him. I know that the action of these soldiers was far more serious and reprehensible than simply yo-hoing. The newspaper stories did General Lear a great injustice, but whether right or wrong in the severity of his punishment of them, this is no time when our Army needs discipline and strict discipline to question a disciplinary act of a superior officer except that it be done in proper channels. If these soldiers were unfairly treated, which I understand they have said they were not, then there is a proper method of redress. I regard this effort to now

punish General Lear as unfortunate, wrong, and a very serious blow to the proper administration and disciplining of an Army.

ROANE WARING,  
National Commander of  
the American Legion.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say that Colonel Waring, who sent the telegram the Senator just read, is a citizen of Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A member of the country club?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think he is, though I do not know. I never saw him at the country club in my life, though he may be a member. If he were, he certainly would be a very worthy member, because he is a grand man, he is a fine lawyer, and stands high in Memphis. He is acquainted with General Lear. Ever since the last war he has taken the greatest interest in all military and veterans' affairs, and the confidence the American Legion has in him is evidenced by the fact that he was elected its national commander.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. There is no doubt of Mr. Waring's deep interest in the enlisted men who served in the last war as well as those who serve in this. He is not only interested in this country winning the war, but because of his position at the head of the American Legion he takes a particularly great interest in the welfare of the men rather than in the high generals who command them.

I also have received a telegram from a very distinguished former Member of the United States Senate, who served in the Philippines with General Lear, former Senator Rice W. Means, who telegraphed to me in part:

The members of the Colorado Infantry who served in the Philippines loved him like a brother.

Meaning Gen. Ben Lear.

I have also received a telegram from Mr. James MacPherson, who is the manager of the largest radio station in the Rocky Mountain region, who telegraphed to me at some length in behalf of Gen. Ben Lear and urging that the Senate confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I have talked with a great many of the officials in the War Department with reference to Gen. Ben Lear and I find that without a single exception they regard him as a very great soldier.

When General McNair was wounded in Africa Senators will recall that the Chief of Staff selected General Lear to be commander of the Ground Forces here. Prior to that time General Lear had the responsibility of training hundreds of thousands of American soldiers who have afterward distinguished themselves on the battlefields in Tunisia and on other fronts.

Mr. President, there is no denial that General Lear is a strict disciplinarian. He knows that to be soft is not a kindness to the soldier.



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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly have not criticized anyone for having maintained strict discipline. I believe in strict discipline. I also believe, however, that the discipline should be fair, should be for the guilty and not for the innocent, and should be administered in accordance with the Articles of War and Army regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the Senator from Missouri on that point, but I do not concede that that is a point at issue in this debate at all.

I have before me a report giving the military history of General Lear, and I notice that his efficiency record is high. In 1926 it was given as excellent. In 1927 it was excellent, and in 1928 was excellent. These reports are made in each case, of course, by his superior officers. In 1929 his record was superior. In 1930 excellent. In 1931 excellent. In 1932 excellent. In 1933 excellent. In 1934 superior. In 1935 superior.

I note that from July 1, 1939, to January 7, 1940, he was rated superior by Maj. Gen. David L. Stone; that from January 8, to June 30, 1940, he was rated excellent by Maj. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis. From July 1, to September 19, 1940, he was rated superior by Lt. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis. In his service from March 20, to December 31, 1942, he was rated superior by Lt. Gen. L. J. McNair. In November 1938 Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees, commanding general, First Cavalry Division, said of General Lear:

A man of decisive views and action. Positive in his views, works hard for his command. Very active, and in excellent physical condition.

In January 1940 Maj. Gen. David L. Stone, in the Pacific sector department, said:

An able officer very active, and has fine judgment and initiative. A very valuable general officer. Absolutely loyal in all things.

Mr. President, we are in a very difficult war. As a matter of fact, we are in two very difficult wars simultaneously. We need all the military skill we can get. It is almost impossible to estimate the value of an able, experienced, tried, and proven general. We know how much we prize the capture of an enemy general. We know how the generals are guarded from capture because of their great value. Many a battle has been lost because of the lack of ability, and many a battle has been won because of the ability of a general who has been in the right place at the right time.

Mr. President, I should like to present my own summation of the facts upon which the Senate should consider the confirmation of General Lear's appointment. I have taken the trouble to study this matter in some detail and to inquire of many high-ranking officers their opinion of General Lear. I have made this investigation quite informally and purely in the interests of justice.

No military man I have questioned has indicated any but the highest regard for General Lear's military ability.

What other type of evidence should the Senate consider in passing upon an appointment of this character? I see no justification for seeking further than the military career of the man and the estimate in which he is held by those best able to appraise him.

During the past few years General Lear has been commanding general of the Second Army. In this important capacity he has been responsible for the training of literally hundreds of thousands of American soldiers, many of whom have already distinguished themselves on the plains and in the hills of Tunisia. This was an assignment of the greatest importance, not only to the men who came under General Lear's command for the combat seasoning they required, but to the parents of those men, who have the right to expect that their training will adequately prepare them for the shock of battle.

I have heard it said that General Lear is a strict disciplinarian. If that be true, I can only say, Thank God for men like General Lear in our training forces. Mr. President, we cannot be soft with the Army, for we are playing with men's lives. The officer who lets his men get away with things rather than having the forthright courage to call them to account is betraying his trust to those men and to the families from which they come.

The other day General McNair, whose place General Lear is now filling temporarily as commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, had something to say about training which bears directly upon the subject of discipline.

General McNair said:

In combat along the front lines, I feel that while our troops have been taught and taught and taught certain do's and don'ts, when they get into the excitement and strangeness of battle, especially in the early stages, they seem to forget. They don't do the things instinctively that they would be able to answer correctly in an examination or quiz. When they get on the battlefield they forget these things and do foolish things. In other words, sound practices in battle are not instinctive. They are not ground into them so that they will apply them without thinking.

Mr. President, I am not a soldier, but as a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I have constant opportunity to talk with Army officers, and I have learned from them that implicit discipline is the only basis upon which you can build a fighting Army. If men think they can get away with something, or if they think their officers will not insist on their carrying out promptly and with unquestioning obedience the orders that are issued, the men become lax and they do not develop alertness, which is of the most critical importance on the battlefield.

I know what General McNair was talking about. He meant that, rigorous as is the training which our troops receive—and most of the men he saw had been trained with General Lear's leadership—it must be still more rigorous before our men become instinctive soldiers.

I mention this in connection with General Lear because General Lear has been accused of being the kind of man who

exacts the highest degree of efficiency from his officers and men. If we are to consider General Lear's strictness as a reason for questioning his reappointment as a lieutenant general, we shall not only be doing a grave injustice to a great soldier, but we shall be serving notice on the military leaders of this country that we want our men coddled in their training. At a time when the entire emphasis of our maneuvers is directed toward a stricter and more rigorous program to make our men better soldiers and therefore better able to take care of themselves in battle, we shall be saying that the Senate disapproves of the very measures which would bring about this result.

I feel sure that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] does not desire to say that he favors an undisciplined army, and I feel sure that this body does not wish to go on record as concurring in any such shortsighted course.

We have recently had irrefutable evidence of the high regard in which our military leaders hold General Lear. We all know that General McNair was wounded in north Africa during the discharge of his duty while observing the course of the final decisive battle for Bizerte. During General McNair's convalescence from his wounds, Lt. Gen. Ben Lear was the choice of the Chief of Staff to carry on the important work of directing the Army Ground Forces. He holds that temporary appointment now. Until General McNair's return to duty General Lear will carry out the important duty of serving as commanding general of the Ground Forces.

I call this fact to the attention of the Senate because it is the most convincing argument which could be presented of General Lear's abilities. Mr. President, I have not always seen eye to eye with the programs of the War Department, and when I differed from the General Staff I have felt it my duty to express my opposition freely. But my study of military problems has given me constant opportunity to observe the strictness with which the Army scrutinizes the ability of any officer before he is assigned to an important duty.

Friendship and the easy-going preference which may be responsible for the advancement of men to posts of responsibility in civilian life have no place in the Army. High-ranking officers have been relieved of their commands, without respect to how many friends they may have had in high places, either in the Congress or in other influential quarters, because the Army felt they were unfit to remain in positions of responsibility. Men are advanced to high positions of trust in the Army, not because they are good comrades, but because their demonstrated capacity recommends them.

General Lear is a man in whom the Army has the most implicit confidence. What further test can this body make of his right to the high rank which the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has proposed for him? I have heard only the most frivolous reasons advanced for opposing the three stars

which he now wears on his shoulders and which he should be permitted to retain.

General Lear has been made to suffer because of an unimportant episode which would never have been given currency even in the press had it not caught the eye of some clever reporter who expanded it out of all proportion to its significance or merit, and it caught on and swept the country.

Mr. President, soldiers can be boisterous, and when this trait is kept within proper bounds it causes no criticism. But the police of our cities do not permit young men to stand on street corners and make objectionable remarks at women who are forced to pass by them on the streets. No officer of our Army should permit his men to engage in such conduct as that which called forth the reprimand and punishment meted out by General Lear. If this episode, forgotten overnight by the soldiers who were brought to a realization of their own responsibilities as members of our Army, were considered as the basis for refusing General Lear's appointment, then I say that this body would be derelict in its duty not only to the electorate but to the all-important fight for victory.

Mr. President, we are called upon to confirm the reappointment of an efficient, colorful, and illustrious soldier. For 45 years General Lear has been known to his associates as a soldier devoted to duty. He has held the highest military posts with honor; and now that the law forces his retirement from active command in the field, the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff wish to retain his services for the Nation in a rank commensurate with the importance of his new duties.

I feel that this body should overwhelmingly confirm his appointment. By so doing, we should not only be recognizing a great soldier. In these critical times the Nation cannot afford to be without the full and appropriate service of a man who has proved by his record his value to our military fortunes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I desire to concur heartily in everything my distinguished colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] has said about General Lear. In Colorado we regard the general as one of our citizens. I do not know him personally, but I do know men from Colorado who went to war with him in the Spanish-American War. Over all the long years which have elapsed since then they have retained their respect and admiration for him. I shall be honored to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Rosendahl to be rear admiral, for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems that in connection with the long list of nominations for appointments in the Army, two of the names have been incorrectly listed. Under the circumstances, I ask that the nomination of William David Lutz, to be second lieutenant, Air Corps, and the nomination of Thomas Matkins Johnston, to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, be re-committed to the Committee on Military Affairs, in order that the names may be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of William David Lutz, to be second lieutenant, Air Corps, and the nomination of Thomas Matkins Johnston, to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, are re-committed to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the remaining nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1943:

##### IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ben Lear to be a lieutenant general.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

Sumner Yale Andelman  
William Clark Doak

George Sharpe  
Gerhard Thurston Shearer

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 1, 1943

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS

John Calvin Bell, Jr.  
James Allen Betts  
Roland Alfred Brandt  
Robert Emmet Burrows, Jr.  
John Francis Buyers  
Ernest Arthur Buzalski  
David Smith Chamberlain  
Boyd Blaine Chambers, Jr.  
Joseph Vincent Chaufy  
Howard Beverly Coffman, Jr.  
David Baldwin Conard  
James Franklin Deatherage  
Francis John Dirkes  
Clyde Tener Earnest  
Thomas William Essen  
William Daniel Falck  
Clare Francis Farley  
Jesse LeRoy Fishback  
Hiram Garrett Fuller  
William Mitchell Glasgow, Jr.  
Walter James Hutchin  
Glenn Paul Ingwersen  
Walker Jamar, Jr.  
John Joseph Kelly, Jr.  
Lansford Franklin Kengle, Jr.  
Bruce Carlton Koch  
Edward Francis McCabe  
Robert Bruce McDowell  
William Hill McKenzie 8d  
Robert Edward Mathe  
Donald John Mehrrens  
Richard Hemmig Meyer  
John Woodland Morris  
Robert William Newman  
Harold Robert Parfitt  
Norman Erland Pehrson  
Milton Keith Pigg  
Samuel Williams Pinnell  
Fred Beaver Proctor  
Charles Sumner Reed, Jr.  
Richard Henry Reitmann  
Frank William Rhea  
Warren Rogers  
Henry Romanek  
William Fredrick Roos  
Kenneth Trevor Sawyer  
Gordon Albert Schraeder  
Frank Bertram Smith  
Richard Concklin Snyder  
Milton Ernst Steinbring  
Arthur Thurston Surkamp  
Lawrence Edwin Swank  
Duane Paul Tenney  
Lorres Charles Thomas  
Ronald Otis Whitaker  
Bernard Nathaniel Wiener  
Crawford Young

##### SIGNAL CORPS

Mike Bedwell Davis  
Harold Warren Gingrich  
Peter John Ryan  
John Patrick Schatz

##### CAVALRY

Clarke Tileston Baldwin, Jr.  
John Stanley Brady  
Robert Douglas Danforth  
Robert Daspit Dwan  
Herman Turner Hunt, Jr.  
Edwin Milton Rhoads  
Stanley Moreell Staszak  
Warren Leigh Taylor

##### FIELD ARTILLERY

George Louis Alexander  
Robert John Barickman  
Raymond Carlton Blatt, Jr.  
LeVerne Edwin Blount  
William Harold Brabson, Jr.  
James Alexander Brice  
Stephen Oliver Brown  
Edward Burr 2d  
Robert Hansen Campbell



Austin James Canning, Jr.  
 Hamlet Robinson Carter, Jr.  
 John Henry Cochran, Jr.  
 Reginald Bifield Cocroft, Jr.  
 William Worthington Cover  
 Charles Leonard Crane, Jr.  
 Fearn Field  
 Kenneth Edgar Freed  
 Stephen Ellison Gordy  
 Bobbie Allen Griffin  
 Leslie Boone Hardy  
 Ralph Julian Hill  
 Ernest Hinds  
 Ralph Kilbreth Jones  
 John Russell Lloyd, Jr.  
 James Norris Lothrop, Jr.  
 Jack Patrick Loughman  
 John Porter Lucas, Jr.  
 Wallace Clifton Magathan, Jr.  
 William Francis Malone  
 Walter George Mitchell, Jr.  
 John Willis Moses  
 Edward Stanley Ott, Jr.  
 Nicholson Parker  
 James Walter Phillips  
 Robert Ernest Plett  
 William Earnest Pulos  
 Robert Lee Rooker  
 Francis Wingate Saul  
 Henry John Schroeder, Jr.  
 Leon Sembach  
 Gordon Lord Smith  
 Donald Calhoun Spiece  
 George William Thompson, Jr.  
 Jonathan Sawyer Vordermark  
 Joseph William Weyrick  
 Richard Frank Wilhelm  
 LeRoy Waring Wilson, Jr.  
 Richard Marshall Winfield, Jr.  
 Jack Coleman Winn, Jr.  
 Lucius Featherstone Wright, Jr.  
 Ivan Willard York, Jr.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Charles Richard Abel  
 William Bruce Arnold  
 Charles Edward Benson  
 George Betts  
 Quellen Denis Boller  
 John Buchanan Bond  
 Joseph Francis Boyle  
 Frank Peter Breitenbach  
 John Metcalf Broderick  
 George Thomas Campbell, Jr.  
 Robert W. Clark  
 Edmond Harvey Curcuru  
 Paul Joseph Curtin  
 Lawton Davis  
 John Taylor deCamp, Jr.  
 Charles Wendell Dickinson  
 Bernard Joseph Dyla  
 Thomas McGahey Elgin  
 Albert Murray Ellis  
 Lawrence Michael Fitzpatrick  
 Louis Sterling Francisco  
 Robert Galbreath Gadd  
 Edward Joseph Geaney, Jr.  
 Stewart Shepherd Giffin, Jr.  
 Thorpe Coalson Grice  
 Joseph Wentworth Hartman  
 Leo Victor Hayes  
 Robert Milton Holmes  
 William Patrick Hunt, Jr.  
 Page Spencer Jackson  
 Donald Joseph Jalbert  
 Sidney Katz  
 Norman Jay Keefer, Jr.  
 James Francis Keenan  
 Edward Anthony Kreml  
 Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Jr.  
 James Douglas Langstaff, Jr.  
 William Clyde Linton, Jr.  
 Robert Hamilton Mattox, Jr.  
 Harry Mazur  
 Charles William Milmore  
 Jesse Herschell Nash  
 Harold Alexander Neill  
 Douglas Francis Parham  
 Laurent Dupre Pavy  
 Paul James Reinhalter  
 Ralph Joseph Renzulli

Walter Leo Roe  
 Hal Thomas Rose  
 Edward Rumpf, Jr.  
 Russell Faux Scott, Jr.  
 Edward Fondren Shafer, Jr.  
 Alton Martin Shipstead  
 Eduardo Miguel Soler  
 Basil Dennis Spalding, Jr.  
 Max Verne Talbot, Jr.  
 Jack Teague  
 William Holmes Tomlinson  
 Louis Blanton Umlauf, Jr.  
 Wendell Grant VanAuken, Jr.  
 James Kuykendall Wade  
 Charles Donovan Warburton  
 Howard Tilghman Wickert, Jr.  
 Reading Wilkinson, Jr.  
 Charles Allan Wilson, Jr.  
 Stanley Livingston Wilson, Jr.  
 Franklin Wood  
 Ralph Edgar Young

## INFANTRY

Harold Robert Aaron  
 John Edward Abbott, Jr.  
 Edward Mallory Almond, Jr.  
 Quintus C. Atkinson 5th  
 John Blair Beach  
 William Lawrence Bibby  
 Garland Cusorte Black, Jr.  
 Mark Mayo Boatner 3d  
 Alexander Russell Bolling, Jr.  
 John Klotz Brier  
 Heber Cowan Brill  
 James Edward Browning  
 George Gordon Bugg  
 Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr.  
 James Webster Cain  
 William Michael Calnan  
 George Gordon Cantlay, Jr.  
 David Marston Chase  
 James Vincent Christy  
 Edward Ryan Cleary  
 Francis Harold Cloudman, Jr.  
 John Hilley Cobb, Jr.  
 Caleb Allen Cole  
 John Walter Collins 3d  
 Roger Leon Conarty  
 Robert Sherman Culbertson  
 Daniel Bernard Cullinane, Jr.  
 James Richard Darden  
 Robert James Davenport  
 William Paul DeBrocke  
 William Cleveland Deekle, Jr.  
 Frank David Derouin  
 Argonne Call Dixon  
 Harold Halsey Dunwoody  
 Joseph Harry Eastmead  
 Bethell Edrington, Jr.  
 Mayo Jack Elliott  
 Robert Charles Foisey  
 Seth Roderick Frear  
 Edgar Jesse Fredericks  
 Robert Joseph Gilles  
 Jame Keith Glendening  
 Ronan Calistus Grady, Jr.  
 James Franklin Greene, Jr.  
 William James Greenwalt  
 Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Jr.  
 Robert Hanna  
 Herbert Pierre Harper  
 Harold Sears Head  
 Warren Robert Hecker  
 Albert Carl Hegenberger  
 Fred Willard Herres, Jr.  
 Roger Hillsman, Jr.  
 Benedict Francis Hoffmann  
 Jarrett Matthew Huddleston  
 John Bowler Hull  
 Thomas Lea Hutchings, Jr.  
 Gabriel Alexander Ivan  
 Thomas Terrell Jackson  
 Samuel Wright Jenkins  
 Earle Albie Johnson, Jr.  
 Alan Walter Jones, Jr.  
 Charles Myers Jones, Jr.  
 Frank Williams Jones, Jr.  
 Harry Jesse Kenyon  
 James Donald Kidder  
 Thomas James Laudani  
 Bernard Thomas Lewis

Robert Louis McCanna  
 Dale Fletcher McGee, Jr.  
 John Price Mattfeldt  
 Weston Fisher Maughan  
 Albert Gaswell Metts, Jr.  
 James Cleveland Miller, Jr.  
 George Robert Moe  
 Henry Grady Morgan, Jr.  
 Roule Cole Mozingo  
 Robert Wells Neilson, Jr.  
 John Henry Nelson  
 George Edward Newman  
 John Henry Norton  
 Alvin Ernest Orlian  
 Richard Cameron Orphan  
 William Oliver Peak 3d  
 Donald Charles Pence  
 Del Sullivan Perkins  
 Phil Roy Phelps, Jr.  
 Charles De Puckett  
 Randell Jacob Purcell  
 Arthur Henry Rasper, Jr.  
 Roger Ray  
 William Johnson Ray  
 Harry Langdon Reeder, Jr.  
 Clarence Walter Richmond, Jr.  
 Bernard William Rogers  
 Harold Jacob Saine  
 James Harvey Short  
 David Lester Smith  
 Robert Daniel Sonstelle  
 William Joseph Spahr  
 Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens, Jr.  
 John Buchanan Stockton  
 Jephtha Charles Tanksley  
 Thomas Kelly Tannler  
 Hubert Edward Tansey  
 Arnold Robert Tucker, Jr.  
 Alfred Ferdynand Tyrala  
 Arthur William VanSchoick, Jr.  
 Fletcher Read Veach, Jr.  
 William John Welsh, Jr.  
 Clarence Richard Westfall  
 Norman Lewis Williams  
 Karl Everett Wolf  
 Owens Herbert Yeuell

## AIR CORPS

Millard Othello Anderson  
 Paul Gregory Atkinson, Jr.  
 Frank Putnam Ball  
 Roger Clawson Ball  
 Ben Butler Barnes  
 Gordon Winthrop Barrett, Jr.  
 Richard Edward Beck  
 Thomas Archer Beckett  
 Walter Rae Beckett, Jr.  
 Richard Nichols Berry  
 Jonas LeMoyné Blank  
 Andrew Boreske, Jr.  
 Ernest Francis Boruski, Jr.  
 Tonnis Boukamp  
 James Alfred Bower  
 Albert John Bowley  
 Freeman Wate Bowley, Jr.  
 William Jasper Brake  
 Cullen Albert Brannon, Jr.  
 William Paul Brierty  
 Leo Cooper Brooks  
 Alston Law Brown  
 Thomas Huntington Brown  
 Oliver Boone Bucher, Jr.  
 Edward Burke Burdett  
 Walter Neal Burnette, Jr.  
 William Hunter Burns 3d  
 Charles William Carson, Jr.  
 Benjamin Buckles Cassiday, Jr.  
 John Seymoure Chandler, Jr.  
 Marvin Edward Childs  
 Robert Herman Clark  
 Heston Charles Cole  
 Edward Hanson Connor 3d  
 Leo Eugene Conway  
 Clifford Charles Cornell, Jr.  
 Richard Ray Coursey, Jr.  
 Ernest Thorpe Cragg  
 William Edward Cramsie  
 Alan Francis Crump  
 Ronald Dennis Cullen  
 Edward Wellage Cutler  
 William Joseph Daner  
 Donald Salmon Dargue

Jack Talmadge Davis  
 John McArthur Davis  
 Douglas Lipp Deal  
 Donald Alburus Detwiler  
 William Bradford Dudley  
 Anthony Raymond Durante  
 John Wyeth Earhart, Jr.  
 Preston Warham Easley  
 Phillips Eastman, Jr.  
 Oliver Richard English  
 William Earl Evers  
 James Thomas Fitz-Gerald, Jr.  
 Henry Merritt Fletcher, Jr.  
 James Dixon Fore  
 Tom Bond Foulk, Jr.  
 Norman Horace Frisbie  
 Charles Arthur Gagnat  
 David Emanuel Galas  
 Thomas Simons Garrett 3d  
 Vincent Augustus Gaudiani, Jr.  
 Eaton Arthur Gorelangton  
 William James Greene  
 Allen Wyant Gullion, Jr.  
 Alfred Dale Hagen  
 Ralph Junior Hallenbeck  
 Jack Willing Hammel  
 Robert Maxwell Hancock, Jr.  
 Burton Clement Hanish  
 Teague Gray Harris, Jr.  
 Frank James Harrold, Jr.  
 Martin Lee Harter  
 Paul Andre Hederstrom, Jr.  
 Harry Ludwick Heintzelman 3d  
 Richard Tilghman Hemsley 3d  
 Robert Alvin Hersberger  
 Edward Jerome Hertel  
 Robert William Hoffman  
 Henry Leon Hogan 3d  
 Arthur William Holderness, Jr.  
 John Mahlon Hommel  
 Luther Walker Hough, Jr.  
 Richard Hugh Houser  
 Joseph Hipolito Huau, Jr.  
 John Bell Hudson  
 Ullin Lee Hudson  
 Herschel DeMent Hughes  
 Paul Joseph Hurley  
 George Howard Ingham  
 Clare Thompson Ireland, Jr.  
 Felix Andrew Kalinski  
 James Moulton Keck  
 William Joseph Kilpatrick, Jr.  
 Harold Ferguson Knowles  
 John Roger Kullman  
 Harvey Haroldson Latson, Jr.  
 Hanford Nichols Lockwood 3d  
 Thomas McAdoo Love  
 Richard Curry McAdam  
 Thomas Eugene McCabe  
 Donald DeForest McClure  
 Robert Dugald McClure  
 Richard David McCord  
 Jack Kenneth McGregor  
 Jack Mann McGregor  
 Frank McCoy McMullen  
 John Robert McNiel  
 Laurence Ronald MacDonnell  
 Robert John MacMullin  
 Gayle Eugene Madison  
 Maurice Langhorne Martin  
 William Wintle Martin  
 Russell Lowell Maughan, Jr.  
 Richard Victor Miracle  
 William Clarence Moore  
 Christopher Henry Munch  
 David Duncan Munro 3d  
 John Walter Myrtetus  
 William Edward Naylor, Jr.  
 Louis Konrad Nesselbush  
 John Jacob Neuer  
 Jack Conrad Novak  
 Edmund Francis O'Connor  
 Robin Olds  
 Thomas Kilbury Oliver  
 Earl Oren Olmstead, Jr.  
 Robert Evans Orr  
 Norbert Joseph Oswald  
 Stanley Carter Pace

Richard Henry Parker  
 Jammie Mendal Philpott  
 John Charles Plebes  
 Waldo Franklin Potter  
 Ernest Collier Price  
 James Rival Pugh, Jr.  
 Robert Duncan MacGregor Randall  
 John William Rawlings, Jr.  
 James Cabell Reed  
 Edward Julius Renth, Jr.  
 Anthony Henry Richard, Jr.  
 Coleman Cabell Richards  
 Zaccheus Camp Richardson  
 Scott Brewer Ritchie, Jr.  
 Robert John Rooney  
 Joseph Henry Rosness  
 Francis Earle Rundell 2d  
 George LeRoy Russell  
 Ned Schramm, Jr.  
 David Gibbon Schwartz  
 Ralph Meloy Scott  
 William Fontaine Scott  
 Richard Francis Shaefer  
 Daniel Francis Shea  
 Stephen Hunting Sherill, Jr.  
 Albert Raymond Shiely, Jr.  
 Lindsey McDonald Silvester  
 Eber Eugene Simpson  
 Elwood Frank Smith  
 Hubert Smith, Jr.  
 J. Weller Smith  
 Kenneth Bates Smith  
 Lowell Blair Smith  
 William Wayne Snavelly  
 Charles Spleth, Jr.  
 Gordon Hall Steele, Jr.  
 Paul Leonard Steinle  
 Richard Carlton Stickney, Jr.  
 Richard Williams Stoddard  
 Marion Scott Street  
 Richard Donald Sullivan  
 Firman Edward Susank  
 Dale Sidney Sweat  
 John James Swisshelm  
 Franklin Woody Taylor  
 Ralph Jamison Teetor, Jr.  
 Junior Craig Teller  
 James Robert Thomas  
 Albert Sidney Johnston Tucker, Jr.  
 Vernon Richard Turner  
 Francis Veazy Walker  
 James Harper Walker  
 Charles Skillman Waller  
 Edward Joseph Walsh, Jr.  
 Edward Menefee Watkins, Jr.  
 James Howard Watkins  
 Lawrence Middleton Watson  
 William Glenn Watson  
 Lewis Frazer Webster  
 Marston Thorn Westbrook  
 J. Duane Wethe  
 William Joseph Whalen  
 Richard Vincent Wheeler  
 Keith Albert Whitaker  
 Jack Henderson Whitson  
 Warren Tanner Whittemore  
 Fred Ordway Wickham, Jr.  
 Louis Charles Wieser  
 Richard Bocock Willis, Jr.  
 Harold William Woodson  
 Edmund Augustus Wright, Jr.  
 Howard Greenlees Yelding  
 Michael Zubon  
 Lloyd Zuppann, Jr.

*To be second lieutenants with rank from  
 June 3, 1943*

#### AIR CORPS

Edgar Knowles Parks, Jr.

#### IN THE NAVY

#### TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles E. Rosendahl to be a rear admiral,  
 for temporary service, to rank from July 9,  
 1942.

#### POSTMASTERS

#### MINNESOTA

Edward T. Gibbons, Sherburne.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Ola Chandler, Braxton.  
 James O. Waldrop, Newton.  
 Robert A. Dean, Okolona.  
 R. Ben Linn, Pickens.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Marvin F. Birely, Blue Ridge Summit.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Father of Mankind, we pray that Thy spirit may arouse in us the feeling of unused powers and the consciousness of responsibility. We rejoice that Thou dost pour out of Thy infinite fullness an overflow transcending all human need. As the humblest flower by the way breathes an unconscious fragrance, so may we by gentleness and humility show forth the spirit of our Saviour, nor ever let an unhallowed day pass.

Most graciously regard our country; humanity with all its burdens seems to be wandering between two worlds—the old one dying and a new one struggling to be born. Teach us again and again that life is more than livelihood. Make us to learn the discipline that the world can be saved only by submitting to righteous law, rather than wielding the bludgeon of force. We pray for a gale from heaven, a rushing of a mighty wind, carrying light to those in darkness and life to those in death.

Blessed Lord, we pray for those in sorrow and for those in joy; for those who are cast down and for those exalted; for those in barren lands, weary and worn; and for all in the battle lines of freedom. Almighty God, make us worthy of the sacrifice and the victory on which the rights of man can be restored. In the name of Thy Son, our Redeemer. Amen.

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

#### LEND-LEASE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Friday, following disposition of business on the Speaker's table, it shall be in order to consider, under the rules of the House, the defense and lend-lease supplemental appropriation bill, 1943.

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

#### NAVY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHEPPARD) there were—ayes 62, noes 0.



Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—360

Abernethy	Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.
Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Doughton	J. Leroy
Andersen,	Douglas	Johnson,
H. Carl	Drewry	Luther A.
Anderson, Calif.	Durham	Johnson,
Anderson,	Dworshak	Lyndon B.
N. Mex.	Eaton	Johnson, Okla.
Andresen,	Eberharter	Johnson, Ward
August H.	Ellis	Jones
Andrews	Ellison, Md.	Jonkman
Angell	Elmer	Kean
Arends	Elston, Ohio	Kearney
Arnold	Engel	Kee
Auchincloss	Fay	Keefe
Baldwin, Md.	Feighan	Kefauver
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fellows	Keogh
Barden	Fenton	Kerr
Barrett	Fernandez	Kilburn
Barry	Fish	Kilday
Bates, Ky.	Fisher	King
Bates, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Kinzer
Beall	Flannagan	Kirwan
Beckworth	Fogarty	Kleberg
Bell	Folger	Knutson
Bender	Forand	Kunkel
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	LaFollette
Bennett, Mo.	Fulbright	Lambertson
Bishop	Fulmer	Landis
Blackney	Gale	Lane
Bland	Gamble	Lanham
Bloom	Gathings	Larcade
Bolton	Gavagan	LeCompte
Bonner	Gearhart	Lefevre
Boren	Gerlach	Lesinski
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	Ludlow
Bradley, Pa.	Gilchrist	Lynch
Brehm	Gillette	McCord
Brown, Ga.	Gillie	McCormack
Brown, Ohio	Gordon	McCowan
Bryson	Gore	McGehee
Buffett	Gossett	McGregor
Bulwinkle	Graham	McKenzie
Burch, Va.	Grant, Ala.	McLean
Burchill, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	McMillan
Burdick	Green	McMurray
Burgin	Gregory	McWilliams
Busbey	Griffiths	Madden
Butler	Gwynne	Magnuson
Camp	Hagen	Mahon
Canfield	Hall	Maloney
Cannon, Fla.	Edwin Arthur	Manasco
Cannon, Mo.	Hall,	Mansfield,
Carlson, Kans.	Leonard W.	Mont.
Carson, Ohio	Hancock	Mansfield, Tex.
Carter	Hare	Marcantonio
Case	Harless, Ariz.	Martin, Iowa
Chapman	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Mass.
Chenoweth	Harris, Ark.	Mason
Chipperfield	Harris, Va.	May
Church	Hartley	Michener
Clason	Hays	Miller, Conn.
Clevenger	Hébert	Miller, Mo.
Coffee	Heldinger	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, Mo.	Herter	Millis
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Monkiewicz
Colmer	Hill	Monroney
Compton.	Hobbs	Morrison, N. C.
Cooley	Hoch	Mott
Cooper	Hoeven	Mruk
Cox	Hoffman	Mundt
Cravens	Hollfield	Murdock
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Murphy
Creal	Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Tenn.
Crosser	Hope	Murray, Wis.
Cullen	Horan	Newsome
Cunningham	Howell	Norman
Curtis	Hull	Norrell
D'Alesandro	Izac	O'Brien, Ill.
Davis	Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.
Dawson	Jarman	O'Brien, N. Y.
Day	Jeffrey	O'Connor
Delaney	Jenkins	O'Hara
Dickstein	Jennings	O'Konski
Dilweg	Jensen	O'Neal
Dingell	Johnson,	Outland
Dirksen	Anton J.	Pace
Disney	Johnson,	Patman
Ditter	Calvin D.	Patton

Peterson, Fla.	Satterfield	Tarver
Peterson, Ga.	Sauthoff	Thomas, Tex.
Phillips	Scanlon	Thomason
Phillips	Schiffner	Tibbott
Pittenger	Schuetz	Tolan
Ploeser	Shafer	Towe
Plumley	Sheppard	Treadway
Poage	Short	Van Zandt
Poulson	Sikes	Vincent, Ky.
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Vorys, Ohio
Rabaut	Slaughter	Vursell
Ramey	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Ramspeck	Smith, Ohio	Weaver
Randolph	Smith, Va.	Welchel, Ohio
Rapkin	Smith, W. Va.	Weiss
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.	Wene
Reed, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.	West
Reed, N. Y.	Sparkman	Wheat
Rees, Kans.	Spence	Welchel, Ga.
Richards	Springer	Whitten
Rivers	Stanley	Whittington
Rizley	Starnes, Ala.	Wickersham
Robinson, Utah	Steagall	Wigglesworth
Robison, Ky.	Stearns, N. H.	Willey
Rockwell	Stefan	Wilson
Rodgers, Pa.	Stevenson	Winstead
Rogers, Calif.	Stewart	Winter
Rogers, Mass.	Stockman	Wolcott
Rohrbough	Sullivan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rowan	Sumner, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Rowe	Sundstrom	Woodrum, Va.
Russell	Taber	Wright
Sadowski	Talbot	Zimmerman
Sasscer	Talle	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—72

Boykin	Guyer	O'Leary
Brooks	Hale	O'Toole
Buckley	Halleck	Pfeiffer
Byrne	Hart	Powers
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Pracht
Ceiler	Hendricks	Robertson
Clark	Hinsshaw	Rolph
Cochran	Judd	Sabath
Costello	Kelley	Schwabe
Courtney	Kennedy	Scott
Culkin	Klein	Sheridan
Curley	Lea	Snyder
Dewey	Lemke	Sumners, Tex.
Dies	Lewis	Taylor
Elliot	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	McGranery	Troutman
Furlong	Maas	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Merritt	Walter
Gavin	Morrow	Ward
Gibson	Miller, Pa.	Wasielewski
Goodwin	Morrison, La.	Welch
Gorski	Myers	White
Granger	Nichols	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Norton	Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Costello with Mr. Rolph.  
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Goodwin.  
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.  
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Curley with Mr. Dewey.  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Culkin.  
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Maas.  
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Guyer.  
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Ellsworth.  
Mr. Klein with Mr. Schwabe.  
Mr. Worley with Mr. Pracht.  
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Hale.  
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Judd.  
Mr. O'Toole and Mr. Lewis of Ohio.  
Mr. Pfeiffer with Mr. Troutman.  
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Powers.  
Mr. Hart with Mrs. Luce.  
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Welch.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address entitled "America's Aviation Tomorrow," by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America; also a statement by 18 air lines, being a joint reply to certain questions by the Civil Aeronautics Board, including a reply by question and answer; together with a letter from the President of the United States to Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first air-mail flight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### C. K. LAWSON AND THE RUMML PLAN

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from an outstanding constituent of mine, Mr. C. K. Lawson, of Cedartown, Ga., which I conceive to be a patriotic, open, frank expression representing the attitude of a majority of the laboring men in this country concerning what is known as the Ruml plan. Mr. Lawson writes as follows:

CEDARTOWN, GA., May 13, 1943.

HON. MALCOLM TARVER,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cotton-mill man, working 7 days a week, putting more than 10 percent of my income in bonds and trying to pay for a home to enjoy when I get too old to work. And I need every dollar I can earn. But Uncle Sam went head over heels in debt last year just to protect my home and my job and my right to enjoy them. And since his income is derived from taxes, I don't see how honest men can talk about canceling his income unless they are going to cancel his debts.

Personally I want to get on a pay-as-you-go tax basis, but I don't want to beat my country out of what I owe for last year's protection, nor have a lot of debts for my grandchildren to pay interest on.

Let us have a pay-as-you-go tax bill and forget about that forgiving and forgetting.

Respectfully,

MR. AVERAGE CITIZEN,  
C. K. LAWSON.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Powers] be granted leave of absence for today on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE FOOD SITUATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that our country is in the midst of a very serious food problem. From all indications this problem is getting worse rapidly. This is due largely to the bungling of the food authorities of the Government.

About a month ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Republican leader in Congress, set up from among the Republicans in the House a committee to study the food situation. This committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been at work diligently, and is alarmed at the seriousness of the food situation. A day or two ago, under the order of this committee, I introduced in the House a bill which, if passed, will bring order out of chaos. This bill provides for the establishment of one single food administrator to have full and complete charge of all of the food departments of the Government. It is our hope that such a measure might be passed by the Congress immediately because the situation warrants immediate action.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by David Lawrence, appearing in today's Washington Star, on the income tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] may extend his own remarks in the Record, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may extend his remarks in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Bryson was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARRIS of Virginia was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the Record and include therein an article from the Aviation News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### GLENN HAMMOND CURTISS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago tomorrow, on the 21st day of May 1878, in the quiet country village of Hammondsport, nestled in the hills of the Finger Lake region of New York State, Glenn Hammond Curtiss was born. Named, first, for a site of local scenic beauty and, second, for the founder of the community which gave him birth, "G. H.," as he was wont to be called by his contemporaries, was destined to become one of the great pioneers in the field of aviation. Though credit for having made the first flight in America has been given to others, Glenn Curtiss was the first man to give a public demonstration of a successful flight in what was then known as the flying machine.

Holder of pilot's license No. 1 of the Aero Club of America, he was the first man to complete a sustained flight of 1 kilometer, slightly more than half a mile, in a flimsy crate dubbed the *June Bug*. Somewhat later he made the first flight from a water take-off in the *Loon*.

Both in conception and development of the aircraft engine and in the plane itself Curtiss has no peer in American history. To commemorate his great contribution to this modern science, I have today introduced a measure providing for the erection of a suitable memorial at Hammondsport, N. Y., as a fitting tribute by a grateful nation for the work done by Glenn Curtiss and his associates.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

#### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my home town is fairly bristling with war industries. Among them is a large rayon plant. This plant was recently visited by two men from the Office of Price Administration. The manager took them through this plant. They were interested in every detail that goes into the manufacture of rayon, so much so that when the manager took them back into the office it was with fear and trepidation in his heart that he faced them. But much to his surprise and amazement and utter relief, one of these so-called experts proffered his hand and said, "Mr. Manager, I want to thank you for this wonderful tour of inspection, for this is the first time I have ever been in a mill in all my life."

Now, that would be funny if it were not the essence of irony.

The soldiers who fight our battles take time out to delouse themselves. It would be well that certain bureaus emulate their example and delouse themselves of some of the vermin that have wormed their way into high offices of trust.

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

#### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and have them printed in the Appendix of the Record and include a telegram from Mr. George C. Thierbach, president, National Coffee Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

#### CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS' ASSOCIATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, if I may have attention for just a moment to make an announcement. The Congressional War Parents' Association, which is such an informal thing that we do not even send out notices of meetings, will meet Monday afternoon at 4:30 in the Appropriations Committee room opposite the barber shop. I think the Members can all find it. We hope there will be a good attendance.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a resolution of the National Catholic Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times entitled "Copernicus and Hitler."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by Fowler McCormack, president of the International Harvester Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.



The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 30 minutes on May 26. In view of the fact that May 26 has been set aside as memorial day I ask unanimous consent that my time be transferred to Thursday, May 27, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have the right to sit during the sessions of the House on May 26 and May 27.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request at this time. Some time ago the Chair made the announcement that when bills were being read for amendment in the House the Chair would not entertain a request of a committee to sit.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, may I not make the request subject to the condition that the committee would suspend its sitting if a bill were being read?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would prefer that the gentleman withdraw his request at the present time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a statement I made yesterday before the House Committee on Small Business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### O. P. A. SUBSIDIES

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has recently announced a new subsidy program involving the rolling back of prices on many commodities, including butter. I should like to read a telegram at this time I have received from Mr. E. S. Trask, chairman of the Idaho Dairy Products Council:

BOISE, IDAHO, May 15, 1943.

Congressman HENRY DWORSHAK:

Idaho dairy products council, made up of Idaho farmer-owned cooperative creameries, with more than 16,000 active patrons, protests the proposed subsidy program to be applied to butter as announced by the Office of Price Administration. Urge you actively oppose this program. Believe that more fruitful results in preventing inflation would be secured by absorbing through increased taxes and enforced savings that portion of

purchasing power for which goods and services are not available. Farmers definitely interested in avoiding the calamity of uncurbed inflation, but do not wish to accept a consumers' subsidy when large portion of consumers amply able to pay prices that will maintain badly needed production. Consumers now certainly more able to pay reasonable prices than loading costs of subsidy program on posterity.

IDAHO DAIRY PRODUCTS COUNCIL,  
E. S. TRASK, Chairman.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Frank E. Gannett.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### O. P. A. AND SMALL BUSINESS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE MAY 26

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request; I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may sit during the session of the House on May 26 unless there be general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would not want to do that if his committee had a bill up; would he?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a very brief article from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### WARTIME ATHLETICS

Mr. WEISS. 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. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr.

Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2719, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 54 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944, from the Committee on Appropriations, let me preface my remarks with a few general statements.

In its deliberations on the pending bill the committee was without the services of several members who have served with distinction for a great many years. I refer, of course, to the present Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], Judge Leavy, who was a tower of strength as Members will recall, and who has been appointed by the President to a Federal judgeship, our colleague and present chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, and Mr. Rich, of Pennsylvania, a sincere and capable gentleman who voluntarily retired from Congress.

The gentlemen who have succeeded these able legislators, Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio, Mr. NORRELL, of Arkansas, and Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, have displayed a keen interest in the work of the committee and have contributed much to whatever success we may have achieved.

The present distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee was present during the opening session of our hearings and made several valuable contributions to the record and interrogated the witness, the Secretary of the Interior, as to several important matters including the Department's food production program, concerning which I wish to refer later on in my remarks today.

I must not overlook mentioning those hold-over members of the subcommittee. We would not have been able to bring to this House a bill which is as well balanced and at the same time severely reduced, without the valuable and experienced assistance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Let me say here that this is the first time during the years I have been a member of this committee that there have been no controversial items in the bill.

In my opening statement to the subcommittee at the beginning of the hearings, after discussing several other matters, I urged that the committee secure all the available information possible concerning the many bureaus and agencies, and then eliminate or drastically reduce every item we could, especially

those which did not bear on the war effort. Let me quote one paragraph from that statement as follows:

And finally, when the hearings have been concluded, let me presume upon the valuable time of the committee further by suggesting that members of this subcommittee make every effort to cut these appropriations to the bone without seriously impairing the efficiency of the various departments and agencies. But let me also suggest that the committee members fight out their differences of opinion here behind closed doors and endeavor to reach an agreement on which they can present a united front both in the full committee and on the floor. Members may be assured of my full cooperation to that end.

A little later I shall give the figures showing how successful the committee was in achieving the ends suggested by me at the opening of the hearings.

I feel that it is correct and accurate to state that we finally agreed unanimously on every item in the bill and that we are all now unanimously behind the bill and every item in it. This does not mean that when we wrote the bill we did not have differences of opinion as to individual items. In fact, there were many such differences of opinion and we spent considerable time in reaching a decision. But we have reached that decision and the bill you have before you represents, so far as I can recall, the first time an appropriation bill has been reported to this House on which all members of the committee were in unanimous agreement.

The subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being chairman, held daily hearings, morning and afternoon, covering a period of about 6 weeks. These were long, tedious, and somewhat nerve-racking hearings. Despite the fact that we heard many witnesses from the various departments, Members of Congress, representatives of pressure groups, and others, your committee has succeeded in keeping down to a minimum the size of the hearings by insisting that much of the discussion not directly related to the appropriation be off the record. Through this procedure we were able to reduce the number of pages by 140.

You will recall that there are 26 agencies and activities in the Department of the Interior. And the committee heard representatives from each of them. There were a total of 88 departmental representatives, including officials from the Department of Agriculture and the War Production Board. In addition, we heard 3 United States Senators, 37 Members of Congress, and 12 representatives of outside organizations.

It is significant that the total cost of all their requests for additional funds would run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is also significant to note that not one witness who appeared before the committee asked for a reduction in appropriations for the next fiscal year, but, on the other hand, each and every witness, save possibly one, urged and demanded increased appropriations, despite the fact that there was no Budget estimate for the proposed increases. I might say here that many if not all of

the requests made by Members of Congress and others had considerable merit. In fact, many of the projects proposed involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, undoubtedly should be considered seriously in the post-war program that we hope is not far distant. But your committee recognized the fact that this Nation is engaged in a desperate war that will decide the future of our beloved country for many generations to come, and feel it is a solemn obligation to cut and slash all appropriations not directly related to the war effort and to refuse to seriously consider any and all new projects pending the duration of the war.

Before going into a discussion of the various agencies and activities in the bill permit me to give you a few facts and figures as to the revenues being taken in as a result of the activities carried on by the Interior Department.

For the fiscal year 1942, the actual total of all general and special revenue funds accruing to the Department of the Interior amounted to \$42,063,846. The estimated revenues for the fiscal year 1943 are \$47,593,420, and for the fiscal year 1944 the revenues are estimated at \$54,450,420. This latter sum is only \$18,410,896 less than the total amount contained in the pending bill. If you add the trust funds amounting to nearly \$9,000,000 to general and special funds, the revenues of the Interior Department for the next fiscal year would nearly equal the entire appropriation for this Department, which, it must be agreed, is a remarkable showing. This is especially true when we realize that for the fiscal year 1933 the actual total of all general and special fund revenues accruing to the Interior Department amounted to only \$9,356,678. It is interesting to note that the increase in revenues during the 10-year period of 1933 to 1943 reflects a net increase of \$45,093,742.

Members may be interested in knowing what is primarily responsible for such a remarkable increase in revenues for this Department. The primary reason is, of course, that revenues are now coming in from the operation of huge power and reclamation-development projects which were opposed by many both in and out of Congress, several years ago. It will be recalled that such projects as Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Parker Dam, and Central Valley were repeatedly referred to as "white elephants."

The fact is, these projects are now beginning to pay back their cost to the Government, not only from a financial standpoint, but, what is more important, some of them are furnishing electric energy and agricultural products, without which our war program would be seriously hampered. Severe criticisms were made in some quarters against all of the Colorado projects, which of course include Boulder Dam, yet it is estimated that revenues from Colorado dam projects, including interest on Colorado dams and other funds, will amount to a sum in excess of \$9,000,000 during the fiscal year 1944. Collections from reclamation projects will exceed \$10,000,000, and revenues from the sale of power from

Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are estimated to be approximately \$17,000,000. Members will find a complete list of these revenues on page 26 of part 1 of the hearings.

#### REDUCTIONS RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE

At this time when the taxpayers are being called upon to finance the most far-reaching war in all history, I know that Members of the House as well as the country at large will be primarily interested in the reductions in the bill.

The committee considered estimates totaling \$82,188,000.

The bill recommends appropriations totaling \$72,861,000.

The amount recommended is a reduction under the 1943 appropriation of \$119,999,000.

The bill also shows a reduction in the Budget estimates of \$9,327,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It will be recalled that that includes the amount that was designated in the 1943 appropriation bill to go for war purposes, \$70,000,000; is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It includes not only that but a number of other reductions in operation and maintenance, including administrative expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to separate the amount that was used in the 1943 appropriation bill designated specifically for power devoted to war purposes. You have not that in this bill. As I understand it, there is not much in this bill, if anything, for power for war purposes; is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. The bill contains funds for continuation of construction of the Central Valley project, for which \$11,500,000 is recommended and which, together with the unobligated balance, will provide a total of \$38,500,000 for this project. This item is for the development of power necessary to the war effort.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that in last year's bill the specific power appropriation was not separated from the general reclamation work. There would be a dam serving power and irrigation purposes and the appropriation would be made for the construction of that dam. Eventually it will be allocated as between irrigation and power. In this bill there is an item of over \$11,000,000 for carrying on the work of the Central Valley project which will be expended largely in the construction of the Shasta Dam, the Shasta powerhouse, the generators and transmission lines in connection with it, and this appropriation was made this year because the War Production Board said that the development of that power there fits into their power program and they wanted that power developed for war purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.



Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The only reason I raise the question is the gentleman from Oklahoma will recall that I asked specifically the question what amount of this appropriation is intended for power development specifically, and you will recall that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Leavy, answered by saying about \$70,000,000. That is the only reason I raise the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman, but, as the gentleman from California has also explained, the power and the reclamation projects are usually tied together.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is a fact, is it not, that upward of 95 percent of the power developed in the Columbia River area is being used for war purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that is true.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the gentleman whether any of the funds that are available for the Bureau of Reclamation for investigation of projects are available for the investigation of projects under the Water Conservation and Utility Act or are they limited to strictly the original type of reclamation projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not believe that there are any funds in here available for the purpose that the gentleman suggests; however, the committee has suggested, and I will be glad to discuss that a little further, that all these reclamation projects that have been stopped by the War Production Board be seriously considered with other projects for the purpose of providing for the war effort.

Mr. CASE. I understand that is for the type of project that can produce quickly needed crops.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I believe in the hearings there is a section devoted to a discussion of the Shipshaw development in Canada, is there not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE. I want to compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee on the advanced and sound stand they take with reference to the Shipshaw development wherein they showed by their sentiments, as they expressed them here, that they thought where priorities were to be granted, certainly we should give priority to our own public and private power development first before we give them to a development in a neighboring country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I may say that the committee stated itself very specifically along that line.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. JENSEN. I think it is well to have the RECORD show on this Central Valley project, that we are in this bill spending

a comparatively small amount in order to get the power and in order to get the revenue flowing into the United States Treasury, and until we can get this work done there will not be any revenue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. The Government has already spent millions and millions of dollars, and it would not be good business to let the project stand idle at this time.

In other words, the bill shows a cut of 60 percent from the current appropriation and a reduction of more than 11 percent in the Budget estimates.

Of course, the reduction of nearly \$120,000,000 below the 1943 appropriation is mainly due to the fact that construction appropriations in the bill have been drastically reduced.

Members will be especially interested, I am sure, in hearing of some of the larger reductions recommended by the committee. They are as follows:

	Reduction	Percent of reduction
Secretary's Office.....	\$322,340	7 1/2
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,158,000	5
Bureau of Reclamation.....	5,638,200	27
National Park Service.....	835,000	18
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	855,000	15

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any provision made for an appropriation for the development of these projects by the Bureau of Reclamation in the event the War Production Board will relax its order on steel.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; there is no appropriation in this bill for that thing. But, of course if the War Production Board should change its attitude and decide that some of these projects are essential to the war effort—and I will say to the gentleman I think that is in the making—there are two things that can be done. The bill will go over to the other body and will be considered there. I can assure the gentleman that if it is provided for over there the committee will give sympathetic consideration to such projects as the War Production Board finds are essential.

Of course, we have a deficiency committee, in the event this bill is out of the way, that could take care of it.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. The people of Wyoming are particularly interested in this matter. There are a number of projects in my State that the people could use for the development of food, so vitally needed at this time in the war effort, and we are hoping the War Production Board will relax its restrictions in the matter of steel for these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I was just about to discuss these War Production Board projects.

#### REMOVAL OF STOP-WORK ORDERS BY WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

As members will recall, the War Production Board issued stop orders against

certain construction features of about 23 reclamation projects. Whether or not we agree with these orders, they have been issued and there is no affirmative action that your committee or this House can take in the matter now. That authority, as Members know, is in the War Production Board. Our committee did hold somewhat lengthy hearings as will be shown in the record, and I am glad to say that the Department of Agriculture has recommended that stop orders on at least some of these projects be lifted. And I might add here that I confidentially expect this to be done in connection with some of these more important projects in the near future. The testimony as to the need of food which can be produced on these projects was convincing.

During the hearings with representatives of the Department of Agriculture the committee questioned the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Grover B. Hill, as to the seriousness of the food situation, and he advised the committee, in part, as follows:

Regardless of how much food we will produce, it will not be enough. Even though we could produce twice as much food as we will be able to produce, we could use it all.

The committee is deeply impressed by the frank statement of the Assistant Secretary and with the testimony of many others who are in agreement with him, and it urgently recommends, in view of Mr. Hill's testimony as to the probability of a food shortage, that the War Production Board promptly reinvestigate and seriously consider allowing priorities which will permit resumption of work on some of these reclamation projects which have been in a deferred status since last October. While some justification may have existed for the issuance of stop orders in October 1942, when the food shortage was not so apparent, the committee is strongly of the opinion that the time for optimism and complacency on the part of responsible officials has passed. These stop orders have involved a serious delay in the development of 877,500 acres of new land and 2,085,000 acres of existing land for which a supplemental water supply is needed. In view of the fact that we must feed our own civilian population, our armed forces, and are now being called upon to shoulder the major portion of the burden of feeding our allies it was and is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Agriculture Department and the War Production Board should not only consider removing existing stop orders, but that they should also consider the desirability of undertaking a program of new and supplemental reclamation projects referred to by the Commissioner of Reclamation in his testimony which may be found in some detail in the committee hearings.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentleman from Oklahoma to say that there is an item in here for the Central Valley project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. On what page does it appear?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It appears on page 66 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it provide for the building of transmission lines?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It provides for the building of transmission lines to a substation; not as much as was asked for by the Bureau of Reclamation, but it does make provision for the building of transmission lines.

If the gentleman will turn to page 36 of the bill, under the caption "General fund, construction," he will see the item which reads:

Central Valley project, California, \$11,500,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you know to whose substation; who owns the substation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will refer to the report, page 10, he will find this statement:

Central Valley project, California: The committee considered in connection with this item a supplemental estimate of \$16,400,000, in House Document No 180, for continuation of construction of certain features of the project. This supplemental estimate provided funds to expedite completion of construction of the Shasta Dam, Shasta power plant, including the installation of two 75,000-kilovolt-ampere generating units and appurtenant transmission and switching facilities, all items enumerated having received the approval of the War Production Board. The committee has included in the bill a total of \$11,500,000 for continuation of construction of all features of the project referred to in the Budget estimate with the exception of the proposed transmission line from the Shasta substation to Oroville. It is the recommendation of the committee that no funds in the bill and no funds heretofore provided therefor shall be used for the construction of a transmission line by the Government from Shasta substation to Oroville and that funds which have been heretofore provided for that purpose be reallocated for construction in connection with other features of the project. The use of funds necessary to construct the transmission line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation—

Which I understand is owned by the Government—

estimated at between \$400,000 and \$500,000, is recommended by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. But the amount for transmission lines in former bills was not reappropriated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is familiar with the Lugert-Altus Dam in Oklahoma where the Bureau has spent a lot of time. I wonder if the gentleman, who is familiar with that project, does not feel that it would be worthy of any additional expenditure above the amount obligated by the district at Altus to carry the project to completion, as it really involves the use of only a small amount of strategic materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I agree fully with the gentleman. The

LXXXIX—296

gentleman knows I have been very much interested in that and many other similar projects. I was rather severe in my criticism of the stoppage orders on 23 projects because I felt, as did the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, that regardless of how much food we might attempt to produce we would not produce enough. The Altus project is one of the outstanding projects in the country and offers a great deal in the matter of producing food for the soldiers and civilians.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Why was this transmission line to Oroville left out this time? It was shown before that it was necessary, and it was appropriated for. It has not been constructed, and it seems to me that it would be absolutely necessary to carry this power to be generated by Shasta Dam. Why was it left out of this bill?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California, who is much more familiar with the project than I.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman is in error in saying that this particular line was ever appropriated for. An appropriation was made for a transmission line that was going direct from the Shasta power plant to the San Francisco Bay region.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Now, during the war emergency it was decided to tie into the already established line there owned by a private company. There are two different places into which it might be tied. One is at the Shasta substation and the other is at Oroville. You are going to tie into the lines of this company regardless of which place the transmission line is built to.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you are hedging this project about with the private power company and shutting out, we will say, for instance, the public power system in Sacramento and probably San Francisco from the benefit of the power development at Shasta Dam.

Mr. CARTER. Not at all. The gentleman perhaps is aware of the order made by the War Production Board in reference to the utilities tying their lines together. I recently visited the Northwest and found there that they use a network over the Northwest at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the privately owned power companies that are all interconnected. The War Production Board issued an order more than a year ago saying that this interconnection should be made where possible in the interest of saving. The line to Oroville was never contemplated for a permanent line. It was to be made on wooden poles, as I recall.

Mr. RANKIN. I am also aware of the tie-up of the public utilities in the War Production Board. That is what alarms me about this movement to strangle the distribution of the power to be generated

at this Central Valley project, the Shasta Dam. I hope that if the House does not see fit to put this appropriation back in the bill it will be put in the bill in the Senate. If this Government can supply the money to build a dam in Quebec as large as Boulder Dam, surely we can find materials to transmit the power we are producing at our own dams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to refer to several other agencies in the Interior Department.

#### GRAZING SERVICE

We have recommended a moderate reduction in the Grazing Service. The Budget proposed funds to establish four additional grazing districts and we allowed funds for only two. We believe this service is doing a good job and helping to provide food by improving the grazing areas for cattle. As many of you will recall, this activity was started several years ago under the Taylor Grazing Act, and you will also recall the fervor with which our beloved former chairman and sponsor of this legislation supported this proposal. Its headquarters have been moved to Salt Lake City, and it is my definite impression that the move has proved so satisfactory that they will not return to Washington after the war.

#### BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is provided for only on an operation and maintenance basis, all construction work having been stopped by the War Production Board. They have an unexpended balance of about \$46,000,000. There are obligations which will reduce this balance to about \$30,000,000 by June 30, 1943. It is also expected that an additional war construction program will be approved by the War Production Board involving the expenditure of \$16,000,000 for new transmission lines and substations.

#### GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The General Land Office has made an excellent record and has increased its receipts over previous years. Receipts during the fiscal year 1942 were \$9,014,172. The total amount recommended in the bill for this office is \$2,119,350. In spite of this splendid showing, we believe that a reduction can be made in the item for surveying the public lands, although the Land Office is surveying land for the Army and Navy. We feel that the Army and Navy should supply such funds as are necessary to survey bombing ranges, camp sites, and so forth.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The next item is the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have made some drastic reductions in several items for this service. First, I would like to give you a few facts with reference to the participations of the Indians in the war effort:

Out of a total Indian population of 400,000, 13,000 have entered the armed forces. The Navajo Tribe alone have contributed 1,400 men, 350 of them volunteers, out of a total population of 50,000.

Many thousands of them are engaged in war work, including work in airplane factories and on the farms.



The first Distinguished Service Cross awarded on Bataan Peninsula went to an Indian, Pvt. Charles Ball, of the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana.

I believe I have referred before to the late Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, an Osage Indian and commanding general of the American forces in Hawaii who was killed in action.

An unsolicited contribution of \$1,000 for Navy relief came from a Kiowa Indian woman of Cement, Okla., who signed the check with a thumbprint. This woman not only lives in the district which I represent in Congress, but resides in a humble home on a farm a few miles from my own home in Oklahoma.

These are only a few of the contributions the Indians are making to the war effort. Suffice it to say that the Indians of all tribes and in all States are not only joining with other Americans of all races and creeds in buying war bonds but are giving their sons, the most precious heritage that any of us have, to promote the war effort and to keep America and the world a decent place in which to live.

A few of the major reductions we have recommended in connection with Indian Service appropriations are as follows:

Industrial assistance, which includes agriculture and stock raising, has been cut \$135,000. These are worthy activities and have assisted the Indian in becoming self-supporting, but they are not of great value to the war effort, so we have reduced them substantially.

We have cut the estimate of \$925,000 for Indian relief to \$700,000. Because of the fact that opportunities for employment in war activities have greatly reduced unemployment, the committee felt justified in making this substantial reduction.

We have reduced the estimate of \$1,200,000 for road construction and repair to \$750,000 for similar reasons. Undoubtedly, the building of roads will become an important part of the post-war building program.

I see my friend, the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. DIMOND, is here. He appeared before the committee and made a very fine appeal for relief in Alaska. A pitiful condition does exist there. Yet all in all, we felt that we should make a rather sizable reduction in Indian relief.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that the amounts appropriated for relief are not for the people who are able to get jobs under any circumstances, the relief is designed for those who are not employable, most of whom cannot earn a cent no matter what the conditions are in the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I realize there is much merit to what the gentleman says. For that reason, we did leave in the bill \$700,000 for Indian relief.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

As I have stated heretofore, funds are provided in the bill for only a few reclamation projects as compared with pre-

vious years. Appropriations generally in this bill are for operation and maintenance of existing projects.

One exception is the Central Valley project in California. The War Production Board has very recently given the go signal and the committee has included \$11,500,000 in the bill for continuation of construction of certain features of the project essential to the war program. The amount we have recommended reflects a reduction of \$4,900,000 in the Budget estimate.

We have also included \$775,000 in the bill for installation of an additional generator at Boulder Dam. Power generated at the dam is being used by war plants in that area. Revenue from the sale of power is about \$7,000,000 annually.

Funds are provided in the bill for the first time for operation of the Grand Coulee Dam which is the hub of industrial activity in the Pacific Northwest. Power from the dam is used extensively by war plants in that area engaged in producing aluminum and other important war minerals.

There are three 108,000-kilowatt generators in operation at Grand Coulee Dam at the present time and two 75,000-kilowatt generators. Three additional 108,000-kilowatt generators are being installed, 1 of which will be in service in August, 1 in November, and 1 shortly after the first of the year. That makes a total of 8 generators with a generating capacity of 798,000 kilowatts. Ultimately it is planned to install a total of 18 generators with a generating capacity of 1,944,000 kilowatts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I notice there has been no money appropriated for certain projects on which there are stop orders from the War Production Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I wondered just what position that would place these projects in. Suppose that during the next 4 or 5 or 6 months we can release these stop orders and proceed with these projects. Does not that leave these projects without any money whatever to proceed with?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman believe that is a fair way to deal with the projects that have been approved?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, with the exception of some unexpended balances that, of course, would be available, but, as I said a moment ago, I am hopeful that the War Production Board will change its attitude. It may be that there was some reason or excuse for these stop orders last fall, but the situation has changed materially since last fall, so we are hopeful and we have reason to believe that a great many of these stop orders will be removed within the next few weeks, not the next few months, but the next few weeks.

Some of them are in the making now. As I suggested a moment ago, this bill

goes to the other body, and if these stoppages are lifted there will be an opportunity to get funds in this bill. If not, Congress will be in session with the exception of a possible vacation in the summer, and in that event the deficiency committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, will, in all probability, be in session. It should not be difficult in a matter like this, which is essential to the war effort, to secure prompt and careful consideration of any deserving items.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this committee should set up some funds for these projects in case the stoppage order is removed. Take the Provo River project: We have been attempting to get the War Production Board to remove the stop order on that for several months, and are expecting to have it removed at any time. But suppose we do not get this removed until this bill is passed. Then will not this put us in the position where the War Production Board can say to us, that we do not have any funds to proceed with, and therefore it would be of no value for them to release their stoppage order? It seems to me the gentleman's committee is putting these projects in a very unusual and a very precarious position by not appropriating money to proceed with them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It may seem to the gentleman that this committee is derelict in its duty, but I think it is not this committee, but the War Production Board, which is all-powerful.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This particular project I might say that it is 49 percent completed, that is, the Provo River project. It has been stopped because it uses a certain amount of steel, and steel right now is a strategic material which is needed in the war effort. For several months we have been trying to have the project approved in such a way that it would not require that much steel, and that it would be satisfactory to proceed with the completion of the project. I might say that the completion of this project is essential to the lives of practically all of the people in Salt Lake City, and the surrounding territory, if we happen to have a shortage of water. We have not been able to procure from the War Production Board as yet a release of this stoppage order. My question is, suppose this bill is passed without any appropriation for this project, then, right after the bill is passed, we go to the War Production Board again, trying to get a release. They are then in a position to say to us, "You have not any money to proceed with this project."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that this committee would be in a very awkward position to begin making appropriations for projects that have been stopped by the War Production Board? Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the particular project to which the gentleman refers is an extremely important project, and I agree with all he says. However, there is now in the general fund \$1,217,771 for the Provo project available now. If they lift the War Production order, the gentleman knows that there is \$1,217,771 available.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. But it would take \$10,000,000 to complete the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; it will take more, but in the meantime, I find that Members of Congress, as well as the department heads, know and others know the way at the other end of the Capitol, and they often get what they want over there. I think that if this stop order is not lifted until after this bill becomes a law, the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which, as I have said, is in session nearly all of the time, can consider the matter. The gentleman with his persuasive powers would still have an opportunity to come before his own colleagues, and tell them that this is essential.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have the statement that when we go back to the deficiency appropriation subcommittee, that we will at least have a favorable consideration of this project, because I feel that this one project is absolutely essential to the war effort. It will not be very long before we can convince the War Production Board that that is a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Along the same line, with regard to the same character of item, do I understand the gentleman to say that the appropriations herein made are really token appropriations or sustaining appropriations and may be added to as circumstances warrant, later? I am hopeful that the stop order will not need to remain in effect long on some of these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will look at these items he will see that they are very much more than token appropriations. They amount to millions and millions of dollars, much more than token appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certain appropriations here seem to me too small even under war conditions, for reclamation works mean power production and food production vitally necessary in war.

#### GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like next, to refer to the Geological Survey.

We have recommended a total cut of only \$72,702 in this activity. A considerable portion of the work of the Survey is of direct value to the war and it is for this reason we have not made greater reductions in this activity. Let me give you one or two instances of what they have accomplished.

One geologist employed by the Survey was exploring deposits in the State of Idaho when he discovered ore containing tungsten, which is essential for the hardening of steel. This deposit has been developed and is now producing over 10 percent of our total need. It is valued at between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000.

Another outstanding accomplishment of the Survey, with the cooperation of the Bureau of Mines, was the location of chromite deposits in the Stillwater region

of Montana. Chromite is also used in the manufacture of steel alloys and as a rust resistant. As a result of this discovery, plants are now in operation capable of supplying about two-thirds of our total needs.

#### BUREAU OF MINES

The Bureau of Mines is, without doubt, more actively engaged in the war effort than any other bureau in the entire Department. For this reason, your committee recommended a reduction of slightly less than \$200,000 in the estimate of \$8,835,130. Let me call attention of Members especially to the fact that the Bureau's experimental and research work in connection with strategic minerals, pilot plant experiments, and the development of helium wells are all directly and materially aiding in the war program.

In connection with the item under the Bureau of Mines for oil and gas investigations the committee was particularly interested in a new estimate of \$33,000 to stimulate oil production by secondary recovery methods which method is proving very successful. In view of the vital importance of oil in connection with the war effort, the committee is impressed with the urgency of this program and recommends that the Bureau of Mines exert every effort to carry the work forward to a successful conclusion.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

We have recommended a reduction of \$835,190 in funds for this activity, a cut of about 18 percent, as heretofore stated. While this is a drastic reduction, we felt this was one activity which could be reduced during the present emergency without seriously impairing the administration, protection, and maintenance of the national parks of the country. Travel in the parks will undoubtedly be cut in half or more during the coming season, and large numbers of resignations to enter the war effort and the ever-increasing demand for manpower will make it impossible for this Service to secure qualified personnel to fill vacancies as they occur.

It is probable that some of the parks will be used to rehabilitate our men who have been disabled in the service of their country. In fact, park officials advised the committee that this is not only seriously contemplated, but that arrangements are now being made to use some of the parks for such purpose. Yosemite National Park is one of them. We feel that this is a very commendable undertaking on the part of the Park Service, and that several parks of the country would make ideal homes in which our war-weary, shell-shocked, and otherwise disabled veterans may be able to rest and recuperate.

To utilize the present parks, in our judgment, would be much more practical as well as far more economical than to build additional Federal hospitals. And one or the other must be done in view of the losses we have thus far suffered and the heavier losses we are fearful our Nation must suffer, according to those in a position to know, if and when we invade the continent of Europe and the islands of Japan.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

#### FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When are we going to get to the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to discuss that now, and I will say to the gentleman that I have long been a believer in the Fish and Wildlife Service. I have long been a member of the Izaak Walton League. It is a great league and has done a great deal for the country in promoting fish and wildlife. I know the officials in charge of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Dr. Gabrielson is a great expert and efficient officer. And my friend Mr. Jackson, the assistant director, is doing a fine job. But some of the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service are not directly connected with the war effort. Therefore, the committee felt that pending the duration it would be possible for the Fish and Wildlife Service to take a rather drastic cut, along with the Indian Service, along with the Bureau of Reclamation, and along with many other departments. There are 26 agencies of government in this department and we made substantial reductions in every one of them.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Now let me interrogate the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's membership in the Izaak Walton League and the sportsman's angle of it, but what we are interested in is the commercial fishing industry. Those of us who live in that part of the country where these industries are located are constantly getting complaints about their inability to get information or advice or any kind of cooperation worthy of the name to maintain and build up the fishery organizations in this country. What I would like to ask the gentleman is whether or not in this appropriation any substantial cut has been made in the fishery-industry item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And whether or not the officials in charge of the Division of Fisheries are taking some notice of the complaints of the fishery organizations all over the country in respect to their inability to get information, advice, and cooperation from that department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I must say to the gentleman that this item is cut, and cut drastically; cut more than some members of the committee felt it should be cut.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the fishery-industry item been cut?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Because of the general feeling that it could be cut without doing any great injustice to the service and without greatly impairing the efficiency of that particular activity.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When Dr. Gabrielson appeared before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries last week in respect to a bill that had as its objective the transferring of the Fish and Wildlife Service from the



Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture, he said then that he had not been able to give, or the Division had not been able to give as much service to the commercial fisheries as they would like, because they are limited. The gentleman says they have ample funds. They say to us they are interested in the fisheries industry, but that they are limited. What are the facts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I made the statement at the outset that this was cut drastically along with every other agency of Government. All 26 agencies are cut. This is not the only agency that took a reduction. I made the further statement that it was cut more than some of the members thought it should be cut. We are in a desperate war, a war that will decide the future of this country for generations to come. I would rather be charged with cutting a little too drastically during these perilous times than to say the committee has spent too much money.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman of course knows that the fishery industry is one of the basic food sources of the country. Last year we suffered a loss of over a hundred million pounds of fish below the year 1941. If we are going to build up our food supply, certainly we ought to lend every encouragement we can to that department of Government that has charge and has authority and has the machinery and the personnel to maintain that source of food supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now the gentleman has made a very excellent speech and I appreciate it and I agree with him, but I hold in my hand a list of 37 Members of Congress who came before our committee, every one of them just as interested as is the gentleman in this particular industry; everyone of them showing us that their particular item was in the interest of the war effort. They were just as enthusiastic about it as is the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman that I think in most cases they were as much justified in asking for an increase as is the gentleman. Thirty-seven Members of Congress and three United States Senators and twelve pressure groups—everyone of them asking us for money, money, money. "Give us money." And, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, used to say, "Where are you going to get the money?" If the committee had given those 37 Members of Congress, and the 3 United States Senators, one-tenth of what they asked, this committee instead of coming here and saying, "We have reduced the Interior Department bill 60 percent this year under what it took to operate last year," we would have to tell you that we had increased it more than 60 percent. So I will say to the gentleman, as important as it is, as much as I agree with him that this is an important item, there are other items and other people who were demanding additional funds.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand from reading the hearings the only reduction made in this appropriation is \$172,000, an appropriation which was made a year ago for the pur-

pose of making some sort of a substitute for tin for containers. That is the only reduction that is made in this item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is not the only thing. We reduced the Budget estimate \$68,540 because the committee was not convinced that it was connected with the war effort.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that in the "Fisheries industry" item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is not shown here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Budget cut out \$172,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. \$172,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the committee reduced the item an additional \$68,540.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is the committee going to have any meeting at a subsequent date?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This is the annual appropriation bill. There will not be another such bill until next year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is the deficiency committee meeting?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is meeting today. As the gentleman, I am sure, knows, it meets during this emergency almost daily. It meets almost every day. We should be glad to have the gentleman come before the committee. He talks very persuasively.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; I must be making an impression.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in some sections of New England our people have not had meat for over a week, and they can get no fish. I should like very much to appear before the gentleman's committee at a later date. I am hoping that the gentleman from Oklahoma will join in supporting the Senate's action when it puts the item back in the bill. We have simply got to maintain the strength of our workers; they must have the necessary food, especially when they are working in heavy industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am certain the Committee on Appropriations would always be glad to hear her; for she, too, is very persuasive. I noticed that instead of saying: "If the Senate puts the item back" she said: "When it puts the item back." I may say that she is probably correct in her statement of the situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with our need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have a few more remarks which I would like to make in connection with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

For the second consecutive year, the committee has been faced with the duty of making rather severe reductions in some very worthy items for this activity. Doubtless they can and will be restored when the war is over. We have recom-

mended a total reduction of \$855,015 in the estimate which, as I have said, is a cut of 15 percent.

Under the heading, "Biological Investigations," we have eliminated an item of \$87,500 for studies under the heading "Life History, Interrelation, and Distributional Studies of Wildlife." We felt that this was one item which could be deferred at least for the duration.

#### PITTMAN-ROBERTSON FUNDS REDUCED

The item of Federal-aid to wildlife under the Pittman-Robertson Act has been reduced by \$500,000. The committee is aware of the fact that funds for this particular purpose are secured from a special tax on small arms and ammunition and that a bookkeeping credit on the books of the Treasury in excess of \$9,000,000 is available for appropriation. However, in recommending a reduction of \$500,000 the committee believes it is not asking too much of the sportsmen and conservation authorities of America to accept further retrenchment in this activity during the war period. While the committee is in sympathy with the purpose of the Pittman-Robertson Act, it wishes to point out that the fund will remain intact and be available for appropriation at a later date, particularly during the post-war period when millions of men returning from the armed forces will be desperately in need of work. This fund will provide a reservoir of peacetime projects which will assist in giving employment to such men.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am after some information, Mr. Chairman. I have not been able to go through all these hearings as yet, but I notice where the committee took testimony on the Bonneville Authority. Was any statement made before the gentleman's committee about extending Bonneville power up into Idaho and Montana, specifically up into the Flathead Lake region?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that from time to time that suggestion has been made. I believe I am not giving away any secret when I say that it is actually contemplated as soon as it is humanly possible to do so. Whether it can be done during these wartimes I do not know.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. What justifications do they offer for raising the level of Flathead Lake, for example, and raising the level of Lake Pend Oreille?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot tell the gentleman, but I shall be pleased to see if I can get the information for him.

#### GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Funds are provided in the bill for administrative expenses and other obligations in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

You will be interested to know that the Alaska Railroad is now operating without a deficit which we had to meet annually up to a few years ago. For one period of time, covering several years, the deficit amounted to approximately \$1,000,000 annually. It is estimated that

there will be a profit of \$1,500,000 during the next fiscal year. Profits for the current year are estimated at about \$2,300,000.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

The last matter which I wish to call to your attention is the appropriation for salaries and expenses in the Virgin Islands, in which was contained an estimate of \$5,800 for the salary of the Secretary of the Virgin Islands, Mr. Robert Morss Lovett. As you know, the House on day before yesterday approved the action of the Kerr subcommittee and the whole Appropriations Committee in recommending that no part of any appropriation, allocation, or other fund should be available for payment of compensation to this employee. The committee received a vote of approval of its recommendation by adoption of the amendment, the vote being 318 to 62.

While the Interior Department subcommittee was not charged with the duty of investigating subversive activities in the case of this individual, we were interested in the matter so widely publicized inasmuch as his salary was contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is significant that in a personal letter from the Secretary of the Interior to Mr. Lovett under date of April 25, 1941, a copy of which was furnished the committee, the Secretary severely criticized this employee in a rather lengthy and sharply worded letter to him because of his alleged membership in certain subversive organizations. The Secretary, according to the letter, stated that the Department had frequently been called upon to defend Lovett against charges, first, that he was a Communist and, second, that he was sympathetic to communism and therefore in effect a so-called fellow traveler.

The committee made no effort to try this employee. But it did hear the present occupant of the office, who appeared at the request of the committee and expressed his opinions and so-called philosophies. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the salary, amounting to \$5,800, could be eliminated from the bill, especially in view of the present occupant, without impairing to the remotest degree the efficiency of the administration of the Virgin Islands. The committee reached this deliberate conclusion despite a lengthy communication from the Secretary of the Interior defending the record, activities, and general conduct of the present occupant of the position recommended for elimination.

#### RÉSUMÉ OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEE

In conclusion and in summing up, permit me to remind Members of the House again that drastic reductions have been made in some instances. But, frankly, I would rather be charged with reducing some of these activities, especially nondefense activities, too drastically during this desperate emergency than to be charged with being too liberal with the various activities affected. It is one thing to talk about economy in government and it is entirely another thing

to vote for drastic economies, especially when there are so many pressure groups, departmental heads, and others who are demanding more and more funds.

If you will examine the bill and the report you will find that all of the 26 agencies in the Department of the Interior have been rather severely cut. It cannot be successfully charged that the committee has picked on any one particular agency or activity. Let me remind Members also that this bill represents a 60-percent reduction under the current year, that it is reduced more than 11 percent below the Budget estimates, and that the Interior Department is now operating on an operation-and-maintenance basis. There are no new construction projects in the entire bill, and except for Central Valley, which the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture tell our committee has become increasingly urgent for the war effort, there are no funds even for the continuation of projects heretofore approved by Congress and on which construction work had heretofore been undertaken.

It is with more than an ordinary degree of pride that your committee presents the Interior bill today, and it is our sincere hope that the bill can be expedited through the House without delay and without any material changes.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What happened in connection with the Central Valley project, Shasta Dam, and those items?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] will go into some detail about those items. The Budget estimate was for \$16,400,000. It was urged by the War Production Board as well as other Government agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, and while the committee did make a considerable cut in it, there is an item of nearly \$12,000,000 in the bill for it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was a supplemental request which was not contained in the original Budget estimate.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee and state that I believe that the War Production Board stop orders as to work necessary for the food program should be lifted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FORD. It had been my intention to offer a proviso containing a declaration of policy that by reason of the hooking up of this authority and private power in this particular case that the private corporations should have no vested right which they could assert after

the emergency was over, but the Parliamentarian informs me that it would be out of order and could not be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from California that private power certainly would not receive any vested right simply because of the action of the committee. I think the committee made itself plain, and the gentleman knows my position. I supported Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and the Parker Dam. In my statement here I show that the revenue from these dams has been very gratifying and that those gentlemen who called them white elephants and ridiculed the idea of those dams as power projects are now admitting that they were not "white elephants."

Mr. FORD. I simply wanted to get the intent of Congress in the Record.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee for the very fair and impartial manner in which he conducted the hearings. We of the minority were given every opportunity to examine witnesses and any other evidence that was presented. I also want to say that Mr. William Duvall, clerk of the committee, was very helpful at these hearings. He is a most capable clerk and renders a splendid service.

This bill is cut nearly \$120,000,000 below the 1943 bill. Of course, we have got to do a lot of cutting in order to reduce the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 nearly \$120,000,000 under what it was for 1943. After the Bureau of the Budget had used the pruning shears on this bill, the committee considered it and cut an additional \$9,227,226 off the bill below the Bureau of the Budget estimate.

That is going to make cuts in matters in which many of us are interested. It made cuts in matters in which I was interested, I know. While I have been a member of this committee I have endeavored to hold the appropriations down; however, may I say that I am more satisfied with this bill than any bill that I have ever had anything to do with bringing on the floor of the House. I did not have my way in all respects. There are some items in this bill that I believe could stand even greater cuts. There are some items, a few, one in particular, that I feel have been cut too much, but you must appreciate that we cannot have our way in all these matters. We have to work cooperatively and we have to give and take. So for the first time since I have been on the Appropriations Committee I stand here on the floor of this House prepared to defend every item in this bill. I have never made that statement before, but I am here to do that in reference to this bill because it has been cut to somewhere near the place that I feel it should be cut.

Considerable was said a few moments ago about the matter of reclamation. I



know the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is very much interested in that, and I am, too. May I say to the gentleman that a number of those recommended projects are being studied at the present time and I am hopeful that the stop orders will be removed as to a number of them. The fact that we did not make an appropriation for them in no way militates against the consideration that is being given them at the present time. I have talked with members of the War Production Board about these reclamation projects. I have talked to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and others who are interested in them from a food point of view. The question of their not being appropriated for has never been raised. In fact, as was pointed out a few minutes ago, there is money available at the present time to carry on some of that construction work. To be sure it is not enough to finish it, but may I say to the gentleman from Utah and to the other Members who are interested in reclamation, as I am, that the minute these stop orders are removed immediate steps will be taken to provide the money. May I say further that I will be one who will be helping those who are out to get the money so that the work can be carried on with the greatest dispatch.

Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said here about the reduction of the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service. May I say that personally I am very much in sympathy with the work that that Service is carrying on. I believe that Dr. Gabrielson and Mr. Jackson and their efficient staff are carrying on that work and doing a very splendid job. But if you will turn to page 2 of the report you will find there that of the various items set out there is not one single item but what received a good cut. Perhaps our cuts were too drastic at times in connection with some of these particular items, and, as I told you awhile ago, I think they were in reference to one which I want to speak about a little later. While I feel they were very drastic, I think that all of us must take our cuts in good spirit. We have to work out this problem as best we can. May I say that I have been advocating cutting, so my colleagues on the committee endeavored to demonstrate to me in connection with an item I was especially interested in what might be accomplished when it came to real cutting.

The Bureau of the Budget was late in getting in their report on the Central Valley project, and when it finally reached our committee they approved an item amounting to \$16,400,000. As the bill originally came to the committee there was not 1 cent in it for the Central Valley Authority, but this supplemental estimate was sent up after the hearings closed, and at my request the committee held a special meeting, considered that item, and then to demonstrate to me what good cutting was they cut it down to \$11,500,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it is fair to say, however, that there was cash available, unexpended, in that particular fund of \$26,500,000. I think the gentleman is going to have to agree that I was one of the members opposed quite violently to the full request of \$16,400,000.

Mr. CARTER. I will agree that the gentleman was violent when it came to cutting that particular item. He will not have any trouble in getting me to agree to that.

Mr. JENSEN. Very well. It had been shown they got more money than they could expend because there was \$26,500,000 left in that fund. They asked for an additional \$16,400,000, which the committee finally cut down to \$11,500,000. If it had not been for the fact that so much money had been expended on this project a different attitude might have been taken, but this was originally supposed to cost only \$170,000,000, while to date we have spent over \$300,000,000. Somebody's figures were wrong, and, in my opinion, the committee was justified in cutting down this amount in the light of those facts and figures which we had.

Mr. CARTER. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, it is true that they have a carry-over of \$26,500,000 as of January 31 of this year, and that is one reason why I reluctantly accepted this cut; otherwise, I would have been down there battling for the rest of it yet. But the gentleman is in error in one statement. He said the original estimate on the project was \$170,000,000, which is true. However, the gentleman said that around \$300,000,000 had been spent up to this time. The gentleman is in error in reference to that. It is now estimated it will cost, when finished, about \$333,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. I did make that error.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is now estimated to cost \$333,605,000.

Mr. CARTER. I will say a part of the additional cost has been by reason of increasing the height of the Shasta Dam so that more power could be generated; a part of that is brought about by reason of the fact that they propose to build a steam plant costing between \$15,000,000 and \$20,000,000, something I had never heard of until a couple of years ago; a part of it is for transmission lines, costing approximately \$25,000,000, that I am not sure should be built. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that if it is demonstrated the steam plant and this additional power line are necessary I am going to be down here advocating them, even though the project does ultimately cost \$333,000,000, instead of \$170,000,000 as originally estimated, because I believe it is worth that to this country, and I believe the power generated at Shasta Dam will largely amortize the entire project—irrigation, flood control, salinity control, and navigation combined.

Mr. JENSEN. If those facts had not been stressed and established before the committee, certainly he would not have got even the \$11,500,000.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will study this Central Valley project carefully. I know he is sincerely interested in it, and I hope that

I may have his support in the future in reference to other appropriations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate it very much, and I am very sure that the gentleman will feel sympathetic to restoring the fisheries item when the bill comes back from the Senate. You know fish is a good brain food, and at the same time it provides physical strength, and there is need for all the brains and all the physical strength we can have today; there is a shortage of both fish and meat today.

Mr. CARTER. I am just wondering if the gentleman is suggesting fish as a diet for the speaker of the present moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from California has a very fine mind. He does not need fish for that purpose; but there is a shortage of both meat and fish, and I know he would like to have it in order that the population of the country may maintain its full strength during these critical war days.

Mr. CARTER. I have a large fisheries industry in my own district, and I am interested in that. When this bill is in conference and this item of the fisheries industry is being considered, I will, as she requests, assume a very sympathetic attitude toward that item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For which we all thank you very much.

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

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the same virtues that applied to the Central Valley project, all of which are very true, do not apply to most of the reclamation projects.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I think the gentleman's statement is correct; I think that is true. These reclamation projects, generally, are projects that pay by their ultimate cost into the Treasury of the United States. In addition to that, they increase property values and stabilize communities and are very beneficial to the country generally.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman said he would be glad to answer any question as to the reasons for the decrease of any item within the bureaus. May I ask the gentleman if he can inform us why they cut \$68,540 out of the fisheries industry item, when it was admitted that they cannot carry on the work of that organization with that amount?

Mr. CARTER. As has just been said, and the chairman also answered that question, and as I called to the attention of the Committee a few minutes ago, we cut every item. There is not a bureau or an agency in here that, perhaps, could not take care of its work better if it had more money. They have just got to work a little harder. As I stated awhile ago, I have a great deal of faith in Mr. Gabrielson and Mr. Jackson, and I

believe that even with the reduced funds they can carry on and do a very splendid work.

It may be that we hit that item a little hard. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and he knows we must cover a large number of items, often in a short time, and it may be that we were a little unduly hard. I thought we were unduly hard about the Central Valley project itself, but, as I stated a few moments ago, if that item should be increased in the Senate, I would look with sympathy on the matter when we get in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I can join with other members of the subcommittee that brought in this bill in saying that I firmly in my heart believe it to be a good bill. There are some items I should like to cut considerably more. Without hunting very far, I think I could find an additional cut of \$1,000,000. I do not, however, propose to offer any amendments because this appropriation bill is such a departure from the bills I have worked on in the past that the improvement, I think, is worthy of a little support even from a humble Republican member of the economy bloc.

In the first place, this bill dramatizes some fights we have had on the floor in the past. You recall that for the fiscal year 1941 the appropriation for the Interior Department was \$155,000,000. For the fiscal year 1942, upon which we voted in the summer of 1941, the committee brought in a bill of \$177,000,000. At the time that bill was brought before the House for consideration, I presented a motion to recommit the bill to the subcommittee for a cut of approximately \$20,000,000 because I felt we should be gearing the Interior Department to war. In 1941, the Secretary of the Interior was running around the country telling the people to get ready to get into World War No. 2, and I felt that if the Secretary of the Interior was aware of impending war his Department ought to be one of the first to gear itself to war.

During the hearings of 1941 I asked the Interior Department to prepare for me a statement of the actual amount that was for national defense. Out of the Budget estimate of \$183,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942, only \$43,420,400 was for national defense. That prompted me to make the motion in 1941 to cut \$20,000,000 from the 1942 fiscal year appropriation bill. This attempt to hold the line against inflation and to hold the line against Government boondoggling, leaving the bill at the 1941 figure of \$155,000,000, was wholly unappreciated by the majority of the membership.

The motion to recommit was overwhelmingly defeated and the bill went to conference, was raised considerably, approved by the Senate and House, and signed by the President.

Last year a considerable effort was made, especially by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, to successively amend the bill, and I confess I was not

a shrinking violet in offering economy amendments to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. I see here now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who offered several amendments at the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment last year. The first amendment the gentleman from Ohio offered, as I recall, was to cut the nondefense items of the Interior bill by 50 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The amendment was to cut the nondefense portion of the bill—\$92,000,000—by 50 percent, which would have been \$46,000,000. That would have amounted actually to a reduction of 28 percent in the entire appropriation. In this bill the subcommittee made a reduction of nearly 60 percent of the 1943 appropriation.

That amendment received 5 votes in the affirmative. I then offered an amendment cutting the nondefense portion of the appropriation, \$92,000,000, by 25 percent. That amendment received 14 votes. Then I offered an amendment cutting the nondefense portion by 10 percent, and that amendment, if I recall correctly, received approximately 38 favorable votes.

I am happy to see that a change has come upon the Members of this House, especially the members of the appropriations subcommittee having this particular portion of the Interior Department appropriation under consideration. It is truly gratifying.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know that our former colleague from Pennsylvania, who many times stood on the floor of this House and asked "Where are you going to get the money?" would be pleased today if he were here to see the subcommittee reporting the bill as you find it today, recommending to the House for appropriation the total sum of \$72,861,316 for the entire Department of the Interior.

Now I want to turn to the portions of the bill in which I think I could save another \$1,000,000 if I were writing it myself. I want to pay my humble tribute to the other members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the fine spirit with which we approached the writing of this bill. There was never a time when we disagreed to the point of becoming disagreeable on any provisions regarding the amounts to be appropriated for any bureau or agency within the Interior Department.

The portion with which I find fault is in the authorization to allow unexpended funds of last year to be used for administrative purposes this year. The amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget was \$3,287,000. The committee allowed \$3,200,000 for administrative expenses. The cut of \$87,000 was for these purposes, and I quote now the committee report:

There was a total unexpended balance of \$46,600,000 available as of January 31, 1943, and it is estimated there will be an unallocated balance of \$30,000,000 as of June 30,

1943. Of this latter sum the committee has recommended that \$3,200,000 be made available for expenses of marketing, operation, and administrative costs, a reduction of \$87,000 in the Budget estimate. The committee has applied the major part of this reduction to funds for district offices and has apportioned the remainder to miscellaneous administrative expenses, and particularly to such items as involve informational activities.

I hope the language of the committee in this report will be adhered to by the Bonneville Power Administration. I think this is the heart of the waste perpetrated upon the American people. I think the \$87,000 is a meritorious cut, made at a strategic place.

If you will turn to the hearings, you will find a statement placed in the record showing the difference between the administrative costs for 1943, with a sizable construction program, and the 1944 administrative costs, with zero construction. The 1943 total figure, with the enormous amounts that were appropriated for construction, included only \$3,525,000 for both construction cost and operating cost. The operation limitation, the major activity for the fiscal year 1944 with zero construction, was \$1,655,112. If they could get along with an allocation of \$1,655,000 for the administration of the Bonneville power operation during the present fiscal year, then they should not have a sizable increase for the 1944 fiscal year.

At page 482 you will find a table describing exactly what I mean. The table is prepared by Bonneville Administration officials:

Division	Requirements 1943			Estimated requirement, 1944 zero construction
	Construction funds	Operation limitation	Total	
Administrative.....	\$56,411	\$188,854	\$245,265	\$206,578
Accounting.....	142,894	174,647	317,541	180,664
Engineering.....	577,204	984,171	1,561,375	1,791,768
Information.....	24,701	27,359	52,060	31,917
Land.....	64,483	-----	64,483	24,619
Legal.....	43,540	92,522	136,062	101,046
Office service.....	208,472	35,050	243,522	196,846
Defense guards.....	398,620	-----	398,620	367,000
Personnel.....	108,225	15,480	123,705	52,854
Procurement.....	75,400	5,770	81,170	36,187
Power management.....	170,000	131,259	301,259	297,521
Total.....	1,869,950	1,655,112	3,525,062	3,287,000

<sup>1</sup> Represents fiscal year total requirements and gives effect to reductions in staff already accomplished.

I have not heard anybody, outside of Dr. Raver, estimate there would be more than \$16,000,000 for construction next fiscal year. I doubt if W. P. B. will release material for that much expenditure. So, if you cut \$1,000,000 from the \$3,200,000 that we have allowed to Bonneville, and leave this authorization at \$2,200,000, there will still be a \$600,000 leeway for whatever construction W. P. B. may allow, and Congress will still be in session, certainly, as in the past, to bring in a deficiency appropriation bill for any emergency that we do not foresee now.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.



Mr. JONES. I think this is a logical approach to cutting another million dollars from this appropriation bill, and that it should be made, because the type of personnel they have at the Bonneville Administration is the type that the Army and the Navy need—skilled personnel men, skilled engineers. We certainly need to enlist all of these people in the war effort.

I call attention to another item that bears reflection, and that is the number of personnel in the Interior Department by years. In 1944, for the fiscal year 1944, with the reductions that we have made, I do not know what the final amount of personnel will be, but I can say that if the Interior Department does what it should these cuts will find their way to the personnel that should be shaved in the war effort from the ordinary peacetime functions of the Interior Department.

I asked the Secretary to put a statement in the record of the number of personnel necessary to run the Interior Department by years. You will find the information tabulated on page 33 of the hearings. As of June 30, 1940, there were 48,947 employees in the Interior Department; as of June 30, 1941, there were 48,569; as of June 30, 1942, 47,823; as of December 31, 1942, 13 months after Pearl Harbor, there were 39,774. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this record is a challenge to the great problem of manpower for the battle fronts, and on the home fronts. It seems to me that if the Secretary of the Interior had been as alert to gear his agency into the war effort as he has been advising others to gear themselves into the war effort, that we could have cut this personnel 1 year ago somewhere near the same proportion that the committee has cut the dollar sign in this bill today.

There is another item that seems to me very important and that is the cost of information in the Interior Department. Every year there is a battle to find out how much the Interior Department is spending for press releases and publicity. Two years ago I asked them to give me information as to the entire cost to the Interior Department and they gave me something near the figure of \$76,000. Then a year later I was able to get a report from the Bureau of the Budget showing that the entire information cost of the Department of the Interior was something more than \$2,400,000. This year I presented Mike Strauss, one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Interior, with these Budget figures. They are not prepared by any partisan, or by me. They were prepared by the Interior Department itself, who confessed that they had spent \$1,429,878 for publications and \$69,076 for press releases alone.

I asked them, first, to put a table into the record showing where any of this 1941 information personnel had been eliminated. You will not find the statement of that. Then I told them to break down the figures, category by category, on the same blanks and forms, so that the membership would have a basis to compare the 1944 fiscal year

costs of the information service with the 1941 costs which Interior prepared and gave to the Bureau of the Budget. To this date they have not sent any letter containing the information to either the clerk of the committee or to members of the subcommittee containing the amount. This flagrant denial of information for the committee is a challenge to the integrity of the House. I must confess it has a New Deal pattern not wholly without precedent. If we want to know how much money the Interior Department has spent for information, certainly Congress or Congressmen ought to be able to get it. We should be the judge of what we should or should not get. Certainly it is not within the discretion of any agency in the executive branch of the Government to deny us any material for which we ask. At this moment the Department has not given us the figures that they have or should have, and I am sorry that the committee did not eliminate the entire amount for information service in the Secretary's office, because of this flagrant denial of the rights of Congress.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the House has designated the Committee on Appropriations to investigate, prepare and report the necessary appropriation measures for consideration. This is a tremendous responsibility.

Your committee on appropriations is making every effort to be fair, reasonable and economical in the discharge of its duties; especially is this true of your subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations headed by our very able and considerate Chairman, Hon. JED JOHNSON, and Messrs. FITZPATRICK, KIRWAN, CARTER, JONES, and JENSEN. These other members of the subcommittee are also very able and conscientious. I endeavor to be helpful.

We are presenting for your consideration today the annual appropriation for the Department of the Interior, your division or branch of government having jurisdiction or custody of the Nation's natural resources.

At this particular time this Department is of very great importance. This war will be won by and with our courageous soldiers and our natural resources. This Department is mobilizing our resources—such as minerals, fuels, power and other critical and strategic materials for our war program.

At the time Germany invaded Norway in 1940 the Anglo-Saxon peoples controlled approximately 75 percent of the world's metals supply. Within a short time, Germany acquired the iron of Norway, the coal and iron of France and Belgium, the copper and aluminum-bearing bauxite of southeastern Europe and, in addition to this, the amount of metal available to us was reduced by Axis raids on our shipping. I think it can be said now that through the very outstanding accomplishments of the

Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines, the United Nations can and will be supplied with sufficient critical and strategic resources for all our needs.

We have allowed the Grazing Service the sum of \$856,700, which is \$26,000 below Budget estimates, to continue the administration, management, and protection of grazing resources on more than 140,000,000 acres of public range lands in grazing districts established in 10 Western States. These services make it possible for this section of our Nation to produce 9,000,000 head of sheep; approximately 2,000,000 head of cattle, 130,000 head of horses, 150,000 head of goats, and approximately 400,000 head of big-game animals. Other appropriations are for construction and maintenance, \$75,000, and for leasing of grazing lands, \$3,000. The domestic livestock are owned by more than 21,000 operators who receive licenses and permits for public-range privileges and they actually paid to the United States Treasury in fees, \$324,790 last year.

Your committee has recommended the sum of \$225,000, which is \$22,030 less than was appropriated last year, for the Petroleum Conservation Division which is necessary for continuing the work as contemplated by Executive Order No. 7755 of December 1, 1936.

The sum of \$1,198,200, which is \$141,800 less than last year's appropriation, has been provided for soil and moisture conservation. This amount is necessary to finance soil and moisture conservation operations on lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior as authorized under provisions of the Soil Conservation Act of April 27, 1935. Approximately 450,000,000 acres of land or 23 percent of the total area of the continental United States remain in Federal ownership. Of this area 280,000,000 acres are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Reports indicate that about 230,000,000 acres are in a condition requiring conservation treatment if the lands are to be kept in production and the badly eroded areas rehabilitated. Something like 60,000,000 acres under the jurisdiction of this Department is in a serious state of erosion. This program is partly self-sustaining. I believe last year they collected in excess of \$812,305 for services rendered.

The above and some other divisions are located in the Secretary's office. The total appropriation for all these activities in the Secretary's office last year amounted to \$6,855,365, whereas, this year the total amount recommended is \$4,026,480 which is \$2,828,885 less than it was a year ago.

I wish to call your attention at this point that no direct appropriation of new money is provided for the Bonneville Power Administration. It is, however, authorized to use not in excess of \$3,200,000 of its unobligated balance of the current appropriation.

The sum of \$97,200 is recommended for the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. This is \$66,300 less than the appropriation last year. This reduction is due to cessation of activities in the Philippines. Personnel detained by

the enemy in the Philippines are paid salaries and wages totaling \$62,800 per annum. This amount is frozen as an obligation under the provisions of Public Law No. 490—Seventy-seventh Congress. The balance of the appropriation covers necessary funds for salaries and expenses of other officers, presently located in this Nation.

The sum of \$850,000 has been recommended for the Solid Fuels Administration for War, which was created by Executive order under date of April 19, 1943. Under the terms of the order this organization absorbs the office of Fuel Coordinator for War. This amount is \$70,000 less than the amount provided in the last appropriation bill.

The General Land Office has been provided with the total sum of \$2,119,350. This is \$201,110, less than was provided in the last appropriation measure. In this connection I call your attention to the fact that the earnings of this Department for the fiscal year for 1942 were \$9,014,172.87. Their income approximately was four and one-half times as much last year as their expenditures.

Your committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,388,500 for the Bureau of Reclamation, which is \$1,258,560 less than the amount that was provided last year, and \$12,100,000 for general construction funds which is \$67,279,340 less than last year. The Bureau played a very important role during the fiscal year. It functioned as chief supplier of electric power, foodstuffs, and water—three basic essentials of national existence in war or in peace. Stored water irrigated more than 3,000,000 acres of productive land, and the gross value of 1941 crops on land served with Reclamation water was \$159,885,998. These values do not, of course, include the livestock fattened on Reclamation projects, nor dairy products which, if included, would increase the production by approximately 25 percent. The Bureau is the principal Federal agency engaged in the construction and operation of water projects for irrigation and power. Its activities are confined to 17 western States. The rainfall in this region is insufficient for crop production. Without water conservation and irrigation it would be impossible for the 15,000,000 people who live in that area, to sustain themselves or maintain their great military centers and other war activities. Last year the Bureau supplied irrigation water to 37,000,000 acres of western land which produced two and one-half million 100-pound sacks of beans, about 36,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and they were able to feed their dairy herds which yielded to the Nation 144,000,000 pounds of beef and 1,709,000 pounds of milk. The gross revenue in 1942 from power plants on 10 projects operated by the Bureau exceeded \$9,000,000. Receipts from landowners whose lands were irrigated by Reclamation Bureau amount to \$6,122,430.56.

This committee has recommended for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds, the sum of \$26,926,421, which is \$1,845,320.43 less than was provided in the current appropriation bill.

In addition to this sum, we have recommended a total for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from tribal funds the sum of \$1,577,655. This is \$20,205 more than was spent last year but this money belongs to these tribes and they have recommended this method of expenditure. I do not believe that the Indians are receiving as much consideration at the hands of Congress as other citizens of the United States, but these services do offer some measure of equality and the appropriation is much less than was provided last year.

We have recommended for the Geological Survey the total sum of \$4,474,600, which is \$216,490 less than the amount provided last year. During the past several years with the gathering of war clouds in Europe, the outbreak of war on that continent, its rapid spread to other parts of the world, its close threat to our peace and security, and finally our entry into the conflict, it became necessary for the Geological Survey to mobilize its facilities and its strength and shift its energies from peace to wartime activities. No agency of the Government has been of more vital service to the war effort than the Geological Survey and practically all its work presently is being done for the military services. The hearings are complete and I wish all Members would read the outstanding accomplishments of this great department. They have done very outstanding work in Arkansas in the exploration of zinc deposits in southwest Arkansas; quartz crystals in central Arkansas. Our quartz crystals are now being developed in greater quantity, and tests heretofore made of a small amount of crude crystals turned out to be higher in grade than that from Brazil. The Metal Reserve Corporation has leased certain areas containing quartz crystals in the Ouachita National Forests and this corporation proposes to do very extensive mining. Bauxite, of course, is our No. 1 mineral. More men and more money have been devoted by the Geological Survey on this mineral than all other minerals in Arkansas. More extensive geological surveys are planned for the future with money provided in this bill, and it can be said now that Arkansas will give forth to the Nation sufficient bauxite from which aluminum will be made to supply our needs.

We have recommended for the Bureau of Mines a total appropriation of \$8,835,130, which is a decrease over the budget estimate of \$194,905. It is hard to discuss separately the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey, because their work is to some extent in the same field. The Geological Survey makes the necessary surveys and the Bureau of Mines makes the necessary investigations and tests. Extensive studies and investigations, however, have been made of practically all of Arkansas' minerals as well as the minerals of other States. The hearings are very extensive. Sixty million tons of bauxite and "potential ores" depending on the perfection of the extraction process have been discovered in Arkansas: 6,835,000 tons grade A; 8,941,000 tons grade B; 10,439,000 tons grade C; and

the balance of 34,000,000 which cannot presently be processed; and extensive investigations are planned for the ensuing year, by which it is believed that additional large deposits may be discovered. Arkansas produces presently 97.3 percent of the bauxite produced in the United States. Other strategic minerals, such as manganese, mercury, nickel, tungsten, chromium, tin, and a multiplicity of other critical materials have been discovered throughout the Nation, and these deposits assure us of victory insofar as the mobilization of strategic and critical materials are concerned.

The National Park Service has been provided with \$3,957,810, which is \$1,529,555 less than they had last year, and many of our parks are now being used exclusively by our military services. Others are being turned over to the military services, soldiers from the battlefields are going to have the exclusive use of many of our best and most beautiful parks for their enjoyment. The Park Service has rendered a very great contribution to the war effort.

This committee recommended \$4,897,350 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, which is \$1,014,220 less than last year. This Service is also engaged in the war effort and they are making a tremendous contribution toward solving the food supply of this and the other United Nations.

For all activities in Alaska we have recommended \$1,392,600, which is \$607,720 less than they had last year. Alaska has become a strategic area. For the first time in my knowledge the Alaskan Railroad has been more than self-sustaining. It may be said that Alaska is, so far as this Nation is concerned, the most strategic area at the present time.

We have recommended \$21,600 for Hawaii, which is \$46,800 less than the amount they had last year—the total amount for last year being \$68,400. The Virgin Islands have been given \$125,000.

I have not agreed with all of the reductions made in this bill. I do not agree with all items that have been allowed. However, as a whole, I think the bill represents the very careful and considerate judgment of this committee, and while very drastic cuts have been made in practically all items I wish to compliment the various departments and other witnesses for being charitable with this committee in its endeavor to honestly extend in this bill the economies so desired by the people in all matters and more especially in those items which do not make some contribution to the war effort.

Also, I would like to call your attention to the fact that while we have reduced the total appropriation from \$192,860,791.43, allowed last year, to the sum of \$82,188,576, which is the amount recommended this year, "making a net reduction of \$119,999,475.43," I wish to call your attention to the fact that of the amount allowed for expenditures for the next fiscal year, all but approximately \$19,000,000 will be expended from receipts of the various divisions of the Department of the Interior. In other words, the taxpayers of the United States, for the maintenance of all these



activities, shall not be called upon to pay more than approximately \$19,000,000. This is an excellent record, and, in my judgment, all sections of the Department of the Interior from its director to its minor officers should be highly complimented.

We think we have done a reasonably good job. We hope the House may reach such conclusion from a very careful study and consideration of the bill, and we believe the amounts finally allowed by the House should be sustained, bearing in mind the historic function of the House of Representatives with reference to making appropriation bills.

Summing up the status of the bill, I advise that the amount for the next fiscal year is \$119,999,475, below the 1943 appropriation. This represents a very drastic reduction in practically all funds for the many activities of the Department of the Interior. The reduction in Budget estimates recommended by your committee is \$9,327,260. The bill as reported to the House through voluntary cuts by the Department of the Interior, reductions made by the Bureau of the Budget, and reductions made by your committee, all told, reflects a 60-percent cut from the current appropriations.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to congratulate my colleague and the other members of the subcommittee for the splendid job they have done in bringing this appropriation bill to the House at a considerably less amount than was contained in the bill last year. I feel that the action of the subcommittee can be followed by some of the other subcommittees. It is a splendid example and I hope the example set will be contagious.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, before covering the subject matter pertaining to the Bonneville item in this bill, I wish to point out the great contribution to the common defense made by this committee. This contribution has resulted from the committee's early vision in providing transmission capacity from the Bonneville plant, which is in my district. The War Department subcommittee also shares in this contribution by their early vision in authorizing the last eight generating units. It is with a high degree of satisfaction that I refer to the committee's contribution, as I can speak with intimate knowledge.

The facts are that when our Nation entered this war, we were ill prepared to fight a modern war. Such wars are based on highly developed electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries. Through the operations of international cartels, during the period from 1920 to 1941, this Nation was relegated to an inferior position in this field of activity. Those of us who have investigated this matter early knew that Germany was

expanding such industries by 1,000 percent of the capacity available in 1933.

It is hard to realize how this Nation would have been able to cope with the existing situation without the early provision for Federal hydropower. It is apparent to those of us who are familiar with the situation, that our Nation's expenditure of blood and treasure, would have been far greater if we had no early expanded electrical capacity, so as to make electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes early available.

At least 75 percent of the light metals going into our air program comes from the Federal power plants in the Pacific Northwest, in California, the Western States, and the Southeast. The largest portion of these light-metal requirements comes from the western plants. Appropriation provisions for these western plants comes within the jurisdiction of the Interior committee. It has been stated on several occasions that preparedness depends on foresight. Without the foresight of this committee, our country would have been ill-prepared.

When the factual history of our war effort is written the work of this committee will stand out as an outstanding example of vision. The sad part of the story is that the men in the war agencies did not have vision or make full use of the authority and funds that Congress provided. Congress was way in advance of the war agencies on the light metal, rubber, mineral, and power problems when it passed the Thomas Act and provided funds for Federal hydro plants and the necessary investigations and processes connected therewith. What is more remarkable still, this vision was exercised in the midst of highly conflicting points of view growing out of the public-private power controversy. These controversies, from my observation point, are secondary to the proper utilization of our resources, both in peace and war. I take pride in the fact that I early urged what this committee approved. I pointed out the basic facts on the power, metal, and rubber situation when I addressed this House in May 1940—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, page 5786. This was 8 days before the President addressed both Houses on the emergency and what lay ahead.

From this observation point it can be plainly seen that the prime industries of the future will be those engaged in the production of electrochemical and electro metals. Airplanes and our future commerce will not be possible without such productivity. In addition, we, as the arsenal for the world, are drawing on our own resources at a rate higher than any of us can visualize. We must find substitutes, if we are to hold our own as a first-class nation.

It is clear that to Congress belongs the task of post-war planning. In the consideration of such planning this House will find that they will have to consider two approaches to the resources phase. These approaches will be concerned with an inventory and use of the national resources that should be dedicated to future new competitive commercial uses, and secondly, such planning must cover

necessary substitutions for those resources entering the depletion cycle.

Energy and power will play an important part in such future planning. Base metal electroproduction must come from low-cost power. The post-war unemployment problem is definitely tied up with adequate and proper resource utilization.

I deem it advisable for the membership of this House to be fully acquainted with the war-power developments in the Axis countries of Norway, and especially in Japan. We on the Pacific coast are especially interested in what Japan has and will be doing. Such an investigation will bring out the advanced preparations of all of these countries to secure world domination.

The South American situation also needs close study. That continent has nearly 50,000,000 horsepower of potential hydropower which is largely unused. This South American power is extremely high class on account of great falls and heavy, steady rainfalls. In the hands of unfriendly competitors, it can become a threat to our position. Nearly half of this South American potential power lies in Brazil in close proximity to high-quality and extensive mineral deposits. Another highly important study should cover the depletion of our own resources and an inventory of what we have and what we need. The growing pains experienced by our war agencies bespeak the necessity of a worth-while inventory.

I have been impressed particularly by these agencies' part in the shipbuilding program now being carried on by Henry J. Kaiser in the Pacific Northwest region. I doubt if there is any question in anyone's mind as to the importance of the Kaiser shipyards.

I think too many of us have not realized the importance of electric power in ship production. We hear of ship production always in terms of the large number of workers required. We usually hear of ship production in terms of astronomical man-hour figures, but it is quite apparent to anyone who delves into the subject that the modern, high-speed shipbuilding, which may prove the salvation of the United Nations, is at least equally dependent upon high-speed electrically operated tools, such as heavy duty cranes, presses, drills, lathes, and particularly the electric welding arc. These tools have been the instruments through which ship fabrication has been reduced from the World War No. 1 record of 236 days to less than 10 days at present in some cases. The yards in my district lead the country in ship production speed.

One kilowatt of electric power is necessary to make every five shipyard workers effective. A yard employing 50,000 men must have at least 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. If the electricity is not available, the 50,000 men must work under the obsolete methods of 25 years ago.

The figures given by Department of the Interior officials to the Appropriations Committee show that the Northwest region as a whole, and particularly the area around the city of Portland where the

Kaiser shipyards are located would be a power shortage area if it were not for Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam, and for the system of transmission lines and substations through which the electric power from those two dams is transmitted to the industrial sections.

The power companies established in the Portland area have for several years been dependent upon Columbia River power which has been made available to them. Without this power they would be unable to meet the rapidly growing needs of their normal market, to say nothing of the added demands for power placed upon them by the shipyard developments. In view of this fact I am convinced that the present is no time to deny the reasonable request of the Department of the Interior for the use of funds for operation and maintenance.

On the basis of the committee's evidence I believe the Department of the Interior has been cooperating with existing privately owned utility systems in the region. It is pouring its power without stint into practically all of these systems. Through these interconnections Columbia River power is being made available not only to the shipyards in the Portland area but in the Puget Sound area as well.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the following excerpts from the hearings, page 470, showing the operations of the Bonneville agencies:

The vital role being played by the Administration in the war program is indicated by the fact that the region will be producing about 30 percent of the total aluminum pig capacity of the Nation, utilizing more than 625,000 kilowatts of power, which is more than the ultimate capacity of Bonneville Dam when completed—518,400 kilowatts; an aluminum rolling mill capable of producing 240,000,000 pounds of aluminum sheet annually, and using approximately 50,000 kilowatts of power; production of tremendous tonnage of new ships, 1 shipyard alone turning out 113 Liberty ships during 1942, with a dead-weight tonnage of over 1,000,000 tons; a steel-rolling mill capable of producing 72,000 tons of steel annually, requiring 14,000 kilowatts of power; the production of magnesium requiring 57,000 kilowatts of power; and many other essential products, such as calcium carbide, sodium chlorate, and ferroalloys. In addition, many other types of industries which are not direct customers of Bonneville have developed in the region in the war production effort, all of which development would have been impossible had not these power projects been built by the Federal Government. The war strategy has also required the construction of many airports, Army camps, naval stations, and other similar establishments of the War and Navy Departments in this area. The Administration has undertaken the servicing of all these activities, including defense housing projects, which have been necessary because of the tremendous increase in the number of defense workers required for this expanded production program.

As a result of recommendations made by the Administration for the acceleration of construction of electrical facilities in the region in anticipation of the present crisis, Bonneville Dam, which was scheduled for completion in 1946, will now be completed in 1943, and installation of generators at Grand Coulee Dam has been advanced so that six units will be in operation by February 1944, in addition to two Shasta units loaned to Grand Coulee for the duration of the war. Three more generating units have

been authorized at Grand Coulee by Congress, but their completion date thus far is indefinite due to priority difficulties.

The present rated generating capacity at these two dams of 626,000 kilowatts will be increased by the end of the calendar year 1943 to more than 1,200,000 kilowatts, approximately 100 percent increase in capacity during this calendar year. The increasing tempo of the Administration's part in the war effort is reflected in its power deliveries since 1940:

Year	Kilowatt-hours	Increase over previous year
1940.....	354,208,000	
1941.....	1,568,728,000	1,214,520,000
1942.....	3,939,600,000	2,370,872,000
1943 <sup>1</sup> .....	7,637,800,000	3,698,200,000
1944 <sup>1</sup> .....	9,647,533,000	2,009,733,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

To meet these large increases in load, a rapid expansion of transmission facilities to take the tremendous quantities of power from the generating plants to the load centers was required. The construction of electrical facilities, accelerated in 1941 in anticipation of these new loads, was interrupted upon the declaration of war in order to conserve critical material. Only such lines and substation requirements were continued as were necessary to maintain minimum service to war plants. The rapid expansion of these facilities is best illustrated by the following data:

Fiscal year—	Mile-years of line in operation	Substations	Kilovolt-ampere-years capacity
1940.....	52.1	3	14,910
1941.....	614.6	25	265,020
1942.....	1,403.6	34	840,625
1943 <sup>1</sup> .....	2,228.9	50	1,639,360

<sup>1</sup> This includes only projects authorized as of Jan. 1, 1943.

#### FINANCIAL STATUS

The accomplishments of the Administration and the effect of contracts and new commitments are being reflected in the revenues being returned to the Treasury. A summary of actual revenues received to June 30, 1942, with estimated revenues for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, follows:

1940, actual.....	\$367,900
1941, actual.....	1,874,645
1942, actual.....	6,160,368
1943, estimated.....	12,003,519
1944, estimated.....	18,007,166

Estimated total June 30,  
1944..... 37,413,598

The Bonneville Agency, which is under consideration, operates the transmission facilities, markets the power, and collects the revenues. The Corps of Engineers, another agency, operates the Bonneville generating plant. Its power costs have been allocated as provided by law. The Grand Coulee plant is operated by another agency, the Bureau of Reclamation. It is not completed, and its first costs have not been allocated as provided in the reclamation law. Therefore in approaching a pay-out cost determination we can deal with absolute figures as far as Bonneville power plant and Bonneville Power Administration are concerned and estimated figures for Grand Coulee. This will be close enough for the purposes at hand.

I will not deal with this over-all figure by combining the figures given in the hearings with citation thereto. The

figures I am covering apply to the fiscal year 1944 as given in the Record. Revenues and expenses are given for other years also, but for brevity I will cover the 1 year:

The gross revenue given on p. 480 is.....	\$18,085,500
Operating and depreciation expenses, Bonneville Power Administration alone, p. 481.....	4,271,990
Net Bonneville Power Administration operating income, p. 481.....	13,813,510
Interest on Bonneville Power Administration Federal investment, p. 481.....	2,145,696
Net income available for power cost and surplus, and operating expenses at generating stations, p. 481.....	11,667,814
The operating expenses at stations, p. 521.....	1,344,675
Net for interest and amortization of two dam plants.....	10,323,139

The only item that need be covered to complete the over-all pay-out calculation is the interest and amortization of the plant costs allocated to power. This is given on page 518 of the hearings, and when considered with the generating plant operating expenses I have just cited, shows surplus over-all charges of all kind: of \$3,267,000 for the fiscal year 1944. These figures definitely answer the question of returns as given from the balance sheet figures submitted by the Administrator.

I must add a word of caution at this point, and that is not to take random figures scattered throughout the hearings. The only correct approach is via the balance sheet route as given on pages 480 and 518 of the record.

The real control must not be lost in any discussion. This control is the requirement of the basic act that requires rate reviews every 5 years to insure a balance sheet return to the Federal Treasury. It is mandatory for the Administrator to charge rates which will insure a full return.

I need to point out that the War Production Board has not used these facilities to their fullest extent. If they had we would have had more planes in the hands of General MacArthur. The testimony of Mr. Krug, as given on pages 959 to 983, is misleading as there is a gap of 2 years in W.P.B. recited activities, which is ignored. The record is complete in the appropriation hearings on the Senate side.

If this record is compared with the House Krug testimony, the gaps will be obvious.

The Department of the Interior is asking for no new appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration in 1944. It is asking only for congressional approval to reallocate \$3,287,000 of moneys already appropriated so that the Bonneville Administration can carry on its operation and management functions effectively during the next fiscal year.

Such funds are to be used primarily for the purpose of transmitting power to war industries in the Pacific Northwest with a combined metal-plant valuation in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000. Those plants are all being operated by private enterprise and their combined value is roughly equal in amount to the



total investment thus far in Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Federal electric power transmission system which takes the power from those dams to market.

I should like to point out that power, when it is made in the generators at Grand Coulee Dam and at Bonneville Dam, is of little value to anyone. There are no big cities close to either of those dams. There are no industries located at either of those dams. Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is of value only when it can be delivered to the industrial centers and the military zones of the Northwest.

That is what the Department of the Interior, through the Bonneville Power Administration, is doing, and that is the purpose of the requested funds.

I am informed that 95 percent of all Bonneville and Grand Coulee power will be delivered to war industries during the next fiscal year. These war enterprises include pig aluminum plants capable of producing more than 600,000,000 pounds of raw metal annually, one of the largest sheet rolling mills in the country, a new magnesium metal plant with 800 electric furnaces, several chemical plants devoted to the manufacture of explosives and other war materials, a number of alloy plants which make materials vital in the production of armor plate and other hard-steel products, and at least 1 dozen military installations such as Army and Navy airfields, depots, and encampments. All of these enterprises are war enterprises; and all of them require electric power which they would be unable to receive if it were not for the Federal development of the Columbia River. For the delivery of power to all of these enterprises and to others which will be established during the fiscal year 1944, the Bonneville Administration will collect more than \$15,000,000—perhaps as much as \$20,000,000—which will be paid into the Treasury of the United States. These power sales will more than double the volume of sales by the Bonneville Administration during the past 12 months.

The Bonneville Administrator has testified before the Appropriations Committee that he will require \$3,287,000 to operate his agency. More than 10 percent of that money is required for armed guards to protect the system against accident and sabotage.

According to the Bonneville Administrator's figures 3,287,000 operating dollars will put into the United States Treasury more than \$15,000,000.

That sounds like good business. I urge the approval of this item in the pending bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, over a period of years I have entertained some difficulty about the ramifications of the various power agencies in the Federal Government. As a result of some studies in that field I dropped a bill in the hopper today to consolidate all power activities of the Federal Government in a so-called Federal Power Administration, under the direction and

supervision of a Federal Power Administrator.

One never realizes the diffusion of power operations in the Government until he sets himself about it for a little while and determines how far they go. Nor do we have an adequate conception of the immensity of our power operations and the investment in public power today. We ought to make up our minds that public power is here to stay. It is like administrative law. It is here to stay, and it has to have some good direction. It has to have some coordination when necessary. But I start from the broad premise that public power is here to stay. So the thing to do is to coordinate these activities wherever possible, that we may more intelligently legislate and appropriate in this field.

It occurs to me we are appropriating something in excess of \$300,000,000 a year or more on power projects and that our investment in public-power projects is well in excess of \$2,000,000,000. You cannot minimize that kind of an investment, and it certainly needs the attention of Congress.

I doubt very much whether there is a single individual in Congress or out, or in any place in the Government today who has a truly comprehensive understanding of our power activities. We have already consolidated in some other fields. We have taken the security agencies and put them under the Federal Security Agency. The Federal loan functions have been placed under the Federal Loan Agency. Public works functions have been placed under the Federal Works Agency. By the same token it occurs to me that all power activities ought to be put under a single power administration for better direction and development.

Let us take a look at the ramifications of power throughout the Government. In the field of planning for power projects we have the National Resources Planning Board. We have the War Production Board, which deals with the allocation of power supply. We have the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the National Power Policy Committee.

In the field of power generation, marketing, and distribution we have the Bureau of Reclamation, which is considered in the instant bill, which includes Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and others. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation has charge today of some 28 power projects on 17 reclamation projects, and its installed capacity is 1,447,000 kilowatts. In the field of generation you also have the Indian Bureau. Next, you have the Tennessee Valley Authority, with 1,300,000 of installed kilowatts. Finally, you have the Federal Works Agency, which has control of the construction of a power project on the Santee-Cooper and also supervises the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, and a number of projects in Nebraska.

Here then are two categories, namely, those agencies dealing with planning in the power field and those that deal with generation. Next, you have those that are lending agencies on public power.

That includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It includes the Defense Plant Corporation and the Rural Electrification Administration. There is a fourth category—the control agencies that deal with the regulation of power. That would include the War Production Board, as it relates to allocations of power supply. It would include the Federal Power Commission, which deals with rates and applications. It would include the Securities and Exchange Commission, which deals with regulation of holding companies and securities.

It is a rather interesting thing that if you go about looking for all these power agencies you will find them in four different departments of government and in six or more differentiating agencies. Obviously, no legislator can keep that whole complicated picture in mind.

If we consider it from the standpoint of legislation, think of the legislative committees that deal with the subject. First of all, the Committee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction over certain power activities—all legislation dealing with the Tennessee Valley comes under that committee; second, there is the Flood Control Committee; third, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where power is involved; fourth, there is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which deals with power as it relates to control, through the Securities and Exchange Commission; next, you have the legislative Committee on Agriculture, which legislates on matters that pertain to the Rural Electrification Administration; finally, when it comes to the lending functions involving power, the Defense Plant Corporation and the R. F. C. customarily appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There you have six legislative committees of the Congress that deal with this question of power legislation.

When it comes to appropriations for power it is the same bewildering labyrinth of authority. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations deals with appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. This Interior Department bill from the Interior Subcommittee deals with the Bureau of Reclamation, Indian Affairs, and National Park Service, including Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and others. The Independent Offices Subcommittee has jurisdiction over T. V. A., the Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. The War Department Civil Functions Committee has jurisdiction over the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the planning activities of the War Department in the field of power. Finally, if there is any deficiency or supplemental requests that the other five subcommittees did not catch, then you still have the deficiency subcommittee. Here, then, are six subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and six legislative committees that deal with this whole question of power.

There is not only duplication in the field of public-power activities but there is duplication right here in Congress in handling problems relating to the power

activities of government. We must spell out this whole program of consolidation. I am persuaded that we have got to consolidate. We must unify these activities if we are going to have a harmonious and effective public power policy; so the bill which went into the hopper today sets up the Office of Power Administration under the supervision and direction of a Federal Power Administrator. Consolidated therein will be Bonneville, Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Power Commission, the R. F. C. activities insofar as they relate to power loans, the Securities and Exchange functions that relate to the control and consolidation of power activities, and similar functions of the Federal Works Agency. In addition thereto, it sets up an advisory committee consisting of the chairman or the administrative heads of every one of these agencies, who, taken together, shall be a Federal public-power advisory committee in wartime and in peacetime.

The National Power Policy Committee and the Power Division in Interior would be abolished. I propose to bring about a transfer of those functions in the interest of economy, in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of a coordinated public power policy, and in the interest of a development in the future that will be coordinated, that will have good substantial direction, and that will make it possible then for the Congress to intelligently deal with this whole ramifying and complicated subject.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Has the gentleman included anywhere in his bill coal or oil? They are a form of power that is increasingly tied up with the public interest and increasingly subject to Federal regulation. It seems to me some day we have got to have some sort of coordinated regulation of these competing forms of power that compete between each other and we have got to have regulation that will include both public and privately owned sources of these three competing kinds of power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not include them for a very good reason. I realized first that they are competitive, and secondly there has been a good deal of controversy already over regulation of these competing fuels whether we call it power, oil, coal, hydro, or something else; and for that reason I leave it as a sort of separate domain because each of them is already being separately dealt with by different agencies of the Government.

Several years ago, I served on the special committee of this House on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. It was a fruitful and constructive experience. The studies of that committee were persuasive of the need for more and more reorganization of Federal agencies in the interest of economy, better policy, and improved public service. Here is a field in which the reorganization technique can be applied in the interest of consolidation of these activities that should prove most salutary. I believe that this proposal

merits the immediate consideration of the appropriate committee of the House.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, a very valuable member of the committee [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, most of the items in this bill have been covered quite thoroughly by our very able chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], and by the very able ranking Member on our side, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and also by my colleague on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. I wish to say here that every member of the committee worked hard and long to bring out a bill that we could support on the floor unanimously. For almost 6 weeks we met daily. We listened to over 100 people who came before us to testify. After that we marked up the bill, which was no small job. Generally speaking, the workings of the Interior Department are carried on very efficiently. Nevertheless, there was room for saving and so we did cut this bill to what we thought necessary, but leaving enough money for every branch of the Interior Department to carry on the work of the Department and carry it on efficiently. I possibly got a little tough on occasion, but I am not apologizing for it, because under present conditions it is necessary to cut all nonwar expenditures to the bone. Our Treasury is in mighty bad shape right now, and it is going to be in worse shape as this war goes along; so it behooves everyone of us to save every dime we can without detriment to our war effort. It is not pleasant to me to have to take sharp issue with the ranking Member, the distinguished and able gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]. I appreciate his position in regard to the Central Valley project in his State. The argument was developed quite thoroughly and we finally decided to permit an expenditure of \$11,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, some disturbing things were brought up and aired quite thoroughly in the committee, part of which had to be off the record because it was of such a nature as to be military secrets. The disturbing thing that came before our committee was the fact that there seems to be a disposition on the part of some high officials in this Government to hinder the development of our national resources.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I hesitate at this time during this war emergency to bring this out too forcibly, but I can say in all honesty and sincerity that it just does not make sense when we need every kind of strategic war material, when we stop projects of all kinds, reclamation, power, and every other kind of Government project and many private projects and industries from getting the necessary steel and other materials that they need to carry on their business that at the same time something should be stopping

these mines and our domestic resources from being developed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman on the fine statement he is making. I would like to ask one question, however. On page 27 of the report which accompanies the bill I find that attorneys' fees for certain Indian tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana have been increased \$18,400 over the amount which was awarded in 1943. Will the gentleman explain that large increase in attorneys' fees for those Indian tribes?

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CARTER. May I say that the attorneys' fees for the Indians comes out of the tribal fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. They have a tribal council that carries on the business of the tribe and it has requested this. As I recall they pay the attorneys for a period of 10 years. I have forgotten the exact number of years, but it is over a number of years. May I say further that the committee has scrutinized these attorneys' fees very carefully in this bill and in every other bill since I have been on the committee because we did not want unscrupulous attorneys taking advantage of the Indians. I think the gentleman will find upon investigation that there is ample justification for every cent that is allowed for attorneys' fees.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask this additional question of the distinguished gentleman now speaking and also members of the committee: Is it the opinion of the committee that this increase of attorneys' fees is fully justified by the testimony which was heard by the committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. In fact, proven to our satisfaction, I may say to the gentleman. There was need for this additional attorney's fee and consequently we all agreed on it. I do not think there was a dissenting vote on this particular item.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking about these metals that we have which are not being developed. Since the time our report has been made public and our hearings have been made public just a few days ago I have received numerous letters from people in different sections of the United States who have private metal deposits. They all tell me how they have been given the walk-around and have not had an opportunity to develop their mines right at a time when we need these metals so badly, not only for our war effort but also to produce food. Our farmers are being stymied to a marked degree because they cannot get the necessary machinery, consequently our food-production program suffers while at the



same time this is permitted to go on. Some individuals in high places are holding back the development of our own natural resources and I promise right now that I shall not stop until I have a pretty good idea who the fellows are who are guilty of what I call sabotaging our war program. I invite every good American to assist me in correcting this thing at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, the bill we now have before us carries appropriations involving some \$72,000,000. It makes appropriations for at least 6 unrelated subjects and has over 100 separate and distinct items. To my mind this raises the question of the desirability of a separate item veto in our procedure here in Congress. In the past various Presidents, including President Grant, President Hayes and, I believe, President Taft, have recommended a separate item veto by constitutional amendment. Thirty-nine States in the Union have a program under which the Governor may veto an item separately or in some cases he may reduce an item.

I think the principal question here, perhaps the only question, aside from the desirability of the program, is whether or not it can be accomplished without amending the Constitution. It is my view that it can be. In order to stimulate a little thought on this subject I am today introducing a bill which is very simple and provides in substance that each item of an appropriation bill shall be considered a bill within the meaning of article I, section 7, and may be vetoed by the President separately. The item vetoed would be returned to the Congress for further consideration just as other bills are considered under such circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief statement I have prepared on the constitutionality of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, in his budget message several years ago President Roosevelt directed the attention of Congress to the desirability of a power in the Executive to veto separate items in an appropriation bill, and called upon Congress to decide whether this result should be accomplished by a constitutional amendment or by legislation. A constitutional amendment would, of course, make this practice obligatory on all future Congresses. However, it would seem that the desired result could be attained without the necessity of a constitutional amendment.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides as follows:

All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

In construing this section, it is necessary to consider other pertinent sections as well as the general intent of the instrument as a whole. While the section provides that "all legislative power . . . shall be vested in a Congress," it is clear that the framers were referring here only to affirmative legislative power. In article I, section 7, they gave legislative power to the Executive in the following language:

Article I, section 7: Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases, the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

The Courts have held that this provision confers upon the Executive legislative power. The legislative power of the Executive is purely negative in character, and even that power of negation is subject to being overruled by a two-thirds vote of Congress. In brief, Congress is the sole repository of affirmative legislative power; that is, the power to say what the law shall be. The Executive has only the power to say that a certain measure adopted by Congress shall or shall not be the law. However, the right and duty of the Executive to exercise this negative power as his judgment dictates, is as clearly expressed in the Constitution as is the right and duty of Congress to perform its part of the legislative function. This is clearly borne out not only by the language of the Constitution, but by the history of the veto power in Anglo-Saxon government.

In an early day in England, the Crown possessed all the powers of legislation. The rise of the English Parliament first restricted this power of legislation to a negative power of veto, and finally abolished it altogether, the last veto being by Queen Anne in 1708. In the American Colonies, the veto power had a different history. In all the Colonies, the Governor could veto legislation, and in all but Maryland, Rhode Island, and Connecticut the King could veto a bill, even after it had been approved by the Governor. The King used the veto power freely to prevent acts of the Colonies injurious to the mother country. This abuse of the veto was complained of in the Declaration of Independence. After the beginning of the Revolutionary War, the American Colonies limited the veto power of their respective Governors. In no State but Massachusetts did the Gov-

ernor have even a qualified veto over legislation, and that not until the Constitution of 1780 was adopted. Under the Articles of Confederation there was, of course, no Executive veto.

The framers of the Constitution were, of course, familiar with this history. They knew both the advantages and disadvantages of the Executive veto, and the subject was very carefully discussed at the Constitutional Convention. It was their general purpose to create a Government consisting of three coordinate branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. In order to maintain such a government, it was necessary not only to carve out the place of each branch in the whole scheme, but also to declare certain fundamental principles for keeping each in its respective sphere. The power of veto was given to the President as a check on the law-making powers of the Congress. The delegates evidently had in mind two main purposes; first, the protection of the executive branch from encroachment by Congress; second, the prevention of hasty and ill-advised legislation. This was well expressed by Alexander Hamilton in the following language:

It establishes a salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to guard the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, or of any impulse unfriendly to the public good, which may happen to influence the majority of that body (Federalist, No. 73).

Beginning in 1820, the use of the rider—often attached to an appropriation bill—became prevalent and often reduced the Executive veto to a nullity. By rule, the House of Representatives subsequently prohibited this practice. However, the practice of assembling appropriations in large bills containing hundreds of separate items on wholly unrelated subjects is rapidly accomplishing the same result.

Many of the States, confronted with this problem, have met it by constitutional provisions definitely giving the Executive the power to veto a separate item of an appropriation bill. Thirty-nine States have taken such action. As opposed to this plan of protecting the integrity of the Executive veto by constitutional provision, the Federal Constitution leaves the matter to the good faith of Congress. The Constitution is, after all, not a mere compilation of legalistic rules. It is rather the pattern of a certain philosophy of government. It states general principles rather than detailed procedure. The fundamental object of the Constitution was to create a government of laws as distinguished from a government of men. It sought to accomplish this by dividing the powers of government among three independent and coordinate branches, each one of which should be a check on the other. It is to this fundamental principle rather than to any mere declaration in the Constitution that the citizen must look for the protection of his property, his liberty, and even his life. The Constitution does little more than to create these three branches and draw the line between them. It seeks to maintain that division for all time by setting up certain

checks and balances. In the last analysis, however, the preservation of that form of government is not to be sought in any mere words written on paper, but rather in the acceptance of that philosophy of government of which the words themselves are the mere evidence. Such a government can only be maintained if each independent branch thereof recognizes the rights and duties of the others and protects them as actively as it protects its own.

In the matter of legislative procedure, the Constitution simply says:

Article I, section 5: Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

This was intended as a broad and comprehensive grant of power and has so been recognized by all three branches of the Government. In construing the right of Congress to make rules, the Supreme Court has said, in *United States v. Ballin* (144 U. S. 1):

It—

The House of Representatives—

may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained. But within these limitations, all matters of method are open to the determination of the House, and it is no impeachment of the rule to say that some other way would be better, more accurate, or even more just. It is no objection to the validity of a rule that a different one has been prescribed and in force for a length of time. The power to make rules is not one which once exercised is exhausted. It is a continuous power, always subject to be exercised by the House and within the limitations suggested, absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal.

In that case, the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the Constitution required the presence of a quorum, but set up no method of making this determination and that it was therefore within the power of the House to prescribe any method which would be reasonably certain to ascertain the fact. The right of Congress to make rules for the purpose of legislation is so broad and final that the Supreme Court accepts the complete law as it has passed Congress and been signed by the President and deposited with the Secretary of State, as the law which passed the House in accordance with their rules, and will not have recourse to the Journals of the respective Houses to prove the contrary.

Attention has been called to article I, section 7, which provides that "every bill shall be presented to the President of the United States." Webster defines a bill as follows:

A form or draft of a law presented to a legislature but not yet enacted, or before it is enacted; a proposed or projected law.

The term "bill," as used in the Constitution, does not have any definite or technical meaning and apparently had none at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. It is simply a vehicle for carrying proposed law through the legislative bodies. There is no constitutional requirement that it shall be in any

particular form, or that it shall contain any designated element. It is simply a device by which the legislative will is expressed concerning suggested legislation. Neither usage nor constitutional limitation requires us to attach any technical or restricted meaning to the word "bill" which will prevent the carrying out of the real intent of the framers in adopting the Executive veto. We must, as in all construction of the Constitution, look to substance and not to mere form.

In *State v. Platt* (2 S. C. 150), in discussing the meaning of the term "bill," the court says:

In a technical sense, the term "bill" is applicable properly to the enactment as a whole. Although the technical use of words should prevail where not inconsistent with the clear intent of the instrument, yet when such intent requires that words should be used in the larger sense, it is competent so to regard them. If we should hold that the Constitution regards the enactment as a whole, in an exclusive sense, we would be led to the inevitable conclusion that to become a law, all the substantial parts of the measure must have together passed through all the requisite stages. The consequence of this would be that alteration in a substantial part during such progress would be fatal to the whole bill.

Forced upon the opposite construction that every substantial part of a bill is to be regarded as a bill in the sense of the Constitution, we find nothing in our way but the technical import of the term "bill." It is not easy to perceive why, if any detached part of a statute is a law within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States forbidding States passing laws impairing the obligation of contracts, any part of a bill is not a bill under a clause intended to secure deliberation in the passage of legislative enactments. Such a conclusion is inevitable if regard is had to the fixed principles governing constitutional construction. The objects had in view by a constitution in government are habitually substantial; matters of form are usually left to the legislative body as subject to change with the progress of ideas and events. The great objects in view in framing a constitution are the division and distribution of the powers of government, the establishment of limits and boundaries beyond which they shall not be exercised, and the creation of an efficient responsibility, tending to restrain and furnish the means to correct neglect or abuse of public authority. Clauses having for their object the creation of responsibility in the exercise of political functions are, to a large extent, intended to act upon the motive, either by way of creating inducement for right action or removing the temptation or opportunity to such abusive exercises. This is in part accomplished by fixing the responsibility for all political action in some definite person, or body of persons, by securing deliberation in the performance of public acts, and by ascertaining modes of authentication and action in important cases vitally affecting the welfare of the state. It is obvious that, in construing clauses of this class, substance rather than form is to be considered. The object to be secured is to be sought for not alone in the formal expressions of the Constitution, nor yet in the technical character of the means employed to serve its ends, but in the nature of the subject intended to be acted upon through such means. In a word, the language of the Constitution in such cases is to be construed in the largest sense fairly attributable to it, and that will best subserve the objects it has in view.

Article I, section 7, simply means that all legislation which has passed the Congress must, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President. The intent of the Constitution is that legislation shall be a result of the meeting of the minds of the Congress and of the Executive—the former affirmatively creating the legislation and the President exercising his right of affirming or denying.

The method by which this result is to be accomplished is left largely in the discretion of Congress. For example, a provision could be put in each appropriation bill stating definitely that for the purpose of the Executive veto, each item shall be considered as a separate enactment of the Congress and subject to a separate veto. There are, no doubt, other ways by which this result could be obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill for amendment be dispensed with and that it be in order at this time to offer amendments to any part of the bill.

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

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, on page 93, line 5, makes an appropriation of \$125,000 for the fisheries industry. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$193,540, while the appropriation for 1943 was \$365,540.

I respectfully submit that the item should be increased from \$125,000 to \$193,540. This is an increase of \$68,540 over the amount provided in the pending bill, but it is a decrease of \$172,000 under the appropriation for 1943. The increase I request conforms identically with the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget.

I think the item is most important, and while I realize it cannot be considered adequately at this time, I hope that the item may be restored in the Senate and that it may receive sympathetic support of the subcommittee, with acceptance in conference, if increased by the Senate.

I know the deep interest manifested by the subcommittee in matters pertaining to fisheries. This particular item has to do with the production of food for war purposes. I do not think that was generally understood by the subcommittee at the time of its consideration, and I believe that the subcommittee would be sympathetic upon due consideration.

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

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I said earlier in the day on the floor of the House that perhaps some of the items were cut more than they should have been cut, and I referred to this item in particular. I think this: That the committee exercised its very best judgment at the time, but perhaps was not aware of the facts and circumstances, and I would be inclined to follow the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and consider this item very sympathetically in conference.



Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have been very much interested in the general information the gentleman is giving the House. I think what the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], the ranking minority Member, has said is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee handling the bill.

Mr. BLAND. I thank both the gentlemen.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman stated that the reduction in this item will considerably interfere with the production of food. I think one of the sources of information that came to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was that about 100,000,000 pounds less of fish was caught in 1942 than in 1941.

Mr. BLAND. Something like that. I am going to ask permission to extend and revise my remarks, which will contain that very statement.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is very important that we should keep that item in the bill and I am glad to see the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction over fisheries, here to support it.

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

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree heartily with what the gentleman has said. I am a member of the special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources. We have held extensive hearings and we went at some length into the question of conservation of food fish, and we found in some reports that were submitted to us that there was an immense quantity of food in the fish and wildlife that we could make use of in the war effort if we give it proper protection. On the basis of information that came to us, I think it would be a very grave mistake at this time to make the reduction proposed under the Budget estimate.

Mr. BLAND. I thank the gentleman. Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, we must never lose sight of the fact that there are many groups of people that are asking for appropriations, great, huge appropriations, to produce everything imaginable in the way of food.

Mr. BLAND. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman says.

Mr. JENSEN. We have cut the agricultural appropriation bill and other bills. We cut that bill down by the hundreds of millions of dollars, and we are cutting out expenditures for reclamation projects, irrigation projects, at the request of the War Department and the War Production Board, and we had to be fair about this thing.

Mr. BLAND. I am not criticizing the committee; I appreciate its task.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this matter does not go in in the Senate, I

certainly hope that everyone who asks for an increase will exercise discretion, because I am sure if they do not exercise discretion the conferees are liable to turn them all down.

Mr. BLAND. I simply ask that it be given full consideration.

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

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is necessary in arriving at the best economy, the important thing is the selection of the items where economies are effected. This particular item, it occurs to me, involves the very foundation of the work of the Fisheries and Wildlife Service and if economies are necessary I think they might come from some other item.

Mr. BLAND. This is a highly important item.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois where we are going to draw the line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter for the subcommittee to determine, after it has heard the justification for the items.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, but this is one of the border line cases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The determination rests with the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Just as in the selective service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is quite a problem.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the fishing industry has been asked to produce some 6,000,000,000 pounds of fish and fishery products during 1943 as its contribution to the war effort. The highest peacetime production has been about 5,000,000,000 pounds, with production during recent years ranging between three and one-half and four billion pounds.

The Department of the Interior has been given the responsibility for fish production in the war food program and of coordinating the activities of all war agencies affecting fisheries. In this work the Division of Fishery Industries is the focal point for basic information regarding the commercial fishing industry; thus the Nation's wartime food program, insofar as it pertains to fish and fishery products, is influenced by the functions performed by this small but essential unit.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended a reduction of \$68,540 in the item for fishery industries in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for 1944. This represents a 35 percent cut below the Budget estimate and strikes at the heart of the Nation's wartime fishery program since the major portion of these funds are used for the employment of highly specialized fishery experts.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains a record of some 37,500 fishing vessels of the commercial fishery and provides the basis for the

withdrawal and return of fishing craft by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and War Shipping Administration.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains record of the some one hundred and thirty thousand fishermen in our commercial fisheries, providing data for the War Manpower Commission, Selective Service, and United States Employment Service.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains record of the production and prices of fishery products for guidance in allocating food for military, lend-lease, and civilian needs, and for establishment of price ceilings.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains data on the materials and equipment requirements of the fishing industry for guidance in the allocation of essential materials and equipment to an industry vital to the war program.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains data to guide the fishing industry in the care and more effective use of its fishing gear.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains information necessary in guiding the Nation in making adjustment to wartime food shortages.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains the necessary technological information to guide the fishing industry in obtaining more efficient and effective utilization of its products during wartime.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains necessary information on the nutritive value of fishery products and recommends the best methods of preparation so as to conserve nutritional properties in a diet being affected by war.

Knowing first-hand the importance of the work coming under this item, I am convinced that inadvertently a mistake has been made in reducing this item. I note that, commenting upon the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service, the subcommittee, on page 15 of the report, says:

In considering estimates for this activity the committee for the second consecutive year was faced with the necessity of making deductions in many deserving and valuable projects which are not related to the war. It is hoped that many of them may be restored to their former level when the existing emergency has passed.

The entire amount of \$193,540 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is used exclusively to carry on the Government's fish-production program. It is an essential part of our war food program, the fisheries being one of the principal sources of vital protein foods needed by our soldiers and sailors on the battle fronts, by our allies, and by our people at home.

In view of the serious effect the reduction in the item for fishery industries would have on functions so essential to the Nation's war program, I hope that the amount of the item be restored to the Budget estimate. I realize that there is no opportunity now for the subcommittee to consider the full effect of this reduc-

tion. I am hoping that the Senate will restore the item and that the subcommittee in conference will accept the item.

Much of the attention of Congress has recently been centered on the food situation. The Nation's fisheries are of vital importance, both as a source of food and of other products essential to the prosecution of the war. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has given close attention to fishery problems for many years, and it is intensifying its study of these problems under the guidance of its subcommittee on fisheries, which consists of Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON of Florida; Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD of Texas; Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, Hon. CECIL R. KING, Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, Hon. FRED BRADLEY of Michigan, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, and Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL of Ohio.

Our fisheries have never been organized. The truth is that the various groups are distinctly individualistic, and there is lacking that unity of effort which is essential to a satisfactory solution of existing problems.

The Coordinator of Fisheries, Mr. Harold Ickes, has issued a statement to the effect that although the production goal for our fisheries has been set for 1943 at an all-time high, the best information is that the catch will not be greater than 3,650,000,000 pounds. This is 2,000,000,000 pounds less than we will require. The industry must find the remedy.

It may be reasonably assumed that the fish may be caught if the fishing industry has the boats and the manpower with which to do the catching, and if the labor and equipment to process the catch can be found.

There are very many disturbing factors in the present situation. One of these is that hundreds of vessels, including a very large percentage of the most efficient deep water craft, have been taken over by the armed services. Every boat taken over has meant that much less production. There has been enacted into law H. R. 2238, which it is hoped will facilitate the return to private ownership for fishing purposes of some of the fishing vessels and similar craft that have been acquired by the United States and other vessels adaptable to the fisheries. It was realized that the withdrawal of vessels from the fisheries had meant a curtailment in the catch and the need to implement the fisheries with whatever equipment can now be made available is obvious. Secretary Ickes and Admiral Land recommended the passage of the legislation.

Appearing in support of the bill, and speaking of the efforts of the Coordinator of Fisheries, Mr. Charles E. Jackson, Deputy Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, said:

Without floating equipment it is impossible for the fishing industry to produce. This is borne out by the fact that in a single year's time the production of fish dropped from 4,900,000,000 in 1941 to 3,700,000,000 pounds in 1942, a drop of approximately 25 percent. It was not until toward the end of 1942 that the drain of manpower from the fishing industry further seriously cur-

tailed production. The industry today is faced with two serious problems; first, the shortage of floating equipment, and, second, the reduction in manpower. The Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries has been working on these two major problems since the very beginning of the war.

Little success was obtained in the early part of the war in securing the return of vessels, the military situation being such that floating equipment simply could not be returned to the fishing industry. In the last few months, however, the situation has improved materially. On last October 30 the War Shipping Administration wrote the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, advising that as of that date the War Shipping Administration would submit all requests for fishery floating equipment to the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries for it to pass on. This policy has consistently been followed, and only a few fishing vessels have been taken out of the fishery. These few were not suitable for fishing or had not been engaged in fishing for a number of years. The Army, Navy, and Coast Guard have gradually shifted their demands so that needed vessels are recruited from sources other than the fisheries.

Such a serious situation with regard to floating equipment for the production of Alaska salmon was confronting the industry for the coming season that the Secretary of the Interior directed a letter to the Secretary of War on January 18, 1943, a copy of which is submitted for the record, together with a copy of the reply from the Secretary of War of January 25, both of which are self-explanatory. Suffice it to say that the War Department is cooperating in every way with the Coordinator of Fisheries and the War Shipping Administration to supply sufficient floating equipment to obtain the maximum production of Alaska salmon this coming season.

In a coordinated plan, the War Shipping Administration, the Army, the Navy, and the Coordinator of Fisheries have gradually undertaken a program of returning vessels and floating equipment to the fishing industry. It is not difficult to return those vessels that were taken on a charter basis, but in those cases where fishing vessels have been purchased outright it is impossible under present laws to return these vessels to the original owners. The legislation proposed here is designed to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. Jackson also testified that in order to expedite the return of fishing craft to the fishing industry, the War Shipping Administration had arranged with the Navy to set up a committee composed of a naval officer, a representative of the War Shipping Administration and the Coordinator of Fisheries to proceed to the various naval districts for the purpose of working out an arrangement with the commandants of the naval districts to release the fishing vessels. Mr. Jackson said that this committee was then, March 18, 1943, on the west coast.

Another disturbing factor in the fishery situation is that until recently the Selective Service System did not regard fishing as an essential occupation and consequently many of the best fishermen were drafted. It takes time and experience to make a good fisherman, and the removal of skilled captains and engineers has been a blow to the industry at many points. I hope that this will be rectified.

Another disturbing factor has been and is that wages and salaries in industrial plants doing war work have attracted hundreds of men and women who for-

merly helped to process and handle fish products.

It is also feared that either entire or partial restrictions imposed on many productive areas may contribute to a shortage.

Other factors enter. Rope, twine, and netting are essential to fishing and are difficult to obtain. Food rationing detains many boats in port because of the difficulty of obtaining sufficient points to supply the food these men need at sea. It must be realized by those administering food priorities that if adequate supplies of fish are to be caught, these obstacles must be removed. It is of paramount importance that those agencies which have placed restrictions on the fishing industry should remove them at once. The removal of present handicaps will result in immediate increased production. Sympathetic consideration is being given to these problems by those who have them in charge and it is hoped they may be solved.

It is becoming increasingly obvious to all that if we are to have sufficient food for our armed services, for our allies, and for our own people we cannot neglect this vital industry. The importance of the fisheries in the war effort becomes clear when we recall that fishery products rank fifth in the essential food list besides supplying vitamins, oils, and fish meal byproducts for livestock and poultry feeds. During 1941, 4,900,000,000 pounds of fish were sold through commercial channels for human consumption and for industrial uses, while more than 12,000,000 sport fishermen took with hook and line and consumed at home, or gave to their friends, another 300,000,000 pounds of nutritious fresh-water fish.

Fish utilization has been increased. Some personnel have been assigned to the task of developing uses for fishery products not now popular as food on American markets. There has been developed from menhaden, a canned food product. Menhaden were formerly used only for making fertilizer and oils. This new use should result in the production of 15 to 20 million pounds of food for domestic and export use. A total of 150,000,000 pounds of new sea-food products can be made available next year as a result of developing methods of utilizing common sea mussels, never before marketed in the United States in commercial quantities, but long popular in European countries. I am informed that, based on the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service, approximately 10,000,000 pounds of the common fresh-water smelts of the Great Lakes for which there was formerly a very limited market, will go to the armed services and civilian trade for the first time. More than 200,000 pounds of fillets from the Great Lakes herring are now being marketed for the first time, and this yield can be increased materially in the future. Similar studies may result in great new quantities of clams, of carp, and of other species being used as food to serve the United States and for lend-lease.

The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that the fish hatchery program has been



realined to produce more food fishes for the duration and that the soil and water conservation programs of recent years have been responsible for the construction of thousands of new ponds that can produce an estimated 100,000,000 pounds of pan and game fish after stocking.

The Fish and Wildlife Service also reports that in order to provide essential food for war purposes personnel of the Service have been loaned to friendly South and Central American republics to make surveys of their coastal fishing grounds and to assist in organizing operations to take the fish locally so as to reduce long, expensive shipments of cured fishes from distant waters. These surveys have been made in the Caribbean, in Mexico, the British West Indies, in waters of the Pacific off Peru, and within the past 60 days, of the South Pacific where our troops are now fighting.

The situation demands organization and cooperation between individuals, local groups, State associations, the State officials, and the Federal officials. By intelligent cooperation and organization far more can be accomplished in the future than in the past. One thing needed to be learned by all groups of fishermen in the United States is that "In unity there is strength."

For more than 25 years I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. During all of that time, I have been peculiarly interested as the fishing industry is the most important in my district.

It is gratifying for me to report that there is a greater manifestation of interest shown in the fisheries by the Department of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service than ever before in the period of my service.

Recently, Secretary Ickes, head of the Department of the Interior, appeared before the committee and discussed its problems. Secretary Ickes manifested a comprehensive and keen interest in the fisheries and a knowledge of fishery problems, which in my opinion promises well for the future. Certainly, it is a much greater interest than has ever been shown before, for during my 25 years of service, this is the first time that the Secretary of a Department having jurisdiction over the fisheries has appeared to discuss the problems of the fisheries, and its related industries.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. Chairman, I am addressing my remarks principally to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I note that the bill provides a total of \$15,118,500 for reclamation purposes, which is a reduction of \$74,554,770 from the 1943 appropriation and \$5,636,200 less than the Budget estimates. Of course, this can mean but one thing, and that is that many of our reclamation projects that are in the course of development in such States as my own will have to be stopped. I cannot understand why the War Production Board has stopped the construction of many of these works.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of the \$5,200,000 to which the gentleman refers, \$4,000,000 was cut out of the Central Valley projects, so that the other reclamation projects are cut but very little.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course that applies only to the reduction in Budget estimate. May I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma this? Do I correctly understand that all work has been stopped by the War Production Board on the reclamation projects, except in minor matters, unless priorities are secured from the War Production Board for the necessary materials with which to complete these projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that he is correct. Of course, \$55,650,000 is carried over in the reclamation fund, and then there is some money in the general funds. It would not stop all the reclamation projects, but it would stop some of them, and certainly would slow up many others. On the other hand, the War Production Board issues its stop orders, and during this emergency it is supreme and there is just nothing that our committee or this House can do about it until those stop orders have been suspended. As I said in my opening remarks, I hope they will be suspended within a few days or a few weeks.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret very much that funds are not provided in the bill to carry on the development of what is known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 in eastern Montana. It is a pumping project on the Yellowstone River.

Buffalo Rapids No. 2 is under construction. No. 1 has already been constructed. It is a water conservation and utilization development where labor was contributed by the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Of course, since the C. C. C. and W. P. A. folded up we now have a camp consisting of 150 men, what we call a conscientious objector's camp, and they work on this project. This project is just about two-thirds completed.

The construction of Buffalo Rapids No. 1 has been completed and the project turned over to the Department of Agriculture, which under the water conservation and utilization law will supervise its operation. No. 2 is two-thirds completed.

The two projects can bring 8,100 acres under irrigation in 1943, in addition to the 12,000 acres now under ditches, and 6,800 acres in 1944.

Now, the amount of steel required to complete these undertakings is insignificant, 31 tons in 1943 and 100 tons in 1944. From this small expenditure we would reap 40,350 tons of alfalfa in 1944, and 80,700 tons in 1945, which is important to the livestock industry in that section of my State.

It will require \$345,000 from the Department of Agriculture and \$515,000 from the Bureau of Reclamation to complete this project.

Also there is the Canyon Ferry project. I am going to give a brief outline of this project. It is over in the First District, and my understanding is that this pro-

posed Canyon Ferry project will bring a supplemental supply of water by 1945 for 50,000 acres now periodically affected by water shortages. When fully developed it will irrigate 300,000 acres of new land and provide a partial supply of water to an additional 150,000 acres, plus generating 35,000 kilowatts of power. Through its power plant and regulation of the river for the benefit of power developments downstream, the output of electrical energy along the river will be ultimately increased by 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

This is a pretty big project. It is on the Missouri River.

The area in which the Canyon Ferry development will be constructed is already settled, having a farm population of 42,000 people, and an annual crop production of \$9,500,000. The power development would be deferred.

On the additional 50,000 acres to be provided supplemental water by 1945 could be grown 50,000 tons of alfalfa, 1,000,000 bushels of potatoes and 112,500 hundred-pound sacks of dry edible beans.

During 1943 the construction would require 300 tons of steel. The new facilities needed for irrigation would cost about \$8,749,000. The cost of the power plant and transmission lines, to be constructed later, is estimated at \$2,655,000.

Now, there is another project known as the Missoula Valley development, near the city of Missoula, Mont. This is also over in the other district. But I understand it is a distinctly worth-while undertaking.

The Missoula Valley development near the city of Missoula in western Montana and the Bonanza and N-Bar-N projects in northeastern Montana are water conservation and utilization projects where investigations have been completed and work could be begun promptly. They are small undertakings and under an accelerated program could be completed within 1 or 2 years.

Now, to complete the Missoula Valley project would require but 17 tons of steel in 1943 and 60 tons in 1944; again, relatively small amounts. The completed facilities will water 2,100 acres of land by 1944, on which can be grown 9,450 tons of alfalfa in 1944. The estimated cost of the project is \$360,000.

Only 21 tons of steel in 1943 and 26 tons in 1944 are required to complete the Bonanza development of 910 acres. The construction costs would total \$75,000.

Then, we have what is known as the N-Bar-N project at a cost of \$500,000, located below Fort Peck. This project would consume only 55 tons of steel in 1943, 200 tons in 1944, and 100 tons in 1945, and bring in 1,000 acres of new land in 1944, and 6,380 acres in 1945. Livestock in this area would be fed 12,720 additional tons of alfalfa that can be grown there by 1945.

In addition to the projects included in the program, I wish to call the Committee's attention to the need for work to improve the Milk River and Sun River projects in my State to prevent crop loss and to restore to productivity areas damaged by drainage. Only small amounts of material would be required.

The wood-stave Pishkin Canal siphon crossing of the Sun River development is in extremely poor condition and must be replaced with a steel conduit. The construction, estimated to cost \$50,000, would provide a greater water supply and remove the hazard of a serious crop loss through a system failure.

It is also urgent that drainage of Greenfield Lake on this project, which has been rising steadily with run-off water from increased irrigated acreage, be provided. The development will restore to agricultural use considerable lake-shore land and will remove a seepage threat from adjacent and somewhat higher lands. An appropriation of \$40,000 is required. About \$100,000 will be needed to continue the present drainage program of the Sun River project, where seepage has been increasing steadily as more land is irrigated.

The Milk River project is also affected by a major drainage problem. About 3,200 acres of the Fort Belknap irrigation district of the Chinook division has been taken out of production as a result of seepage. Drainage of this idle land, capable of producing as good crops as any land in northern Montana, is essential if the district is to survive. Much of the area is only slightly affected and can be placed in production immediately. The cost of this improvement is about \$100,000.

The Montana areas in which there are investigations yet to be completed are the Bitter-Root, Marias, the Yellowstone, Big Horn, and Powder River, the Kalispell, Milk River, and Sweetgrass. In connection with the Yellowstone River survey, there is the Laurel-Park City area where an important agricultural section needs attention.

The construction or completion of these various projects would require very little steel, yet we were unable to secure such priorities. I repeat again that this is a mighty short-sighted policy of the War Production Board and the O. P. A. That there is a shortage of food no one will deny, and it is going to get mighty keen before this emergency is over. Already we are told that there are many places where the farmers are flooded out.

Along the main stem of the Missouri River from Fort Peck to Kansas City over 800,000 acres have been flooded out. The number of acres would run into millions if we take into account the flooded acres along the tributaries which flow into the Missouri River.

In other places they are being frozen out by late frost and snows. In my own State my understanding is that 45 percent of the fall wheat crop has been already destroyed. It is impossible to predict just what is going to happen.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did the gentleman take up any of those projects with the War Production Board?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did, and I could not get any priority either, so I am not blaming the committee. But I am

pointing out that it is a mighty short-sighted policy. I do not care whether it comes from the War Production Board, or where. We must have food in this country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our committee has been very sympathetic with reclamation projects, but under the circumstances the committee could not recommend an appropriation.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to my distinguished colleague from New York that I have pointed out to my friends in the West that the West has no better friend than the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]. He has always been a supporter of our reclamation projects. We appreciate the splendid work he has done. As a matter of fact, we appreciate all the members of this committee, and in fact all the members of the Committee on Appropriations, because they have treated us very fine in the past. But whether this policy is a War Production Board policy or not I do not care. I repeat that it is a short-sighted policy. If they do not change their ways, we may find ourselves short of food right here in this country in the not very far distant future.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee make an explanation as to why the Central Valley project in California is receiving an appropriation here of \$11,000,000. If all the other reclamation projects have been eliminated, why has this been left in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that that is obvious. The War Production Board has lifted the stoppages on this particular project. A representative of the War Production Board appeared before our committee and urged that this item be included. It was stated that they were giving very serious consideration to other items. We are hopeful that the stop orders will be canceled against many of the other projects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So the War Production Board is granting priorities in this particular case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the subcommittee if it investigated priorities and releases of material now being made by the War Production Board to build reclamation projects in South America and Africa, at a time when they deny them in this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That was entirely without our province. Our committee could not investigate a matter of that kind.

Mr. CURTIS. It is taking place, though, is it not?

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

#### THE AMAZING AND INCREDIBLE SHIPSHAW TRANSACTION

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### DENIAL OF PRIORITIES TO AMERICAN PROJECTS CONTRASTED WITH WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TREATMENT OF SHIPSHAW OF CANADA

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, because of the question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] just a moment ago and because in the minds of many of the Members there is some doubt about this granting of priorities to plants outside of the United States and the denial of priorities to plants in this country, I take this time to discuss the matter in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill. I direct your attention to page 486 of the hearings under the title "Loan to the Aluminum Co. of Canada," wherein will be found a very illuminating discussion by the distinguished members of the committee with Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE EXHIBITED COMMENDABLE SKEPTICISM OF SHIPSHAW

In that section of the hearings there are statements made by the members of the subcommittee who participated, questioning the advisability of the War Production Board granting at times higher priorities to the Shipshaw project on the Saguenay River in the Dominion of Canada, than to power projects in the United States. I have introduced a resolution in this Congress seeking to have the transactions making that development possible, and similar transactions investigated. House Resolution 212, to investigate the supplying of equipment and facilities for furnishing electric power and energy for war purposes, is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

#### WE UNDERWROTE SHIPSHAW

Let me give you briefly the history of this Shipshaw scandal. The whole thing was kept very secret until this year, approximately 2 years after the first agreements were entered into between Metals Reserve Company of the United States and the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. The New York Times on January 31 gave the first public intimation that the United States Government was financing a branch of the Aluminum Trust in Canada. I quote from the New York Times:

Not the least amazing thing about it is that it is already paid for. The \$65,900,000 cost of the new plant was financed by the



Aluminum Co. of Canada out of contracts for sales of aluminum to Britain and to the United States, which were in some measure paid for in advance so as to encourage this enormous new power development so essential to war.

#### NO INTEREST ASKED ON LOAN TO CANADIAN PLANT

By a series of four contracts, two in 1941, two in 1942, Metals Reserve Company of the United States, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, advanced \$68,500,000 to the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. That money was an advance payment on 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum to be delivered by the end of 1945. The first two contracts provided for interest to be paid on the advance until it was amortized by the delivery of aluminum. That is the usual procedure. The 1942 contracts, however, provided that, not only would no interest be paid on additional advances provided for therein, but that interest already paid on the first advances would be returned. In other words, the end result was that \$68,500,000 was advanced the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., without interest at all.

#### SHIPSHAW A SECRET UNTIL RECENTLY

In October 1941 construction began on the Shipshaw power development in Canada. As I have pointed out, it was kept very secret until recently. The project will have cost \$65,900,000 when it is completed in November of this year. In other words, our advance payment completely covered the cost of that power development.

#### WHY CODDLE THE ALUMINUM TRUST?

The Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., is controlled by exactly the same interests as control the Aluminum Co. of America. They are both part of the international Aluminum Trust, with I. G. Farbenindustrie of Germany. The Canadian branch was established in 1928 by the American company as "Aluminium, Ltd." to develop certain properties of the Aluminum Co. of America. The Aluminum Co. of Canada is a wholly owned subsidiary of Aluminium, Ltd. May I quote from page 2725 of the Canadian House of Commons debate of May 14, 1943, on this matter:

The Canadian company obviously was organized originally as a separate corporation to escape the United States antitrust laws in order that this company might be able to play its part in the international cartel, whose agreements restricted production in the democratic countries and allowed Germany greatly to expand her aluminum production before the war.

#### A HIGHLY DUBIOUS POLICY

The United States has financed, interest free, a power project for this international cartel, which will enable it to produce aluminum in such quantities and at such a low price as completely to prevent light-metals production in competition anywhere in the world.

#### WE SUPPLIED CRITICAL MATERIALS AS WELL AS MONEY

The financing of this project by an American agency is a disgrace in itself. That is, however, by no means the end of the story. Materials for the construction of this Canadian project were sent

from the United States. The War Production Board has admitted that shafts and certain other items were sent to Shipshaw. Power projects in this country vitally needed the same materials. It is claimed that most of the fabrication for Shipshaw was done in Canada by Canadian firms. It develops, however, that those Canadian firms are Canadian subsidiaries of American firms—Canadian General Electric, Canadian Westinghouse, Canadian Allis-Chalmers, and so forth. I have reason to believe that these Canadian plants are not capable of building the large fabrications required for this huge project. How much material was fabricated here in American plants and merely distributed through the Canadian subsidiaries?

#### POWER PROJECTS HERE WERE STOPPED WHILE THIS GREAT CANADIAN ENTERPRISE WAS GIVEN ALL HELP

While we were helping build Shipshaw, the erection of power projects in the United States was being stopped by War Production Board, which denied priorities sufficient to enable them to go into the open market and secure the material with which to carry on. I have here a description of many of the projects in the United States against which the Board issued stop orders.

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

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Was not one of the projects stopped the Central Valley project?

#### CALIFORNIA POWER PROJECTS AFFECTED ADVERSELY

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. And the need for power in that area is particularly acute because of the fuel-oil shortage. At Keswick Dam, three 25,000 kilowatt units were cut out by W. P. B. stop order. At Shasta Dam, unit No. 5, with 75,000 kilowatt planned capacity, was also stopped. These units, if they were all allowed to go to completion, would replace annually about 2,000,000 barrels of fuel oil now being used to run steam-generating plants. There is a tight oil situation in that area now, which development of hydro power projects would greatly relieve. When the major emphasis of this war shifts to the Pacific, as it must if we are ever to defeat Japan, the situation will be a great deal tighter. As a matter of fact, it has been suggested that with increased demand for oil for fighting craft in the Pacific, it may be necessary to shut down war production plants in California now using oil.

Yet construction of these hydro plants in California was stopped while construction of the Shipshaw project in Canada went on.

These California plants were not to be used for power alone. If completed, they would have enabled supplemental irrigation water to be furnished to 2,000,000 acres of land. That land is not now growing food at top capacity.

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

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I call attention to the fact that that stop order was only partially issued.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct. Construction was allowed to go on under low priorities on facilities for fish protection and that sort of thing. The generating units I've mentioned were not allowed to go to completion, however.

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

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. And is the Grand Coulee project not one of them also?

#### GRAND COULEE HELD UP

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. Construction of generating units 7, 8, and 9 was stopped. At Grand Coulee, a dam and a powerhouse are already built to hold these three new generating units. Their construction has been authorized by Congress, and shafts for two units were nearly completed when their construction was stopped last year. Each unit had a rated capacity of 108,000 kilowatts. All existing capacity is now being used and new loads are being located in the area.

#### SHIPSHAW ADVANCES WHILE GRAND COULEE IS ORDERED TO STAND STILL

I have the names of the companies, where generator shafts were being manufactured for Grand Coulee, before the order went out to take them out of production. Shafts for Grand Coulee Units 7 and 8 were taken out of the production schedules of the Mesta Machine Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., after some work had been done on them. Why were they removed from the production schedules of one of the few machine shops in the country capable of handling such large shafts? Presumably because of a shortage of critical materials. Yet a letter from Hon. Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, answering some questions I asked him, admits that shafts for generators and turbines at Shipshaw were put in the production schedules of Camden Forge Co. and the Midvale Co. in the United States.

Power engineers say that shafts are the bottleneck in power plant construction. Every shaft sent to the Shipshaw project, owned by the Aluminum Trust, meant one less shaft for badly needed projects in this country, Government owned, and privately owned.

Not only were production schedules shifted around, but priorities higher than those for power projects in this country were given to materials to go to Shipshaw. Mr. Nelson, in his letter to me, says this "was part of the uprating to AA-1 of the entire aluminum program." Why were materials meant for this power project in Canada considered more a part of the aluminum program than materials going to power projects in this country, equally vital to aluminum production?

#### GRADES IN PRIORITIES

Nelson's letter belittles the amount of materials given high ratings and sent to Shipshaw. As a matter of fact, at the time that the blanket priority for the power program was AA-3, men within the Power Branch of the War Production Board itself expressed great concern for the completion of the scheduled projects on time, if the policy of giving higher priorities to certain projects were

continued and allowed to interfere with regular production schedules. All assurances given to the President and to the Secretary of War, and others, as to the adequacy of our war power supply, were based on the assumption that all projects scheduled for completion would be completed on time. Uprating of particular units was interfering with the schedules. It would seem that not only did materials go to Shipshaw, but the uprating of Shipshaw construction in this country interfered directly with our own war power program.

**STOPPAGE OF GRAND COULEE CONSTRUCTION HAS GREATLY INTERFERED WITH OUR WAR POWER PROGRAM**

Mr. ANGELL. And is it not a fact also that they are in need of additional power in that area—I mean the Pacific Northwest—where 30 percent of the aluminum will be manufactured?

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the situation is too tight right now, that with a dry year, war plants may have to cut down.

**DAVIS PROJECT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST**

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman say whether the Davis project in Colorado was also one of those against which a stop order was issued?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. I have a complete break-down of the whole proposition. Davis Dam, which would have an initial installation of 180,000 kilowatts which would have augmented the supply of power in southern California, southern Nevada, and Arizona, where large war plants are located, was not allowed to go to completion. Congress had appropriated \$8,000,000 for construction which was proceeding under low priorities. By a stop order, the project was abandoned and must, in the future, start from scratch. Yet, as I have pointed out, materials, time, and manpower went into the construction of shafts and forgings for Shipshaw in Canada.

**OTHER AMERICAN ENTERPRISES DENIED PRIORITIES**

I could enumerate many more projects that have been stopped while construction of Shipshaw went on. Work on the Colorado-Big Thompson project on the Continental Divide has been stopped. The power plants originally to be built would have generated a total of 103,000 kilowatts. Work on the third generating unit of Douglas Dam and the third generating unit at Cherokee Dam, both in east Tennessee—part of the T. V. A.—was stopped in December of last year. Each unit would have had 30,000 kilowatts capacity.

Smaller power projects all over the country, serving Army camps, or small communities, or rural electric cooperatives, have not been allowed to go to completion. Some of them lack only small amounts of steel or fabrications.

These are mentioned because they are pertinent to the Interior Department appropriation bill, because the subcommittee manifested an interest in the fact that we have for some peculiar reason sent materials, under high priorities, to this project in Canada while our own projects are being cut out.

What I say here I do not want to be construed in any sense as reflecting upon our good ally, one of the United Nations, the Dominion of Canada. There have been heated discussions in the Canadian Parliament on Thursday and Friday of last week, on this same matter. The matter has been discussed in the Canadian press. The Canadians are not sold on this deal any more than we are. They do not like the war emergency to be used as an excuse for giving the international aluminum trust a power project that will enable it to control the aluminum market after this war.

**CANADIAN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DENOUNCES SHIPSHAW FINANCING METHODS**

Let me quote from a speech the Honorable M. J. Coldwell, M. P., made in the Canadian House of Commons on May 14. This will indicate how Canadians feel about this project:

On March 23 the Minister of Munitions and Supply said that in the dim and distant future the Aluminum Co. may obtain some benefit from the Shipshaw development and there may be some post-war value in it for them. I say that these powerful aluminum interests have obtained in effect the greatest power resources at present available in the world, virtually as a gift; and thus they can, if they will, effectively block, in Ontario and New York State and eastern North America as well, any government-owned public power development because their plant will be paid for during the war, and any plant which the Province of Ontario or the government of New York State, or the Government of Canada or that of the United States, or both, may wish to build, will have to be paid for over a period of years. Not only that, but they will be able, through the cheapness of power, to control the price of aluminum almost everywhere on earth, and when we realize that we are entering upon an age of light metals and that they have entered into the field of magnesium production as well, we can understand how dangerous a monopoly we are building up by our public funds and war activities in this country.

I wish I had time to go into all the details with reference to this project. I have spent considerable time in attempting to ferret out all the facts.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I want to compliment the gentleman for calling this to the attention of the House, and remind him that when we passed the reciprocal trade agreements we placed an amendment in that bill this year urging the President to take cognizance of these cartel arrangements which threaten every business interest in our Nation. It is time that our Nation stopped and considered what is happening to it under these cartel arrangements.

**INTERNATIONAL CARTELS ARE INDEFENSIBLE**

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this matter of cartel arrangements. It is part of this whole situation I am bringing to your attention today. In January of 1941 a Federal grand jury brought in indictments against the Aluminum Co. of America and several other companies for conspiring and combining with the German

firm, I. G. Farben Industrie, to keep the price of magnesium artificially high by restricting production. Magnesium is a lighter metal than aluminum. The two metals together make a very strong alloy used in the construction of airplanes. Aluminum Co. of America (Alcoa) and these other companies conspired to prevent the proper development of our light metals program.

As I have pointed out, the Aluminum Co. of America and the Aluminum Co. of Canada are controlled by the same interests. They are the two biggest branches of the International Aluminum Trust. Is this most recent transaction another big step toward complete monopolization of the light metals market of the world? That is exactly what it is.

**CANADIANS WAKING UP TO THE IMPLICATIONS OF SHIPSHAW**

I should like to discuss the way the Canadian Government has been taken in on this deal. That is, of course, a matter for the Canadian Government to investigate, if it sees fit, but I think it should be brought up here just to emphasize the fact that the investigation I am urging is not, by any stretch of the imagination, meant as a reflection on our good neighbor and ally, Canada. As a matter of fact, you will find that some gentlemen in the Canadian House of Commons have already indicated a desire to have this whole thing investigated from their side of the border.

I think I may conclusively demonstrate the benefits the aluminum trust has gained in agreements with the Canadian Government, by quoting rather extensively from remarks by Hon. M. J. Coldwell, whom I have quoted before:

It is to this giant corporation that the governments concerned have given or advanced hundreds of millions of dollars to enable them to build a huge plant at Shipshaw and to expand their aluminum monopoly. How was this huge expansion financed? This is where we enter more directly into the provisions of the bill we are now discussing. Part of Canada's contribution, although not all, is covered by P. C. 11745, which provides for a special write-off or accelerated depreciation of \$154,500,000 \* \* \*. I have the prospectus of the company, and it has the following to say about Canada's contribution:

"Normally such capital expenditures for plant additions are written off for tax purposes over a period of years. In order to give effect to the fundamental basis of the contracts, permission has been granted the company to amortize these capital expenditures by a special deduction from income at a stipulated rate per pound of all aluminum delivered, \* \* \* the effect being to amortize the estimated cost of the additional aluminum producing facilities and 60 percent of the estimated cost of the additional power facilities by the time all deliveries have been made under the war contracts."

**A GREAT CANADIAN STATESMAN FEARLESSLY EXPOSES SLIMY RECORD OF SHIPSHAW**

Mr. Coldwell then goes on to discuss some other projects of this company, Aluminum Co. of Canada, costs of which have been written off by accelerated depreciation. He concludes:

It seems to me therefore that the total is not \$154,500,000, as we were told in the house this year, but nearer to \$175,000,000.



A STRANGE OFFERING OF ALUMINUM TRUST  
SECURITIES

The prospectus from which Mr. Coldwell quotes is the prospectus of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., published in conjunction with the issuance of \$15,000,000 preferred stock. Mr. Coldwell discusses this stock issue:

Why are the preference shares being offered now for the first time in the company's history? \* \* \* I am advised by people who have made inquiries that if one wants to get preferred shares the limit is 25 shares. Why? Because they want to give the small investor a chance to get in first, they say. In my opinion what they really wish to do is to spread some of the preferred shares over the country in order that there will be public opinion favorable to the aluminum company. That is a trick of utility corporations everywhere.

I might point out that the prospectus mentioned above, says, on the front cover:

This prospectus is not, and under no circumstances is to be, construed as, an offering of any of this issue for sale in the United States of America or the territories or possessions thereof, or an offering to any resident thereof or a solicitation therein of an offer to buy any of this issue.

That is very clear is it not? Why does the company not want shares sold in the United States? Because then the company would come under the prying eyes of the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States. It evidently does not want that.

WHY SHOULD UNCLE SAM FINANCE THE  
ALUMINUM TRUST?

We can see from this little bit of information I have given the House this afternoon, some of the ramifications of this huge advance the United States has given to the Aluminum Trust. We can see some of its effects upon our war power program now, and on our light metals development program. We can see its probable effects on the light metals market after the war. We can see its effect on any further power development in the St. Lawrence region of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter should be investigated by Congress in the interests of effective prosecution of the war, and in the interests of proper development of the natural resources of this country when the war is over. House Resolution 212 provides for the establishment of an investigatory committee to do just this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. First, I want to compliment this committee for the statesmanlike job they have done in matters of wartime economy concerning progress very close to my own heart.

Secondly, I would like to talk about the Columbia River which enters the United States in my own State and travels to the sea. It never leaves the State of Washington. During that travel it falls hundreds of feet, and constitutes, to my knowledge, today the greatest single source of water power in the Western Hemisphere.

When we speak of water power in the United States it might be wise for us to

realize that nearly 40 percent of all the water power is to be found in the State of Washington. We have there, when we shall have fully developed all the water power possible in the State of Washington, nearly 50,000,000 horsepower. I mention this for only one reason. When we speak of developing our water power as a national resource; when we speak of our national investments in water power; when we speak of that investment as an obligation against our national integrity, let us remember that to liquidate that obligation will require the sweat and purpose of the people who will live near our rivers, those who use that water power to create useful things for the rest of the Nation. Specifically, in the case of the Columbia River, it will be paid for through the service that the people whom I now represent can render to the rest of the Nation. We should not forget that. In any bill, such as the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has introduced today, which would allow Federal jurisdiction over that vast amount of water power, out there along the Columbia and elsewhere in the Nation, we should not lose sight of the fact that those people should be allowed wide latitude in the use of that water power through the trying years, the lean as well as the fat. Their voice should be dominant in matters of policy. Their continuous industry demands it. Their continuous industry spells part of our security.

I also want to compliment this committee for calling attention to the discriminatory act in the matter of the Shipshaw affair and to call the attention of this House to the printed proceedings of the committee, particularly pages 486, 487, 488, and 489, as well as the letter to be found on page 539, which is Jesse Jones' letter to Senator TRUMAN, who investigated it. It should be investigated further. If we want to have healthy international relationships it must be by open covenants openly arrived at. There is entirely too much secrecy in what is to be found in these hearings. I want to quote, if I may, something that the able chairman of your subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], said during these hearings. He said:

Referring to the story that was in the paper that morning about the Shipshaw affair, I have just heard about it. Frankly, I was not only amazed, but shocked at the story. I have known and admired Secretary Jones for many years. I have also admired his businesslike methods, as well as his quick and definite decisions. I shall, of course, not pass final judgment until I hear his side of the controversy, but the story, to say the least, calls for a clear-cut explanation, or else there must be a thorough investigation of the whole transaction.

My colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] has introduced a resolution calling for such an investigation. I believe it should be allowed to come to the floor of this House by the Rules Committee and this matter at least have some light thrown on it.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement and for

the vigor with which, as a new Member, he is representing his district. But I also call attention to the fact that the Columbia River is not entirely in the State of Washington. It is the boundary line between Oregon and Washington, and the great Bonneville project, a portion of which lies in my district, is in the State of Oregon. I know the gentleman agrees with that.

Mr. HORAN. I want to assure my able friend, the gentleman from Oregon, that the things I said in behalf of the people of Washington I would certainly not deny to the people he represents. We can work together out there, I assure him.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he will, of course, realize that Washington was originally part of the Oregon country.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, when I asked this question about irrigation projects in foreign lands I was not aware of the facts about the Shipshaw project. It, of course, will have to stand or fall on whatever the facts are. It is alleged that the United States is now supplying materials for irrigation works in South America and Africa. If this is true, it should be stopped so long as our own projects are held in abeyance. I do not believe it is a safe proposition to turn the future of reclamation over to the War Production Board. I have the greatest respect for many of the eminent businessmen on the War Production Board; they are doing a good job; they have many problems, many things on their minds, but they are not familiar with the reclamation program. Unless someone has lived with it and has seen reclamation projects work, they do not know how vital they are to the economy of our country. As one Member of this House, I seriously object to letting the War Production Board write the ticket so far as the future development of irrigation is concerned, for the simple reason that the top-notch men down there do not know about irrigation matters. I realize, of course, that there will have to be restrictions of material, but I do say that this splendid subcommittee which has given so many hours of careful study and has been fair in its consideration of these matters in times past should continue to handle this matter. We should not make our program of appropriations dependent upon the will of any executive bureau. Personally, I hope that before this bill is sent to the White House a few changes can be made.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman is familiar with the particular problem that affects the Great Plains States as far as irrigation projects are

concerned. I wonder if he has any thought as to what might be done to give consideration to this area by way of small projects in view of the decisions of the War Production Board?

Mr. CURTIS. Without a doubt the studies should go on. There are many projects which could be built even during wartime and which should be built. Chester Davis has made the statement that if we produced all the food possible through using every avenue of production we still would not have enough to meet the demands being made on this country. A certain amount of construction should go on as a part of the war program, but by all means a full program of studies and investigations for post-war irrigation projects should be carried on.

The gentleman is interested in the same valley I am, the Republican River and its tributaries. These projects should be advanced, for they will make a great contribution to the war effort. I want all parts of that great valley to have the benefits of flood control and irrigation.

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

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this subcommittee has been diligent and has been motivated in its activities in presenting this bill to the committee with a desire to effect savings of public funds wherever possible, particularly those which do not have to do with the prosecution of the war. However, I regret that the committee has seen fit to drastically curtail the appropriation requested by the Fish and Wildlife Service for Federal aid in wildlife restoration and for funds to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out its activities.

The total amount recommended for this service is \$4,897,350, which is a reduction of \$1,014,220 below the 1943 appropriation and \$855,015 less than the Budget estimates.

I am a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and we have held extensive hearings considering the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the conservation program and particularly its functions which have to do with the furthering of our war efforts. I call the committee's attention to the testimony given by Dr. Gabrielson, who heads this department of Fish and Wildlife Service, appearing in the hearings on page 627. Here is given the evidence disclosing that this department is making an unusual contribution toward supplying the Nation with fish and game for food during this critical time.

Fishing is an essential war industry. In 1941 the commercial production of fish for food and other purposes reached an all-time high of approximately 5,000,000,000 pounds. It fell materially last year due to interference of the war in our commercial fishing efforts. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that it could if provided with the staff and the necessary funds produce safely over 6,000,000,000 pounds of fish products in a

year without depleting this resource. They estimate that there could be safely taken this year 2,000,000,000 pounds more than was taken last year. They point out that fish and wildlife constitute a resource that costs very little so far as the Federal Government is concerned and the only investment of the Federal Government for the production of this great natural resource is the funds provided to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year hunters alone during the open season took about 255,000,000 pounds of meat from game birds and game animals. Dr. Gabrielson points out that during the last 5 years his department has been able to take more than 50,000,000 pounds of salmon per year out of the Alaskan waters than each of the first 5 years after the passing of the 1924 act, known as the White Act, establishing a system of regulations of the commercial fisheries of Alaska. With rationing and the extreme shortage of meat we should not curtail this supply of fish and wild game.

In March of this year I asked Dr. Gabrielson to give me a short report on the activities of his department and received in reply the following letter, which I include as a part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,  
Washington, March 20, 1943

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: In accordance with our telephone conversation, I am submitting the following information concerning the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in connection with the fisheries and the war food program.

Normally, we have no regulatory authority over the commercial fisheries with the sole exception of that exercised with regard to the aquatic resources of the Territory of Alaska. There our jurisdiction is directly comparable to that exercised by the individual States through their State conservation authorities and organizations. Our activities with regard to the commercial fisheries carried out under authorization of organic legislation and annual appropriation acts, consists of biological investigations with a view toward recommending conservation and management measures, methods of increasing the populations, and means of restoring depleted resources; the collection and analysis of statistical information on the fisheries and its publication; the collection, compilation, and daily publication and dissemination of market news information at seven field offices in important commercial fishing regions, and technological studies to improve handling, processing, and refrigeration practices, to develop new fishery products, as well as to conduct investigations on net preservatives and improvements of fishing gear. These are the only services which the Federal Government ever has provided for the fishing industry, and in this respect the United States is far behind the other main fish-producing nations such as Great Britain, Norway, and Japan.

Even before the declaration of war we realized that some conservation of our fishery activities to an emergency basis was necessary in order that we might be able to render more effective assistance to other agencies concerned with fishery matters and production, and such conversion was undertaken as necessity demanded. Immediately upon the establishment of the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration, we

were called upon to perform special services in order to provide these agencies with the information they needed. We have furnished these agencies regularly and promptly basic information upon which many important plans, decisions, and orders were based.

On July 21, 1942, the President signed Executive Order 9204 (7 F. R. 5657) designating the Secretary of the Interior as Coordinator of Fisheries and establishing the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries. The primary duty of this office originally was to coordinate the plans, policies, and programs of Federal and State agencies, and the commercial fishing industry in the interest of maintaining an adequate fishery production program. At the outset we found that 21 different Federal agencies were carrying on work or issuing orders that affected the fishing industry. Through work with a liaison committee composed of representatives of each of the 21 agencies, and our continuous insistence and efforts to insure that the fisheries be recognized as an important, essential, and indispensable food producing industry, we now have overcome many formerly troublesome problems and cleared away some confusing issues and uncertainties. Some examples of the type of work we have been doing will show the diverse nature of our activities:

Upon the outbreak of war the Navy, Army, and the Coast Guard began at once to purchase, requisition, or charter fishing vessels both along our coasts and in Alaska. The fleets were reduced so greatly that production of fishery products declined. By constant effort we have finally effected an arrangement whereby the armed services may not take over any fishing vessel without the approval of the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries. During recent weeks progress has been made in effecting return of purchased and requisitioned vessels to the industry.

Through our negotiations with the War Manpower Commission on the subject of occupational deferment of skilled men in the industry, Occupational Bulletins 18 and 20 recently were issued by the Director of the Selective Service System. These bulletins declare commercial fishing to be an essential war industry and list as eligible for deferment from induction men holding the majority of the important positions in the fish-producing and processing industries.

With the recent rationing of canned foods, fishing vessels began at once to experience difficulties in obtaining adequate supplies for their crews. Through work with the Office of Price Administration, amendments to General Ration Order No. 5 (institutional users) and Ration Order No. 13 (individuals) have just been issued which classify the major fishing vessels as "institutional users" and which list fishermen as eligible for supplemental supplies of rationed foods. Adequate provisioning of fishing vessels is thus assured.

The controlled materials plan soon to be substituted for the priorities system by the War Production Board, as it will affect the fishing industry, has been based on our estimates and recommendations.

Pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9280 (7 F. R. 10179), the Secretary of Agriculture, on February 8, 1943, issued Food Directive No. 2 (8 F. R. 1777) delegating to the Secretary of the Interior responsibility for those phases of the war food program concerned with the production and processing of fishery commodities. Prior to that time the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries served as an investigative and advisory agency, but was without any regulatory authority. Food Directive No. 2 confers authority to issue such orders as may be necessary to insure the maintenance of an adequate fishery production program. The Directive was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture because of the fact that the desired personnel and facilities for administering the production and processing phases of the war food program existed in



the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Agriculture also recognized that utilization of these facilities instead of setting up units and personnel in his own Department for the purpose of administering the fishery program would result in greater efficiency and economy of funds and personnel. Arrangements have been perfected so that the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, handling production and processing, works closely and in complete harmony with the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture which is responsible for distribution of fishery products and purchases for Government requirements.

We have worked out a program designed to increase production with a view toward meeting the requirements stipulated by the Food Distribution Administration for the coming year. At the present time prospects for large increases in production are not too good because of the shortage of boats and manpower. Unless these shortages are alleviated production may fall as much as 2,000,000 pounds below the fish requirements for 1943 desired by the Army, Navy, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, other Federal agencies, and the civilian population. There are plenty of fish available and new sources have been explored successfully for producing substitute processed fishery products to compensate somewhat for the great demands for such items as canned salmon, canned sardines, and salted codfish that are in short supply.

On March 1 and 2, at the invitation of Secretary Ickes, 17 representatives of the fishing industry, labor, and consumers, met with our staff in Washington to discuss industry's problems, devise means of solving them, and to develop a practical production program for 1943-45. The meeting served to focus attention upon many important problems, facilitated exchange of information, and has led to the development of methods of offering to the industry direct assistance in meeting their problems. To accomplish the latter objective, the country has been divided into 11 principal areas and a man with the best overall knowledge and widest experience has been placed in charge of each area to serve as area coordinator. Local representatives will be stationed in the major fishing ports, under the supervision of the area coordinator, and local industry committees will be appointed soon in order that the local representatives and the area coordinator may bring into their work the benefits, advice, and collaboration in solving the industry's problems. The local committees will be especially helpful in devising means of utilizing existing facilities, equipment, and manpower to better advantage, and in some instances short-cut methods of increasing production undoubtedly may be devised.

For the first time we have the authority to set up and operate an effective fishery program. The production program which has been outlined is constructive and is designed to effect healthy developments in the industry and substantial increases in yield. We are working on a 3-year program rather than a program for the present year only, inasmuch as food will be a badly needed item until long after the war. We shall have to supply food to the war-torn countries until they have had time to reestablish their own agriculture, cattle raising, dairy industries, and fishing enterprises.

The cooperative arrangement between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture for handling the fishery war program, referred to above, is functioning efficiently. All of the most able men in both departments are hard at work and things are moving satisfactorily as never before. There appears to be no justification for disturbing the existing arrangements at the present time, especially since serious interruptions in important work and loss of valu-

able time are always coincident with organizational transfers and revisions.

Sincerely yours,

IRA N. GABRIELSON,  
Director.

Mr. Chairman, I express the hope that the Senate will restore the appropriation requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that our conferees will support the restorations when the matter is returned to the conference committee.

The committee has seen fit also, Mr. Chairman, to reduce the allowance for Federal aid in wildlife restoration. This activity is under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act. In 1943 there was an appropriation of \$1,250,000. The Budget estimate for 1944 is a like amount. The funds from which this appropriation is paid are provided by a special tax paid by sportsmen under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act. There is at the present time over \$9,000,000 in this fund. It is in the nature of a trust fund. Dr. Gabrielson testified with respect to it, hearings, page 706, as follows:

That fund, as you know, comes from a special tax on sporting arms and ammunition, the collections from which are set aside in the Treasury by act of Congress in a special fund known as the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund. A great many of the States have built up programs based on that act, for land purchase, and various other things that they are doing, so it would be very difficult for them if appropriations were suddenly discontinued.

The appropriation has been cut very materially, from \$2,750,000 for fiscal year 1942 down to \$1,250,000 for the current fiscal year, largely because the States could not continue some of the previously planned development work; but they are anxious to keep enough of this fund so that they can keep up their commitments on land acquisition and keep their key personnel now employed on essential wildlife management fact-finding work.

Under the provisions of this law the State matches funds provided by the Government, and, as Dr. Gabrielson testified, they have built up programs based on a continuing policy with the expectation of receiving their proportion of these funds.

It is not only unfair to the sportsmen who have contributed the funds, but to the States which have been induced to provide projects under the act, and they will suffer great loss if the appropriations are cut off and they are not allowed to proceed with their programs.

I include as a part of my remarks the following excerpts from the testimony and a statement presented by Dr. Gabrielson which appears in the hearings, page 707:

#### FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

When this Federal aid in Wildlife restoration program started functioning almost 5 years ago, the majority of the States were badly in need of factual information on how best to manage their wildlife. This undesirable condition stemmed from the fact that funds were not available to enable them to procure such information. With funds that have been made available, the cooperators have stressed wildlife management fact-finding. The program has been highly successful and much of the success has come from the technically trained men employed as project leaders. These men have accom-

plished splendid results in the field of wildlife conservation and restoration by furnishing information and advice on how State wildlife resources can be increased and more effectively administered.

Wildlife populations are not static and certain species of game birds and mammals, such as ring-necked pheasants and cottontail rabbits, which have high reproduction potentialities, under favorable conditions can quickly produce populations that are capable of assuming pest proportions if they are not held in check. Likewise big game ranges must be investigated annually and their populations inventoried to ascertain whether hunting pressure must be increased or decreased in order to insure sound utilization of available ranges and the wildlife inhabiting them. Through the assembling of factual information by trained workers and the translation of that information into appropriate seasons and bag limits, perpetuation of the Nation's wildlife resources is assured, along with assurance that maximum utilization is obtained.

Outside of birds classed as migratory, in treaties with Canada and Mexico, the States are responsible for the management of the Nation's wildlife. In normal times the pursuit of wildlife is most important in providing healthful outdoor recreation for more than 10,000,000 licensed and unlicensed hunters. While the recreational benefits are paramount even in times of war, wildlife does provide a very useful supplemental supply of highly nutritious meat. During the last hunting season more than one-quarter billion pounds of usable meat was harvested by the Nation's sportsmen. This is a solid contribution to the present inadequate meat supply of the Nation.

In the Southeast particularly, and to a considerable extent elsewhere, the State game departments, through this program are cooperating with organized Soil Conservation Service districts in providing supplies of seed of perennial legumes, particularly for strip plantings adjacent to woodlands. Farmers thereby are not obliged to plow to the edge of the woods and cultivate land that is not productive, due to the shading and leeching action of bordering trees. These wildlife strips provide food and cover for farmland wildlife but most important to the farmer, they insure permanent cover on a strip of nonproductive land, which has had to be cultivated heretofore to prevent the encroachment of woodlands. Through such cultivation in the past, serious soil erosion has frequently resulted. In Virginia last year seed distributed to the farmers permitted the establishment of field border strips 1 rod wide for a distance of 300 miles.

As the result of studies carried on under this program, the Missouri Conservation Commission last year inaugurated a farm pond construction program. Thereby more than 650 demonstration farm ponds were constructed and as a result of that demonstration it is reported that 4,500 of these one-half to 2-acre ponds were constructed by farmers last year. Through the fencing of these ponds with a margin of land around them, wildlife seed stock refuges have been established. Through this work the farmers are assured of a dependable water supply for livestock and culinary use during drought periods and in addition, through stocking the ponds with fish, a supplemental food supply of a high protein value is being produced. Encouraged by Missouri's successful efforts, Ohio has undertaken like work under its Federal-aid program.

A number of States are engaged on fur-management studies designed to increase returns from this natural resource which annually provides around \$50,000,000 in raw pelts. Surveys and investigations are being

conducted to determine methods of improving environments of fur animals, to find ways to trap and prepare the skins for the market so that better utilization will be made of fur bearers, and to trap and distribute fur animals to suitable but vacant areas. For example, Louisiana, which annually harvests around 6,000,000 muskrats, is conducting studies on its extensive coastal marshes to determine how the productivity of those marshes can be increased.

A number of the States, especially in the West have undertaken the live trapping and transplanting of beaver. These animals stabilize stream flow, impound water, improve environmental conditions for wildlife, and in addition are real assets to the livestock industry in providing dependable water supplies in areas which otherwise could not be used for the summer grazing of livestock. Idaho, through this program has trapped and transplanted more than 3,700 beaver, most of which have been placed on lands administered by the United States Forest Service and the Grazing Service. Those two services have requested the planting of these valuable fur bearers in selected locations with the view of expanding grazing opportunities for range livestock.

Many of the participating States have emphasized the acquisition of lands for wildlife use. In the West, particularly, lands have been acquired in order to provide a badly needed balance between summer range and winter range for deer and elk. Lands of no value to agriculture have been purchased for waterfowl usage by a number of the States in order that the waterfowl population, which has been greatly increased through sound management in recent years, may be spread out and harvested more effectively by the Nation's sportsmen. During the fiscal year, which ended June 30 last, the 46 participating States had 301 projects approved. Of the money obligated thereby, 41 percent was for the acquisition of land, 30 percent was for wildlife restoration development activities, 24 percent was for wildlife management research and 5 percent was for wildlife management coordination.

With the decrease in the appropriation from \$2,750,000 for the fiscal year 1942 to \$1,250,000 for the current fiscal year, together with the war and the impossibility of obtaining materials for construction work, the 47 participating States are stressing wildlife management investigations more than has heretofore been the case. Their object is to assemble facts for translation into action to insure that the maximum wildlife populations may be harvested without impairing the basic resource and concurrently to institute measures to make certain that wildlife populations are maintained at maximum levels consistent with prudent management so that they will be able to bear the greatly increased hunting pressure that can be anticipated after the war is over. Estimates as to increased pressure are predicted on the 30-percent increase in hunting licenses sales immediately following the termination of World War No. 1, notwithstanding that during that war more hunting licenses were sold progressively from 1916 through 1918.

The recommended appropriation of \$1,250,000 for carrying on this cooperative wildlife restoration program in which the State game departments participate to the extent of 25 percent of project costs will enable the several State game departments to carry forward well conceived long-range wildlife restoration fact-finding and management programs on a reduced scale. It will enable them to maintain a nucleus of trained and experienced wildlife technicians who will be available after the war to counsel and advise State game administrators on the multitude of problems pressing for solution in connection with the management of the Nation's

wildlife, a product of the soil, the supply of which in normal times is never equal to the demand of those who desire to participate in its taking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This is an item that does not reflect in the Budget estimate. What would happen if we cut this half in two? That proposal has been made seriously, and I would like to know what objection there is to it.

Dr. GABRIELSON. You will notice that it has been cut very drastically from a \$2,750,000 appropriation in 1942. This really should not show in our appropriation either, because we do not get this money; we just distribute it to the States. We get a small portion of whatever is appropriated for the administration of the act, but not to exceed 8 percent of the appropriation for administration.

#### TAX ON SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITION

This money is collected through a special tax on sporting arms and ammunition. It was imposed for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act. It comes out of a special tax which a special group of people pay. The money is distributed to the State game departments under a formula set up by Congress.

The work under this appropriation is carried on in the various States.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate will restore this item as recommended by the Budget so that this useful service and wildlife restoration may go forward and by so doing help in the winning of the war, and that our conferees will agree thereto when it goes to conference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest today, as I do whenever we have an appropriation bill before us. It seems to me that we have reached the state of mind in regard to these appropriation bills that many seem to think all we have need to do is to appropriate enough money and we can produce all the food we can possibly need. We are in a much more embarrassing position as far as food is concerned than most people realize.

Today I received the report showing the downward trend, as far as butter is concerned. Butter production is more than 7 percent below 1 year ago. Day before yesterday I had the weekly report on cheese. Cheese is 24 percent below last year's production. We sit here appropriating money but at the same time we let these agencies for whom we also appropriate money run hog-wild and some of these agencies are doing more harm to food production than all the money we appropriate and our efforts here can remedy.

WHY IS THE AVERAGE BUSINESSMAN NOT DESERVING OF SIMILAR CONSIDERATION TO THAT AFFORDED OTHER GROUPS?

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to two situations. First, I wish to remind you of the Ways and Means

Committee bill to allow the increase in the public debt with the special amendment attached to it preventing the Executive Department of our Government from placing a \$25,000 limit on salaries. The reason given for the amendment was that the Executive had exceeded his authority, and this assumption of power was corrected by the amendment. This amendment had majority sponsorship, as well as majority and minority support.

Secondly, I wish to call your attention to the following section of the same Price Control Act—paragraph (h) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act (Public Law No. 421):

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

If there is a Member of this House who believes that this section of the Price Control Act has been followed by the O. P. A., I wish to yield to him to so state at this time. Everyone knows that the O. P. A. has disregarded, not only the spirit of this law but the word of the law as well. We have seen hundreds of small businesses hampered, hamstrung, and, in fact, put out of business. The small packing plants and the canneries of our country are two good examples of what the O. P. A. has done to prevent the orderly marketing of food products and to prevent the maximum food pack for this season.

This O. P. A. outfit, since its inception, has seemed to be more interested in making America over than in making America strong. They now seem more interested in putting through their particular schemes than they are in providing for maximum food production in 1943. The question resolves itself around to this point. If the Congress was justified in correcting the Price Control Act so that the executive department could not place a \$25,000 ceiling on the salaries of a limited number of people in the higher income brackets, why has it not by corrective legislation action clarified the provisions of this same Price Control Act so that this O. P. A. outfit will not continue to ruin one small business after another? There surely was no more assumption of power by the executive branch in regard to the \$25,000 salary limitation than there has been by the machinations of this O. P. A. outfit. What is fair for one group is fair for the other.

We have had enough committees, we have had enough hearings—but where are the legislative proposals to do anything about it?

We passed the Wolcott amendment to protect all our citizens from the O. P. A. This provision was eliminated by the other body. We should not be put in the position of advising our constituents that they must continue to suffer from the unfair rulings and the assumed powers of the O. P. A.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin as being one of the leading agricultural experts in the Congress of the United States. He is one of the most valuable Members of Congress. Now, he does not have to answer this question, but if he wishes, he can. I think the Department of Agriculture is equally at fault with the O. P. A. in connection with this food shortage. I think the O. P. A. has done more harm than good in its effort to ruin small business. Does the gentleman agree with me, and he may answer or not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I always answer if I have the time. First, I humbly thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind words. My answer is that the Agriculture Department has had a lot of criticism that it should not have had. We must realize that the Department of Agriculture has not been able to put through a program that it wants any more than you or I can put through the kind of program that you or I may want.

Taking the whole picture into consideration, I personally must stand here and defend what the Agriculture Department has tried to do, though I know they have made mistakes. Covering as many fields as does the United States Department of Agriculture, it is not humanly possible to avoid mistakes. There is one thing about the Department of Agriculture, and that is this—if you have a grievance, you can present your grievance to them and you get sympathetic consideration of it, but as far as the O. P. A. is concerned, all you get is a promise. The Agriculture Department has been most cooperative with me ever since I have been a Member of this House. They furnish the facts and do not add their interpretations unless asked to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, this is one appropriation bill in which I always take much interest because I come from one of the great western States which has much public land and a large proportional interest in the Interior Department appropriation bill, with regard to Indian reservations, reclamation, and the like.

I expected this cut. We anticipated there would have to be a severe cut on account of war conditions, although it is a little heavy in spots. I want to add my word of commendation of the fine work of the committee and I want to sanction what my friend from Montana said about the gentleman from Manhattan who has always been so considerate of us in the great open spaces of the West. May I also join with the gentleman from Utah in what he said earlier today. I feel that the War Production Board has stopped work on some mighty important reclamation projects which would have contributed very powerfully to the war effort.

There is one matter which I did not mention to the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I shall mention it here.

Uncle Sam is a great land owner. Two-thirds of the area of my State is in the public domain, or at least under the control of the Forestry Department, the Indian Service, or some such agency. Throughout the entire West a great deal of the public domain has been used for war training purposes, bombing ranges, and that sort of thing, having been taken over by the War or Navy Departments.

I hope that some provision will be made either in the Interior bill or in some military appropriation bill for the rehabilitation of those vast areas which have served as a proving ground for tanks, bombing ranges, and so forth, before they are turned back to us, as we hope they will eventually be turned back to the livestock people for grazing purposes and other uses of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say for the Record that 54.6 percent of all the land in the gentleman's State is owned by the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is a little less than I thought, but it confirms what I just said.

Mr. JENSEN. On page 227 of the hearings, the gentleman will find a table showing the percentage of land and the acres owned by the United States Government in every State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I notice that; but the column to which the gentleman refers is administered by the Interior Department. However, that confirms my statement that Uncle Sam is a great landowner, and we hope he will continue to be a good husbandman. It is in such appropriation bills as the Department of the Interior appropriation bill that we look to Uncle Sam to take good care of his resources and develop them to the limit.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say further that Uncle Sam owns 14.5 percent of all the land in the whole of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, much of that great area is forest land and mineral ground and we are interested in roads. Especially do we need access roads to tap the forests and the new mines that are being developed and more which ought to be developed. Right now we are called on to furnish more and more critical materials. The great Rocky Mountain region is the treasure chest of America and that is where we need development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to again advert to the subject I mentioned this afternoon when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] so graciously yielded to me.

It will be recalled the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1943 called for the amount of \$162,000,000. Perhaps some of you will also remember I offered 3 amendments to reduce that amount. The first called for a reduction of approximately 28 percent. When I offered this amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] opposed it and questioned my sincerity in offering

it. That amendment received 5 affirmative votes, including my own, and had 82 votes against it.

My second amendment called for a reduction of 14 percent and it received 14 "aye" votes and 76 "no" votes.

My third amendment called for a reduction of the amount requested—that is, \$162,000,000 of 5-plus percent and it received 37 affirmative votes and 86 negative votes.

Now just a year hence, the Appropriations Committee has brought in this bill which calls for a reduction of 56 percent of the amount requested in the appropriation bill last year. Strange to say, this reduction has had the unanimous approval of the Appropriations Committee and will probably have the unanimous support of the House. What a change of spirit must have come over the Appropriations Committee and the Members of this House. It is encouraging, to say the least. Now if the Congress can only come to realize the need of making comparable savings in other governmental departments it will be truly wonderful.

How my heart throbbed with joy as I sat here this afternoon listening to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] so vigorously and enthusiastically making the same speech, in substance, I made a year ago—the speech wherein he questioned my sincerity.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want this bill to pass without calling attention to one more item in it. I shall not offer an amendment today to this bill, but I am expecting that the Senate will offer an amendment and I want to say just a word concerning it.

On page 96 is what we generally speak of as the Robertson-Pittman Act. For those who are not familiar with this act I want to say that there is a 10-percent tax on munitions for civilian use which goes into a fund, which is used for the preservation of wildlife. Up to last year there was about \$2,500,000 a year appropriated out of that fund but last year the amount was cut, on account of the war, to \$1,250,000. It was hoped that at least an equal amount would be put into the bill this year, but the committee decided to cut it \$500,000 from last year's appropriation, or a cut to about one-third the amount provided in normal times.

That particularly affects my State of Colorado. In my particular district, in just one little section, over 2,000 elk and deer died this past winter because they lacked proper feed and too much segregation resulting in disease. There was over \$4,000,000 worth of wild game killed in my State last year, and more than that will probably be killed this year. This is important when our civilians do not have sufficient meat. This section of the bill should appropriate sufficient money to properly protect this wildlife.

I mention this item particularly because it does not cost the Treasury anything. The money is already in a fund which has accumulated to some \$10,000,000; it is increasing all the time and I ask the committee, when and if the Senate increases the appropriation to

somewhere near what it ought to be, that they be sympathetic to it.

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that this is really a trust fund, a fund provided for the sportsman and is not out of the public Treasury; it is money that is paid by the sportsmen, who are glad to put it up, in order that this very fine work may be carried on?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is true.

Mr. ANGELL. For the protection of wildlife.

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse what the gentleman has said regarding the attitude of sportsmen; I am sure that is quite true all through the West, and I know, particularly in my State, exactly what the gentleman has indicated is correct. The sportsmen gladly pay this money into this fund, and I think the major proportion of it ought to be expended for the purposes for which it is collected.

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

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the gentleman is entirely correct that this money in the Treasury is not usable by the Treasury for other purposes. I am interested in this fund. As a matter of fact, the first year I came to Congress I offered an amendment to increase the appropriation bill which made the first \$1,000,000 available under the Pittman-Robertson Act. The House accepted it. The explanation was given at that time that this tax was a tax which had been put on with some other nuisance taxes, and this particular tax on ammunition was not repealed with a sort of gentlemen's understanding that it would be the measure of appropriations that might be made under the Pittman-Robertson Act. However, I think the money is in the Treasury and could be appropriated for other purposes, except that from a bookkeeping standpoint the appropriations that are made under the Pittman-Robertson Act are measured against it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is not my understanding. My understanding is, as the gentleman from Oregon says, that a trust fund has been created and can be used for no other purpose. The committee, in its report, states that the money will stay there and accumulate. Their idea is that it will all be spent after the war, if the money is not spent now. My contention is that it is an economy to spend enough of it now to keep going in a small way the work that has been done up to this time.

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

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, America is today the strongest country financially in the world. Nevertheless, we are headed toward an economic Pearl Harbor infinite-

ly more disastrous than the defeat at Oahu unless we begin immediately to put government finances in order.

I am no alarmist. But I know of no greater disservice to America than to remain silent about the administration's policy of financial appeasement. Their financial failures parallel with deadly exactness the events leading to Pearl Harbor. When China was attacked in 1937 the President talked about quarantining aggressor nations, but war exports to Japan increased. After we had babied Japan with war materials, what happened? The strongest fortification in the world, America's bastion of strength that dominated the entire Pacific, was smashed to pieces in a few hours.

Mr. Roosevelt's policy on inflation has followed the same pattern that produced Pearl Harbor. To keep this discussion clear, let us define the term "inflation": inflation is a major decline in the purchasing power of the dollar. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt campaigned with energy on the theme that the country was going into bankruptcy because of the deficits of those years. Those deficits of 1931 and 1932, of which he talked so eloquently, were \$901,959,080 and \$2,942,051,451, respectively. Today, every 12 days, on the average, our deficit is greater than was the shortage then in a full year. Think of it! An increase in our shortage of about 3,000 percent from a condition which Mr. Roosevelt represented as the road to bankruptcy. I say this with no partisanship, because the cost of living and the arithmetic table are nonpartisan. Inflation, like rain, falls on the just and the unjust alike. But when we are making a mistake that Mr. Roosevelt has said will lead to disaster, and then he enlarges that mistake 30 times, either we are going to wake up promptly or calamity will befall us.

Here we encounter the alibis for this fantastic situation. It is explained that because we are at war, the budget of America must be unbalanced as it is today. That simply is not true. Practically all our expenditures are being paid to American people in dollars. These dollars could be collected from them in proportion to the increase in Government expense if the administration willed it. There will never be as good a time to do this task as now. Certainly the willingness and ability to pay heavy taxes will not increase after peace has arrived. Then the fervor of our war patriotism will have cooled.

England is collecting over 50 percent of her war expenditures in taxes. In the year ended April 1, Canada collected about 48 percent of her governmental costs. But what is the record in America? During the 1943 fiscal year to date, only 25 percent of our expenditures have been collected in taxes. Unfortunately, there is no way of accurately portraying the ominous consequences of this failure of America's leadership. Like floating downstream in the Niagara River above the falls, the signs of disaster are recognized only by those who have explored

the end of the journey. So it is with a financial policy of collecting only one-fourth of the cost of this war, while our allies are doing 100 percent better on this vital front. Frantic skirmishing on the price-fixing front cannot conceal the danger or substitute for action in the decisive field of taxation.

In his message to Congress the President asked for \$16,000,000,000 in new taxes for the coming fiscal year. So far Congress has made no progress on this task. With all the earnestness at my command, I plead with the majority leadership of this House to prepare a tax program immediately that will raise not less than \$16,000,000,000. What should those taxes be? Frankly, as a new Member of this body, I am not a tax expert. But I have some ideas. No political cowardice will keep me from presenting them in this hour of national crisis. Let me suggest them briefly: first, a Federal sales tax on goods and services, possibly excepting basic food commodities; second, a special Victory tax on gasoline and other motor fuels and oils, replacing rationing and black markets; third, additional or new taxes on tobacco, coffee, chocolate, and beverages generally; fourth, some increase in personal income-tax rates. Any large increase in personal tax rates will black-out the middle class. It will masquerade as a soak-the-rich policy. Actually, it will result in making "poor whites" out of everyone except the bureaucrats and the idle rich. Other specific taxes could be designed to absorb excess income before it produced explosive inflation in the market places of the Nation.

My suggestions may not provide the right answer and certainly not the full answer. But I say this—either levy new taxes in proportion to our expanded spending or curtail our commitments abroad to fit our resources. Whatever taxes we levy will be labeled unfair and unjust. They can result in general defeat at the polls for those with the courage to vote for them. But if America is to be saved we here must exhibit moral courage that will match the physical courage of our boys on the battle fronts. Taxes commensurate with Government expenditures are one of the prices of liberty. Actually, liberty with high taxes or slavery with high taxes is the choice confronting us. Can we see that truth in time?

To do this job, Congress must have genuine help from the Executive department. The blame for our present plight does not rest alone on the shoulders of Congress. Mr. Roosevelt has taken credit, and rightly, for the overdue social gains of the past 10 years. The credit is due the President because he dominated Congress and controlled its efforts. So then it is only correct and logical that the economic crisis existing today be charged up to the President who has controlled the actions of Congress. Just as the social reforms are a New Deal achievement, the financial errors and today's inflation are likewise his failure. Let me be specific.



Following the first major inflationary act, breaking the gold pledge, the New Deal, quite like a spendthrift who finances his riotous living by loans from his friends and relatives, kept borrowing steadily until the war danger threatened us. The insidious progress of this financial sickness was never effectively challenged. The forces for upright financial practices could not effectively combat such tricky arguments about debt as, "We owe it to ourselves," and other sleight-of-hand financial phrases. Compare that kind of leadership with what Churchill said to England a few weeks ago, and I quote:

These savings of the nation arising from the thrift, skill, or devotion of individuals are sacred. The state is built around them and it is the duty of the state to redeem its faith in an equal degree of value.

The policy here of evading and confusing the problem fooled many of the people but it did not entirely mislead Congress. Occasional attempts were made in this legislative body to levy taxes that would balance the Budget. A Federal sales tax, higher personal taxes, and other special taxes have been proposed from time to time. But for 10 years the Executive has had practically absolute control of legislation. Programs to tax adequately have been pettifogged by the Executive branch again and again, just as the Administration has blocked pay-as-you-earn taxation for many months. It is clear that the failure to prevent inflation by higher tax levies is not alone the failure of Congress. It is important that that responsibility be squarely placed.

For we are now nearing the crisis in our financial affairs. Strong measures to preserve the value of the frugal savings of the common people of America must be enacted, or else the same formula that has produced dictatorship in other parts of the world will produce it here. First would come social dissensions, resulting from the disruption of home life and skyrocketing of prices. These disorders would take the form of food riots, sectional strife, or recurrent labor disputes. Whatever their apparent nature, the underlying cause would be the protest of the people against destruction of the America they love by unsound economic practices. Should that day arrive, it will provide an alluring setting for the Executive power to seize all the reins of government. All that would be necessary then would be to shrewdly charge that the Congress had caused the crisis by failing to enact adequate tax legislation.

Special powers would be arbitrarily assumed, based on the necessity for preserving order and stopping dissension. That old alibi for despotism is hard to combat in a critical hour. It has been used wherever democratic nations have been destroyed from within. Always the primary cause has been inflation and economic distress. The first act of the dictator has always been to dissolve the legislative body, claiming that the legislature is incapable of dealing with prevailing conditions. Likewise, the promise is always made that once the emergency is over, the Reichstag—Hit-

ler—the Chamber of Deputies—Mussolini—or whatever the legislative body is, will resume its functions. This sort of tragedy need not happen here. If it does happen, every American boy who dies in this war will have died in vain.

It will not happen if Congress will enact tax levies commensurate with the present national expenditures.

The people of America are counting on the Members of Congress to preserve their liberty. Victory in this battle does not rest on our brave soldiers and sailors but on us at home. With you and me rests the final decision between solvency and liberty or inflation and slavery. Before the judgment seat of God each of us must some day answer for our actions during this critical hour.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] who desires to offer an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART: On page 39, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following: "Presbyterian College at Durant, Okla.: For 100 pupils, \$40,000; for pay of principal, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, \$7,000; in all, \$47,000."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to reinstate an appropriation for a college, the Oklahoma Presbyterian, a going institution heretofore supported by the Interior Department for the past 40 years. My own daughter attended this college.

To give you a little better background, my father came to the Indian Territory in 1894 as a Presbyterian missionary to the Choctaw Indians. Somehow, somehow this college failed to receive an appropriation 2 years ago. Yet it has produced some of the most outstanding Indian citizens in all America. I hope you will not forget that our very freedom which we enjoy today was brought about by the cooperation of the Choctaw Indians. In the Congressional Cemetery stands a humble monument to Pushmataha, an ally of General Jackson, who was the only full-blood Indian who ever rose to the rank of a general, and the only Indian statesman that was ever successful in getting all of the Indian tribes together. When the great war with England was raging in 1812, Tecumseh gathered many tribes, and it was the answer of this great general who brought the Choctaws over on the side of the United States, whom this Government gave military honors for his contribution to our very freedom today. Let us keep faith with our solemn agreements. I appeal to you to reappropriate this money. I am just as strong for my Catholic brethren, my Methodist brethren, and my Baptist brethren as I am of my own religion in this respect. Do not discriminate. I thought enough of this college that I sent my own beloved

daughter there. She attended this school. We are pioneer folks, and this school was one of the trail blazers of our civilization.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Was there a Budget estimate or request for the item involved in your amendment?

Mr. STEWART. I am sorry I cannot give you that information. I have never been able to have any information.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I regret to inform the gentleman from Oklahoma that there was no Budget request presented for this item, and that may be the principal reason why it was not favorably considered by the committee.

Mr. STEWART. Possibly that is so, but I am appealing to you as Members of Congress, because some ideologists went in there to shear the wings of a great institution—to prevent the appropriation for this school. The gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. JOHNSON], knows the picture as well as I know it, and I ask him to express himself at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say I am very familiar with the history and the record of this school. It is one of the outstanding schools of the entire United States. It has turned out some of the finest citizens of the country, and as a member of the committee I opposed closing the school. That is still my position.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you for your contribution. I just wanted to get that picture before the Members of Congress. Sometimes the Members of Congress do not get a clear picture of the country as a whole. I feel I am as tolerant as any man in Congress. I would go as far for a man who opposes my religious or political views, if he were honest and conscientious in his convictions as I am in mine. I am going to ask you few Members who are here this afternoon to restore this appropriation.

I might add as I go along, I read in a trade journal that we had in one department here in Washington 2,700 attorneys, controlling the affairs of that department, and England was able to cope with 10 attorneys with a like branch of government. I want you to figure that out. I am appealing to you. I believe that you men will see that these cold-hearted experts, if you please, are in error. They would pass judgment on an institution that has served America for 50 years, and one man of Indian blood has served three terms in the United States Senate, Senator Robert L. Owen and two others, Charles D. Carter and Bill Hastings in Congress. Please do not pass judgment on this institution until you learn of the great good it has done. I hope you do not oppose me. I beg of you your support, because I believe we all see eye to eye. I hope that you recant and reconsider and forget the ideologists who are

trying to destroy one of the greatest institutions in the United States, even though it is a small church school.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BENDER. How large a body has this institution?

Mr. STEWART. It is a very small school—100 or 200. It has never had over 200.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that it is less than 100 today?

Mr. STEWART. It is far less, because no appropriation was made 2 years ago, and it has been carried on by public subscription.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that it is less than 25?

Mr. STEWART. I do not know what the number is.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I can give the exact figures.

Mr. STEWART. All right; go ahead.

Mr. CARTER. Somebody said just 16 students.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know, but he may be like some of these others. I want to restore the institution; that will take care of 100 or more and they will have the enrollment if you vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret to find myself in opposition to the genial gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]. He has made a very fervent plea for this school, but his plea, with all due deference to him, comes a little too late. This committee held hearings for a number of weeks. Many Members of this House who were interested in various matters appeared before the committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma never appeared to present his case. We have no estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on this matter, and I say that this matter was called to the attention of the committee by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], who presented communications that had been written in behalf of the institution. The chairman of this subcommittee was very much in favor of the support of this school, and I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART], that when it came time to vote, although the chairman of the subcommittee favored it, the remainder of the committee was unanimously against it under the conditions under which it was presented. Had the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] gone to the Bureau of the Budget, or had he come to the committee and presented the matter with the fervor and devotion he has presented it here on the floor of the House, he might have appealed to us in such a manner that we would have put the school in, but I ask him now to withdraw his amendment so that we can get on with the bill.

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

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wrote a letter to the committee asking for the privilege

of appearing on this matter and it is in your files. I wanted to make a clear case, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his remarks and support this matter instead of opposing it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Was the gentleman notified to appear?

Mr. STEWART. I never had notice to appear. But I wrote a letter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that the gentleman was notified to appear.

Mr. STEWART. If I was, it was missed in the mass of correspondence that comes to my desk.

Mr. CARTER. I am sure that if the gentleman wrote a letter to the chairman of this subcommittee or to the clerk of the committee asking to appear, that he would have received a prompt reply. I saw but two letters in connection with this school, neither of which was written by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I might say that we have taken pretty good care of the gentleman's district, so far as schools are concerned. We have provided for two other schools.

Mr. STEWART. The subcommittee chairman just left the room, but I wrote him a letter asking him the privilege of appearing before the committee and presenting this matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to say that I think the gentleman was notified to appear before the committee. I am so informed by the clerk.

Mr. STEWART. I do not care what the clerk told the gentleman. I was not told.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further. If the gentleman applied for permission to appear before the committee and did not get it, that is regrettable and I say that I hope he will withdraw his motion, and that next year he will present the matter to the Bureau of the Budget and let it be brought up in an orderly way.

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

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. A remark has been made here about one of the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations. If there is a group of men in this whole Capitol that is devoted to the office which they hold that group is the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations, with which I have been connected for a long time. They are most devoted to their duty, and I am sorry to hear anything said derogatory to any one of them. If a letter was sent to the committee, there will be evidence of it.

Mr. CARTER. I agree with the gentleman. The clerk of this subcommittee is most efficient and courteous.

Mr. RABAUT. And I hope that the evidence will be produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time only for the purpose of making some remarks pursuant to what was said by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUF-

FETT] a little while ago about national finances, and then to ask some questions of the members of the committee.

It is true of course that the only real cure for the problem of inflation is additional taxation. A nation cannot bring into balance the available supply of goods with the available purchasing power of the people, so long as it permits billions of dollars of new money in the form of deposits to be created by the banks and loaned to the Government at interest month by month.

As long as that condition prevails the attempt to control prices by means of O. P. A. will be of itself a most difficult and hazardous procedure. As a matter of fact, I have put into a short volume called Out of Debt, Out of Danger my own thoughts about this whole problem of our national debt and national financial structure. A copy of that book I am going to take the pleasure of sending to each Member of Congress in a day or two. I rise at this time only to say that one of the chapters in this book points out that in time of war the kind of financial policies that should be followed by a nation are quite the opposite of those that should be followed in peacetime and that the thing we need to do above all others is to have sufficiently courageous taxation including, if necessary, a compulsory savings program so that we can avoid the creation of a single dollar of new money by the banking system of this Nation.

I should now like to ask one or two questions of members of the committee. In the first place I should like to say that I saw recently a statement to the effect that the War Production Board had lifted its stop order against the completion of the Friant Dam in California and also the Madera Canal. I realize this action on the part of the War Production Board is somewhat late from the standpoint of this particular bill, but I should like to ask some member of the committee, perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], what effect that might have on future actions.

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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Gladly.

Mr. CARTER. While I have received no official notice, I understand that that is the case, that the stop order so far as the Madera Canal and the Friant Dam has been removed. This appropriation bill carries an item of \$11,500,000 in addition to the carry-over which was \$26,500,000; so there is a considerable amount of money with which to work at the present time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And could that be used on the Friant Dam or any portion of the Central Valley project?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; there may be a very small portion that is earmarked, but it would not in my opinion amount to more than \$3,000,000 which could not be used for these purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will a portion of it be used for the completion of the Shasta Dam and the installation of power units there?

Mr. CARTER. It will be used immediately and continuously until that power



is brought in which will probably be soon after the first of next year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And how about the transmission of that power?

Mr. CARTER. There is plenty of money provided in this bill for the transmission line and it is the opinion of the committee that the only transmission line the Government should build is from the Shasta power house to the Shasta substation about 25 miles away.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It would have to be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. unless the transmission line authorized by Congress were completed from Shasta Dam to load center at Antioch.

Mr. CARTER. There is no hope of having that done for many years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But there is no prejudice against that being done as soon as possible?

Mr. CARTER. No; not if it is decided it should be done.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have been discussing a bill making appropriations for the Interior Department. During this time there has been some consideration of the question of food supply. I see on the floor the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] who has just returned from a visit to that great interior hinterland, Hot Springs, Va., where I understand he crashed the gate and was admitted to the food conference.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I want to make it perfectly clear that I did not crash any gates; as a matter of fact, I was welcomed very cordially, as I expected to be, by our former esteemed and distinguished colleague the Honorable Marvin Jones.

Mr. CASE. I am sure that the gentleman was treated nicely by Mr. Jones, who was a former distinguished Member of this body. If the gentleman at this time cares to elaborate on what he discovered, I shall be pleased to yield to him further.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I shall be very happy to tell the gentleman and the Committee what I found down there.

The United Nations Food Conference convened at Hot Springs, Va., last Tuesday, the 18th. As you all will remember, the Government originally ruled that the press of this country would be barred from covering the conference with the exception that they would be permitted to attend only the opening and closing sessions. In order that the American people would not be kept completely in the dark on developments at this conference, I introduced, on April 13, in company with our own Senator HOMER FERGUSON, House Concurrent Resolution 18. This resolution was designed to permit the Congress to have full knowledge of all discussions, all transactions, and all decisions which may be arrived at during the course of the sessions by having in

attendance a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives—to consist of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the majority party and one who shall be a member of the minority party; five Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker, three of whom shall be members of the majority party and two of whom shall be members of the minority party.

This resolution further sought to permit the vitally interested people of this Nation to be kept informed of the happenings of this historic meeting through daily attendance of representatives of at least the three major wire-press services, namely, the Associated Press, International News Service, and United Press. It is provided in that resolution that the gentlemen of the press are subject to a reasonable amount of censorship to prevent the disclosure of military secrets which might bring aid and comfort to the enemy.

No action having been taken upon this resolution by the Rules Committee up to April 27, I addressed a letter to its chairman, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, urging the imperative necessity of prompt action immediately upon the reconvening of the House on May 3. I pointed out to the chairman that if, as we had been led to believe, nothing of a military nature was to be discussed at this conference, there should be no objection raised to the adoption of my resolution and further that if discussions are to be had and decisions arrived at or commitments made which might affect the post-war security and economy of this Nation, then by all means it was imperative that favorable action be taken immediately on this resolution.

I became concerned about what appeared to me to be an obvious muzzling of the press and I became worried about some possible deliberate attempt on the part of the sponsors of this conference to keep valuable information away from the people of the United States or from we Members of Congress, who are the duly elected representatives of the people. Consequently, I continued to push for action before the Rules Committee. Republican members on that committee caused our resolution to be brought up for discussion last Friday. I was not called in before the committee at that time but I was promised that I would be called before the committee to testify early this last week. Not having been called and no action having been taken on my resolution, immediately after Mr. Churchill finished speaking on Wednesday, I jumped into my car and drove 220 miles down to Hot Springs, Va., to look into this conference personally. I consider it my duty to my constituents and my country to keep myself as fully informed as possible on all matters which pertain to the general welfare.

Some newspapers have carried the story that I crashed the gate at this historic conference. Even though it be true that I was the first and only Member of Congress to go to the trouble of seeking entrance to this conference up to the third day of its sessions, neverthe-

less I was very courteously received. Here is what actually happened.

On my arrival I was, of course, stopped by one of the military police, of which there are some 200 posted very wisely all around to protect the safety and welfare of these hundreds of representatives of the 43 Allied Nations that have honored us with their presence at this historic international conference.

Upon presenting my official identification as a Member of Congress, I was promptly and courteously sent to the main guard desk at the front door of the famous and beautiful huge Homestead Hotel, where my credential were again examined and I was promptly escorted to the office of the secretariat, Mr. Michael J. McDermott, of the State Department, and was given a daily visitor's pass. I was permitted to register and fortunately able to obtain a room in the very much overcrowded hotel. Huge as it is, this hotel is not able to accommodate all of the delegates and some of them are of necessity occupying rooms in buildings nearby.

Following my assignment to a room, the captain of the guard was good enough to take me up to meet my former esteemed colleague—a Member of the House for 24 years and recently chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and now a judge in the Court of Claims, the Honorable Marvin Jones, duly elected chairman of this historic conference.

I talked with Judge Jones for a long while about the aims and purposes of the conference and was very pleasantly received indeed. Following that session, Mr. McDermott took me all over the building, through the various meeting rooms, and so forth, and later I went down to the press room for an interview by members of the press in attendance.

On Thursday morning I returned to Washington for the purpose of repeating to my colleagues in the House the warm assurances of Judge Jones that all Members of Congress were welcome at any time to attend any and all sessions of the conference and that nothing whatsoever will be kept from them. In my humble opinion, it is most imperative that the Members of Congress accept this invitation whenever their time permits and sit in on these historic meetings. After all, I have been told that this conference is but the first of a number of such international conferences that it is expected will be held between now and the peace to follow this devastating war. These conferences are looking toward the post-war period and it seems to me that we as Members of Congress are woefully remiss in the discharge of our duties if we fail to profit by our mute attendance at these conferences and get the viewpoints of the international delegates who are thus assembled. It seems to me this is a golden opportunity for the Members of Congress to interview these delegates—statesmen and economists—from all over the world and get their outlook on the post-war world, in order that we may be in a better position to pass upon the various questions that will be presented to us and thus render decisions which in our

humble opinion will be for the best interests of our Nation and the post-war world in general. Furthermore, we are more than remiss in our duties if we do not indicate by our presence that we are alive to our responsibility as the people's representatives by being willing to keep ourselves thus informed. Obviously, if we do not attend this conference in some numbers, it seems to me that it is perfectly logical for the administration officials, charged with the responsibility of arranging for the conference, to feel that Congress is disinterested and therefore there is no reason to issue any invitation to Members to attend any future conferences which may be held. In other words, this conference might well be regarded as setting a precedent and it is up to us in the public discharge of our duties to see to it that Congress is actively included—not necessarily as voting delegates—but certainly as observers in any and all of these future conferences.

Now, as to the aims of this particular conference, let me quote from the opening address of the since-elected chairman, Judge Marvin Jones:

The fact that representatives of 44 nations, from every part of the earth, have traveled long distances under wartime difficulties to be here bespeaks your earnestness and the importance of the subject we are to discuss. More important, it reflects a genuine desire on the part of all free peoples for a better understanding of our common problems and a united approach to their solution.

This conference has rightfully been referred to as a forerunner of other conferences which unquestionably will have a part in shaping the post-war world in which freedom will again rule.

Thinking people everywhere now realize that what we have called surpluses are, for the most part, not surpluses at all, but are the results of accumulations caused by defects in the systems of distribution and the inability of the masses to purchase the food they need. The peoples of the world have mastered the machinery of production to a far greater degree than they have mastered the machinery of distribution.

If by the exchange of views and a consideration of these questions we can produce a better understanding and promote the flow of farm commodities and the articles produced therefrom into the markets of the world; if we can leave the peoples of the world freer and more able to produce and secure the things they need; if we can make it possible for surplus products to be distributed and used and thus prevent them from overloading and overwhelming the distribution machinery of the countries in which such surpluses have been backed up for lack of a market, we will not only have achieved a great world-wide humanitarian objective, but each of us will have helped to promote the economic and social betterment of his own country as well.

Now, I earlier referred to the very justifiable indignation of the press at the original decision which was to bar them from all excepting the opening and closing sessions of the conference. Considerable modification has since been made in the initial regulations. Here is the actual situation as I saw it on my arrival Wednesday evening.

Press headquarters have been set up in the Hotel Casino, which is located about 100 yards distant from the hotel proper. In this rather spacious building, the many reporters covering the conference

have their work tables, their press wire outlets, and so forth. One of the major wire press services—International News—has set up an electrical printer. In another section of the city two blocks away, the news photographers have been provided with a temporary darkroom for developing their photographs. These boys, however, are operating under considerable difficulty in that they have to drive some 20 miles to Covington in order to get their pictures on the wire transmission services. This is no fault of the conference.

It is true that so far the members of the press have been denied permission to enter the hotel proper, where all the sessions are being held, for the purpose of either attending the various sessions or for interviewing the delegates. My own personal opinion is that the press should be permitted reasonable representation at all open sessions and should be given an opportunity to interview the various delegates within the hotel proper, if the delegates themselves are willing to be interviewed. Now, of course, this much is true: The conference has in no way whatsoever attempted to restrict the utterances of any of the delegates and has made it perfectly clear that not only can they step outside of the hotel proper to talk to reporters but they can also at their request call the reporters into a special press conference room which has been arranged in the hotel proper. So far—and the conference is only a few days old—it is natural to assume, and it is a fact, that some of the delegates—unaccustomed to American press procedure—are perhaps somewhat backward in accepting press invitations to be interviewed. On the other hand, it is likewise but natural to assume that these individual delegates desire and expect full press coverage back in their own nation and our American press stands ready to give them that coverage and can do it very quickly if permitted to thus promote international good will.

In all fairness, I think I should say that Judge Jones and Mr. McDermott, of the State Department, who has been designated chief press officer of the conference, are both hopeful that some method can be worked out to better the press relations with this conference. Both join me in very sincere regrets that there has developed an unfortunate lack of understanding of the press situation on all sides. Certain it is that we still have a free press in America—we are told we are fighting to preserve the freedom of speech—and certain it is that we do not have today at Hot Springs a free press. There still remains in America a power of the press and if this and future conferences are to be successful, then that power of the press to influence public opinion in America must be fully respected and so far as I am concerned, I intend to continue to exert every influence that I can bring to bear to see to it that the American people get freedom of the press at all times and on every occasion.

In conclusion let me just add one word of caution to any of the Members who may desire to attend the conference

sometime between now and its closing, which has definitely been set by resolution for June 3. Hot Springs is temporarily in the same position as many other cities in this country. It is woefully short of accommodations. The Homestead Hotel itself, headquarters of the conference, is overcrowded beyond its capacity—in fact, to such an extent that some of the delegates have had to be quartered elsewhere. Judge Jones, therefore, has suggested to me that I call the attention of the Members to the reasonably good rail accommodations which are presently available. One can leave Washington at 11:30 at night on the Chesapeake & Ohio pullman and arrive in Hot Springs early the next morning in plenty of time to attend the sessions, which generally start at either 9 or 10 o'clock and continue throughout the day and into the evening. Returning, one can leave there on the sleeper at 8 o'clock and arrive in Washington about 3:30 a. m. Of course, I appreciate this is an early hour to land here—and I understand it is a through sleeper for New York—but the fact remains, and I am sure the membership appreciates, that if one will go to bed early, as is the habit of the membership, one can still get a full 7 hours' sleep and upon arrival in Washington can go directly to the office and get in several hours of work free from interruption by telephone or presence of constituents.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan, and I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield in these last few minutes of debate in order to secure opportunity for a word of commendation for the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling the bill. This is one of the most important of the annual supply bills and one of the most difficult. And in all the years I have been on the committee I do not recall seeing it disposed of with such dispatch and general approval, in the committee and in the House. That is all the more notable in view of the fact that the bill as reported has been reduced 60 percent below the current expenditures of the Department and 11 percent below the Budget estimates. It is a record which has not been equaled this year—if ever before in the history of the Congress—and I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] who probably knows more about the affairs of this Department than any other man in the House, and with him the members of his subcommittee, including



especially the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. The reductions in the bill are in keeping with the national program of retrenchment and the subcommittee in recommending them have contributed in that respect to the successful prosecution of the war program. I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman JOHNSON, and his committee on the conduct of the bill, throughout the hearings and particularly on its management and passage without amendment on the floor here this afternoon.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just made, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the limit on time that has been given, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may be accorded as much time as was used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that time has been previously fixed by unanimous consent and can only be changed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, that is my request, that notwithstanding the fixing of time, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may be accorded an extension of time equivalent to that used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. Is that the desire of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I only want about 3 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given enough additional time to make up 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my word of commendation of the members of the subcommittee for the effective manner in which they have demonstrated in a realistic way how economy should be applied to the administration of the Federal Government. They have reduced the current year's budget by \$120,000,000, and, while I am sincerely interested in the Interior Department and the effect of its work in the development of the great West, I think that this same pattern of economy should be carried throughout other appropriation bills which will come before the House.

I want to call attention to the fact that last October some stop orders were issued by the War Production Board which affected most, if not all, reclamation projects which were then in process of construction.

I did not check the record, but I presume that approximately \$60,000,000 remains unexpended of the 1943 appropriations for various projects. I have checked the appropriation bill for the

current fiscal year, and I find that all of the amounts appropriated 1 year ago are to remain available "until expended," and that applies both to the reclamation fund and the general fund.

I simply want to make that observation because I believe that the House, having control over the purse strings of the Nation, will not transfer this control over the reclamation projects or various activities of the Bureau of Reclamation to the War Production Board or to any other wartime agency.

I believe that as soon as this war emergency shall have passed the House should demonstrate that it has control and insist upon seeing that neither the War Production Board nor any other agency shall bypass or divert the expenditure of funds which have been appropriated by the Congress for the various activities of the Department of the Interior, and particularly for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Reclamation projects throughout the West are contributing materially to the production of essential foodstuffs, and this important Federal program is proving its worth in this emergency. It is unlikely that many projects under construction can be completed until after the termination of the war, but then there should be resumption of the program directly controlled by the Congress, and no interference should be permitted by Federal agencies not charged with supervising this work.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that if we continue to spend, as we are spending, until the war is over, we will have anything to conserve on?

Mr. DWORSHAK. We will have to take that chance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H. R. 2719.

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

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CARLSON of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain data.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an appeal issued by the United States Christian Council for Democracy for the passage of anti-poll-tax legislation.

I have been informed that this will exceed the usual two pages and will cost \$135.

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

#### SPECIAL ORDER

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

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor at this time because I feel the Members of this House are entitled to know exactly what happened last Monday during my appearance before the House Committee on Military Affairs, a proceeding which older and more experienced Members have told me was one of the most unusual hearings that any committee ever conducted in the history of our Congress. As you realize, I, as a Member of Congress, was recently charged by Drew

Pearson, radio and newspaper commentator, with intent to receive a bribe in connection with the sale of two boilers to the Aluminum Co. of America.

I testified before the House Military Affairs Committee on that matter, giving a full statement and showing that I had neither received nor was I going to receive any bribe, fee, or commission of any nature whatsoever, but did of my own free will attempt to assist one of my constituents who had purchased two boilers from the New Orleans Public Service at New Orleans and had got entangled in Government red tape here at Washington while trying to sell them to the Aluminum Co. of America.

Drew Pearson, the man who made the bribery charge over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, testified immediately after me to the Military Affairs Committee. He failed to produce the slightest support of his lies about me, but this is what I wish the Members of the House to know about the Military Affairs Committee and its chairman. Immediately after Pearson testified, the hearing was continued without ever calling the principal witness, namely, Mr. E. A. Jumonville, of Plaquemine, La., the man who was subpoenaed by the committee and came all the way from Louisiana with all his files to tell in detail this boiler transaction. Mr. Jumonville was told by the committee's attorney to go home, as his testimony would not be taken.

Mr. John P. Monroe, 2101 R Street, was charged by Drew Pearson as the one who purchased the boilers. I insisted that Mr. Monroe be subpoenaed, but Chairman ANDREW MAY refused to do so. I then asked Mr. Monroe for an affidavit, which I have given to the committee. In this affidavit Mr. John Monroe swears that he did not have anything to do with this boiler transaction, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. Jumonville, in a sworn statement and under oath, said that I was representing him as his Congressman, that I had received no fee nor was I to receive any fee in connection with the boiler transaction. Mr. Jumonville further swore that all he wanted was the price as set by the O. P. A. for those two boilers, which he knew he was entitled to, just as every other businessman in America today gets the O. P. A. price whenever he sells a commodity. This evidence I had to force into the hands of the committee, with the chairman refusing to accept it from the witnesses in person.

Mr. Drew Pearson, whom I defined as a claptrap, fly-by-night columnist, testified under oath to the committee that he received his first information in connection with this boiler transaction from an anonymous phone caller. The person who informed him of my alleged fee, Pearson said, was an alleged friend of mine, whose alleged name he refused to divulge, allegedly giving same to Chairman ANDREW MAY in executive session. It is my understanding that Chairman ANDREW MAY has refused to give that alleged name to the other members of the committee. Evidently Mr. MAY is

not very consistent, because information that he secured in another hearing approximately 2 weeks ago in executive session was given by him to every newspaper in America that would bother to ask him for it.

Personally, I know Drew Pearson lied on the radio and I know he lied on the witness stand, which, down where I come from, is perjury, and that the person's name he gave Chairman MAY was either manufactured and is fictitious, or else he conspired with somebody to agree to give this synthetic and bogus information.

I have had occasion to check into the record of Drew Pearson to see what kind of reputation he has for telling the truth. I find that United States Senators, Members of Congress, Cabinet members, generals, and even the secretary to the President have in no uncertain terms labeled him as a downright liar and garbage-can collector of filthy, manufactured, synthetic lies.

But Drew Pearson has not spent all of his time blackmailing, intimidating, and lying about public officials and Congressmen. His vocations describe a thwarted and frustrated man with a warped, twisted, and diseased idea of mankind and life. Among his minor contributions to society of which he boasts—and just ask him if you want to hear more in detail—was the illegal representation by the aid of an accessory or bag man, namely, a Mr. John Henshaw, of the Irish sweepstakes, which gave him a vile start in his obsessed, putrid craze for money.

I want the Members of this House to know that Pearson, who poses as a great liberal, is at heart a money miser and one of the greediest men for cash I have ever met anywhere any time. If he cannot get it honestly, look out for the blackmail. And as for his reputation for truth and accuracy, listen to this:

Congressman Martin Sweeney, of Ohio, who sued Drew Pearson in practically every court from coast to coast, branded Pearson as an unmitigated liar and a falsifier of facts. He said:

I intend to pursue the matter to the very end, because I believe all persons in public life are concerned with the extent to which the "free" press may go in attributing to public officials false acts or un-American motives.

He then brought against Pearson the longest, largest number of libel suits in American history, which I understand still to be in process of settlement.

Jesse H. Jones, a high-ranking Cabinet member and Secretary of Commerce, stated frankly that Drew Pearson was a liar.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in referring to Drew Pearson, said he is only one-third right one-tenth of the time.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS said of Drew Pearson and Robert Allen:

The truth is not in them.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, said, "There was not an atom of truth in this libelous statement by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen," when in a broadcast Drew Pearson charged Sena-

tor TYDINGS had had the W. P. A. build a road and yacht basin on his private estate to keep W. P. A. workers busy. On another occasion, the Washington Post had to publish a two-column full apology and retraction of false charges Pearson made against Senator TYDINGS.

Here is what Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, in answer to an attack made on him by Drew Pearson in his column on October 6, 1942, said:

Drew Pearson in my opinion is the most contemptible, dishonest, and dishonorable smear propagandist in America, and by inference the most colossal liar in the Nation.

Senator GERALD P. NYE stated in answer to an attack on him in the Merry-Go-Round that it was a deceitful falsehood published by Drew Pearson.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, said a statement by Drew Pearson is absolutely without foundation.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS said on another occasion:

Unfortunately the only way a public official can avoid vilification by these two men, namely, Robert Allen and Drew Pearson, is to bow to their will and the will of those they serve.

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina, stated that an article in connection with him by Drew Pearson falsely insinuated things and was without foundation and is maliciously false.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, stated Pearson had not only lied about him but had lied about Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, stating that Drew Pearson was a little black animal with a white stripe down his back—must be a skunk. WHEELER declared that this very crowd in Washington, meaning Drew Pearson and his crowd, had been taught to smear every Senator and Member of the House who does not agree 100 percent with the New Deal bureaucrats.

Colonel Harrington, former head of the W. P. A., proved a statement of Drew Pearson's to be an outrageous, unjustifiable and bold-faced lie. In a column by George D. Riley and Page Huidekoper in the Washington Times-Herald on January 10, 1943, it was stated that there was nothing true about Pearson's claim of President Roosevelt prevailing upon Ambassador Joe Kennedy to refrain from publishing a book.

Here is what Cordell Hull said about one of Drew's articles appearing in the Merry-Go-Round April 14, 1939:

Those parts of it of which I have knowledge are so thoroughly inaccurate and misleading that they could not, in my judgment, be substantiated by anyone.

Senator NYE said:

Pearson is a master of the half truth. When a direct lie does not suit his purpose because it might be too dangerous, he can lie by inference by merely leaving out qualifying remarks and explanation.

The gentleman from Alabama, Congressman FRANK BOYKIN, said:

Drew Pearson is the damndest liar that ever lived.



The powerful Rules Committee of Congress branded as "a false, malicious lie" statements made by Drew Pearson about the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman COLMER.

White House Secretary, Stephen T. Early, described as a complete lie a story printed in the Washington Merry-Go-Round column written by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen on the recent slaying of an agent of the F. B. I. by two Army deserters in Virginia. "There is no truth in any detail of this story," said Secretary Early.

The gentleman from Oregon, Congressman JAMES W. MOTT, in a statement to the House Naval Affairs Committee, said:

Drew Pearson and Robert Allen are a pair of journalistic polecats.

The gentleman from Minnesota, Representative MELVIN P. MAAS, speaking of Pearson and Allen, declared:

Whoever gave out the scurrilous story is guilty of the grossest kind of contempt.

Here is what Drew Pearson said in a letter about General MacArthur which he himself manufactured:

DEAR GENERAL: You have done a great job and I am going to see that you are rewarded. When Congress convenes I am going to write my Congressman and have him take steps to give you another medal. This medal will have a ribbon on it down the middle of which will be a broad streak of yellow with a piece of baloney on the end.

Think of this, Members of the House, America's No. 1 hero, one of the greatest generals that ever lived, being subjected to this filth and abuse by Drew Pearson.

Drew Pearson, in an issue of Liberty magazine, said:

As the fierce battle around Manila neared a climax, an old friend of Douglas MacArthur's remarked, "Douglas may have to swim for it and he can still do it. But he will have to leave his medals behind, total estimated weight 13 pounds, 16 ounces."

The Washington Times-Herald, the largest newspaper in Washington, which ran Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round for a long time, finally threw it out and stated:

We dropped the Washington Merry-Go-Round out of the Times-Herald because of the poisonous attempts Pearson and Allen have made, and are still making, to smear the reputation of a great soldier, and in our opinion one of the greatest Americans of all time, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Here is another crack that Drew Pearson made about General MacArthur, and I quote:

Wire pulling is one of the general's greatest arts. From his first days in West Point he learned how to get on in the Army.

Here is another quotation by Pearson:

But during the World War—

Meaning World War No. 1—

MacArthur won the confidence of Secretary Newton D. Baker, suddenly was promoted from major to brigadier general, was the only brigadier general below the grade of colonel to keep his temporary war rank afterward.

Here is another bit of slime from the pen of Pearson:

MacArthur got in wrong at the White House from the way he slid out of responsibility for the air-mail fiasco. Also the grand

jury investigating Army purchases smeared him for rowing with Woodring.

MacArthur was forced to sue Drew Pearson for libel, and if the Members of this House knew the way Pearson responded to that libel suit to get it dropped not one decent, self-respecting Member of Congress would ever speak to Pearson again.

And now, Members of the House, just let us see the contrast between the war record of General MacArthur and Drew Pearson. General MacArthur served in World War No. 1. General MacArthur is serving again in World War No. 2, having displayed such indescribable courage and ability that today he is unanimously acclaimed as America's No. 1 hero, who is still fighting, still giving his all for his country. Drew Pearson was not in World War No. 1. Drew Pearson, who was young, able-bodied, and single, waited until a few weeks before the end of World War No. 1 to join what—not the Army, but the "Saturday Afternoon Tea Club," which is a slang expression for Student Army Training Corps, one of those bomb proofs from the draft in World War No. 1, almost as popular as Government jobs are today. That was in World War No. 1. Drew Pearson therefore did not fight in World War No. 1, nor is he a member of the armed forces now, nor is he fighting in World War No. 2, though he is one of those who howled loudest for us to get in. But rather his contribution to the war effort is based on a low-down, degrading, cowardly, yellow, stinking pen to defame, to vilify, to humiliate, and to attempt to destroy America's No. 1 hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And, incidentally, the man he is accusing in this boiler transaction, E. A. Jumonville, is too old to be in the armed service, yet he has one son in the armed forces and another son leaving in 1 week for the Army Air Corps. Drew Pearson has no sons in any service.

Now, my friends, I regret that I have had to take up this time in the House of Representatives, but as you know, I thought that perhaps I was the only person that ever had trouble with Drew Pearson until I checked his record. My only comment, therefore, is this: Seldom do I have the unpleasant task of skinning a skunk. I hope I have done the job well.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole I may include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address by Hon. Jesse Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. McCORD, for Friday, Saturday, and Monday, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on investigation of civil-service policies and practices of civilian employment in governmental departments at 10 a. m., Friday, May 21, 1943, room 246, House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Friday, May 21, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 356, House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

##### COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Thursday, May 27: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 19, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on

which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Friday, May 28: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers and the middle Atlantic region including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Tuesday, June 1: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf, west of the Mississippi River, and in the Western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Tuesday, June 8: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Wednesday, June 9: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

429. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers, and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

430. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting budgets for the fiscal year 1944 for the military and

departmental activities of the War Department, containing estimates of appropriations amounting to \$59,425,586,500, and for the Office of Strategic Services in the amount of \$38,476,000, and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 205); to the Committee on Appropriations.

431. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2745. A bill providing for the erection of a monument at Hammondsport, N. Y., in commemoration of the contribution of Glenn Hammond Curtiss in the development of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work, made necessary by the flood of 1943, on the Missouri River between Pierre, S. Dak., and the mouth; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2748. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2749. A bill to authorize for the duration of the war the establishment of zones prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors around plants engaged in the production of war materials, and prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors on property of the United States, and to men and women in uniform, for the duration of the war, and prescribing penalties for the violation of any of the provisions of this act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2751. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$10 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to their credit; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 2753. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2754. A bill to establish the Office of Power Administration for the coordinated administration of all Federal functions pertaining to the generation, distribution and sale of electricity and the regulation of electric utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GWYNNE:

H. R. 2760. A bill to amend an act approved August 26, 1842, relating to appropriation acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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 California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2426 and Senate bill 971; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation authorizing the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and state government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Howard H. Thames; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Dr. V. H. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Margaret Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Higgins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice E. Shinnick; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

828. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Wilmington, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

830. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Dressmakers Union, Local No. 22, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, urging the defeat of the Connally bill (S. 796); to the Committee on Military Affairs.



831. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Frances G. Teichmann, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Aurora and Evanston, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

832. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Schulhafer, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

833. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Huntington, N. Y., in advocacy of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

834. By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: Resolution of the Illinois House of Representatives, urging enactment into law of House bills 7 and 51, known as the poll tax and antilynch bills, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

835. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Mrs. Philip Male and 53 other residents of Schenectady and Niskayuna, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food, materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

836. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, urging the passage by the Congress of the United States of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

837. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mabel E. Eld and 79 other citizens of Canby, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

838. By Mr. LANE: Memorial in the nature of a resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

839. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

840. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war

and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

841. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

842. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the East Bay Sponsoring Committee for Public Protest, of Oakland, Calif., against extermination of Jews and other minorities in occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

843. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, Seventeenth Congressional District, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

844. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Rev. Elizabeth R. Choate and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

845. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Alice Girdwood, of Aurora, Ill., and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

846. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., urging the Congress of the United States to establish a Chiropactic Corps in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

847. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of R. J. Bennett and 21 other citizens of the city of West Union, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

848. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of L. E. Armel and 72 other citizens of Holton, Kans., urging that the Congress of the United States pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

849. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Wanda N. Gum, director of student employment, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

850. Also, communication from Elizabeth Myrna, corresponding secretary, Business and Professional Women's Club, Harrisburg, Ill., urging the continuance of the National

Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

851. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 117 of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, Eldorado, Ill., signed by Wm. Gallagher, president, and Leonard Smith, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

852. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of St. John, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

853. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Sharon, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

854. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petitions sponsored by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Georgia, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

855. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

856. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the amendment of the Federal Motor Carriers Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

857. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Perth Amboy Smelter and Refinery Workers Union, Perth Amboy, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

858. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, Oakland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House Joint Resolution 96; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord of life and power, we would not plead for ourselves alone, but for all who serve Thy cause by word and deed. In fashioning our conception of Thee, we pray that it may be resplendent of justice and august in truth; how much more bravely we would march forward, catching the light that is absorbing the shadow of doubt. In seeking the solution of our problems, give us to understand that calmness is might and candor is the nobility of labor.

With faith in Thy fatherhood as a blessed inheritance, we would have sacred access to Thee as a comfort in all trial and as guide in all wisdom, as an illumination in all darkness and as stability when we need rest. When men and nations live by envy and rivalry, by vanity and physical appetite, O Lord, have mercy on their pauperized souls. We praise Thee for the uncalendared and nameless millions of our country whose industry, sacrifice, and patriotism give abiding assurance to the glory of our common democracy. Spare our land from the selfish rich who disregard the poor and from the discontented poor who envy the rich. Deliver us from these vain tempers which disenchant many a