

Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Joseph G. Pasternack, July 1, 1943.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1943.
Llewellyn L. Ashburn, July 1, 1943.
Leland J. Hanchett, July 1, 1943.
Thomas B. McKneely, July 1, 1943.
William G. Workman, July 1, 1943.
Victor H. Vogel, June 15, 1943.
Robert H. Flinn, July 1, 1943.
Robert K. Maddock, July 1, 1943.
Roy E. Butler, July 1, 1943.
Robert H. Onstott, July 1, 1943.
John L. Wilson, July 1, 1943.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1943.
Leslie McC. Smith, July 1, 1943.
Alfred B. Geyer, July 1, 1943.
Oliver C. Williams, July 1, 1943.
Austin V. Deibert, July 1, 1943.
Richard C. Arnold, July 1, 1943.
Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1943.
Marion K. King, July 1, 1943.
Thurman H. Rose, June 1, 1943.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

William A. Miller, July 1, 1943.
Robert L. Smith, July 1, 1943.
Joe M. Chisholm, July 1, 1943.
Kenneth M. Endicott, July 1, 1943.
Malcolm J. Ford, July 1, 1943.
James W. Hawkins, July 1, 1943.
Glen E. Ogden, April 22, 1943.
Rudolph F. Sievers, July 1, 1943.
Samuel S. Spicer, July 1, 1943.
William H. Stimson, July 1, 1943.
William B. Wiley, July 1, 1943.
Clarence L. Hebert, July 1, 1943.
James A. Finger, July 1, 1943.
George E. Parkhurst, July 1, 1943.
John F. Oesterle, June 1, 1943.
Frederick K. Albrecht, July 1, 1943.
Edwin N. Hesbacher, July 1, 1943.
William S. Baum, July 1, 1943.
Arnold B. Kurlander, July 1, 1943.
William F. Powell, July 15, 1943.
David B. Wilson, July 1, 1943.
Ralph W. Pagel, July 1, 1943.
Leslie W. Knott, July 1, 1943.
Evert A. Swensson, July 1, 1943.
Robert J. Anderson, July 1, 1943.
Jesse D. Harris, July 1, 1943.
Frederick H. Hull, June 26, 1943.
Raymond S. Roy, July 1, 1943.
James L. Southworth, June 1, 1943.
William G. Budington, July 1, 1943.
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano, June 15, 1943.
Stanley E. Krumbiegel, July 1, 1943.
Donald W. McNaughton, July 1, 1943.
James B. Donaldson, July 1, 1943.
James A. Smith, October 2, 1942.
Milton W. Gwinner, July 1, 1943.
Vernon W. Foster, August 15, 1943.
George F. Ellinger, June 1, 1943.
Verne C. Waite, July 1, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER

Maj. Gen. Harry Clyde Ingles (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. Dawson Olmstead, Chief Signal Officer, to be retired June 30, 1943.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, WITH RANK FROM OCTOBER 5, 1942

First Lt. Dawson Hope Mullen, Jr.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Maj. Frederic J. Hughes, Jr.
Maj. Vince Moseley
Capt. Adolph Benedict Schneider, Jr.
Capt. Freeman Irby Stephens
Capt. Bertram Allen Weeks

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. Albert Rhoades Bucklew

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, VETERINARY CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Maj. Alpheus Heise Seeley

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mary D. Briggs, Los Angeles.

MINNESOTA

Louis F. Masonick, Browerville.

Russell A. Quist, Fairfax.

Sam Doherty, Le Sueur.

George V. Anderson, New York Mills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the holy name of Him who is at the right hand of the Father, we pray; we praise Him that our eyes are open to the wide reaches of His impartial love. On this summer day we are wooed by the marvelous voices and hushed by the tender spell as we behold the ever new miracle of nature. Bewilderment overtakes us as we look across this world; the pitiless struggle goes on. Blessed Lord, we pray that the lower impulses of men may know of the mastery of Thy teaching and that they may forswear avarice, violence, and intolerance and be brought into the kingdom of sacrifice and peace.

In Thy name there is no higher gift than one's self and the stronger we are the more we owe to the lowest and least. Teach us Thy rule, dear Saviour; the poorer one is the more we are needed, and the further away from the state of happiness the greater our obligation. We then who are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves. O God, we need not search the heavens for Thy guidance or the horizon for Thy presence. We would unveil the cross and behold infinite love struggling with the dying expression for the salvation of the world. O may men know the touch of the Master and see the light in His eyes and take their place in the midst of a doubtful and a perverse world. In the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the

House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 19, 1943:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

On June 22, 1943:

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Doctor and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1731. An act 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.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Saint Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2798. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. REED, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BURTON as members on the part of the Senate to attend the meeting of the Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, June 26 to July 1, 1943, pursuant to the provisions of Senate concurrent resolution 14.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

2409) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 40 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill does?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This is a bill recommended by the Post Office Department, approved by the Budget, and unanimously reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. Under present law a substitute carrier may serve for 10, 15, or 20 years and remain in the same status with the same pay. This bill gives him the right, after he has served 2,448 hours to be promoted to the hourly pay of the lowest grade of regular clerk.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I introduced a bill some time ago to make these substitute rural mail carriers eligible for promotion to the position of carrier. Of all people in the Postal Service who deserve more consideration, in my opinion, they are the substitute rural carriers. They never get to carry the mail as a rule except when it is raining or when the weather is so cold or so hot that the regular carrier wants to get off, or when he is off on vacation or he or some of his folks are sick. I wish the gentleman would bring out a bill to make the substitute carriers eligible for promotion and transfer to the position of carrier when the carrier dies, resigns, or retires.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The gentleman says he has introduced a bill to that effect?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. And would like to have a hearing on it?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly would.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. I will see that the gentleman has a hearing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This, in the meantime, comes a little nearer doing justice by them.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That substitute postal employees, after 2,448 hours of actual and satisfactory service as such substitute, including service as a special-delivery messenger, shall be paid for services actually performed at the rate of the annual salary received by regular employees of the first grade, the hourly rate to be computed by dividing the annual salary of such regular employees by the number 2,448; and thereafter the rate of pay of such substitute employees shall be increased to the annual rate of the next higher grade of such regular employees, computed in the same manner, upon the completion of each additional period of 2,448 hours of actual and satisfactory service, until they shall have attained the rate for the highest successive rate of regular pay or shall have received appointment to a regular position: *Provided*, That there shall be not more than one increase in the rate of pay of such employees within a 12 months' period: *Provided further*, That the increases in the rate of pay provided herein shall become effective at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 2,448 hours of required service.

Sec. 2. Upon appointment to a regular position in the Postal Service an employee shall receive credit for actual service performed as a substitute, including time served as a special-delivery messenger on the basis of 1 year for each unit of 2,448 hours, and shall be promoted to the grade to which such employee would have progressed had his original appointment been to grade 1. Any fractional part of a year's service as a substitute shall be included with regular service in determining eligibility for promotion to a higher grade, following appointment to a regular position.

Sec. 3. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such service as has been rendered during continuous active service and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment: *Provided, however*, That in the case of those who have been separated, or shall hereafter be separated from the Postal Service for military duty, the periods of terms of service immediately preceding induction into the military service, as well as the time engaged in military service, shall be construed as allowable service, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service upon the basis of 2,448 hours for each year of such service.

Sec. 4. The amounts of the increases in the rates of pay provided in this act shall be regarded as part of the earned basic compensation for the purpose of computing the increase of 15 percent of earned basic compensation authorized by the act approved April 9, 1943, entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "service" insert a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That in the adjustment of the increases in the rates of pay provided herein credit shall be given for past continuous service and the hourly rate of compensation adjusted accordingly.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from James E. Thorp, chairman, committee on livestock and dairies of the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2798), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. ROBINSON of Utah, WHITTINGTON, and WOLCOTT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from the Worcester Telegram of Sunday, June 20, 1943, entitled, "Market Basket Too Vital for a Political Football."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an advertisement from the St. Louis Star Times and in the other a resolution of the Missouri Bankers' Association.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN MEAT SITUATION

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

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Vinson has before him a proposition proposed by the various interests in the meat industry which contemplates the elimination of all price ceilings, with the exception of the retail level on all meat except pork, the 10-percent roll-back to be effective without subsidy at the retail level—other levels in the production of processing of meat to be free.

It is hopeful that this would immediately free the meat industry in such fashion as to start packing houses in full production. This suspends all of the O. P. A. rulings which have been the cause of price squeezes and black-market operations. It is considered by the industry, retail, wholesale, and slaughterer, and producers that there is sufficient margin under the retail ceiling. This becomes the responsibility of everyone in the meat industry, from the growers to retailers, to work together to prevent the danger of crowding the retail ceiling.

I think the plan is worthy of immediate trial, and much more preferable than the ill-advised and impetuous ruling of the 10-percent subsidy roll-back on meat prices which has recently been put into effect at the processors' level.

THE ROLL-BACK AND SUBSIDY SCHEME

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Members will be interested in the following wire from Harry B. Coffee, long an able Member of this House. It reads as follows:

Have yet to find first livestock producer favorable to price roll-back subsidy program. Hope Congress prohibits this misuse of public funds and authorizes Office of Price Administration to adjust meat prices upward to cover cost of production. Otherwise production will be curtailed and more meat diverted through black-market channels.

UNION STOCKYARDS CO.,
HARRY B. COFFEE, President.

The roll-back and subsidy scheme is just the same vicious rebate racket used in the 90's by Standard Oil and many great railroads to destroy their competitors. As Mr. Coffee points out, the farmers of America have seen through this rebate trick, which would eventually destroy free enterprise. The rural uprising against subsidies will not be ignored by thoughtful officials. Hunger cannot find nourishment in Executive orders.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the

Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment numbered 26: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment and amendment thereto insert the following:

"Sec. 204. The Joint Committee on Investigation of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is hereby directed to make a study of the problem of penalty mail in all of the departments and branches of the government, with a view to eliminating unnecessary volume and reducing costs, and shall report its findings and recommendations by bill or otherwise to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The departments and agencies of government shall furnish such information and detail such personnel as may be requested by the Committee to assist in its investigation"; and the House agree to the same.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
PAT McCARRAN,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Strikes from the bill the limitation, proposed by the House, prohibiting the use of any of the funds appropriated for carrying into effect the Silver Purchase Act.

Amendment No. 26: Strikes from the bill the limitation, proposed by the House, prohibiting the use of any of the funds appropriated for the handling of penalty mail and the section, proposed by the Senate, requiring a study of the use of the mails by Government agencies to be conducted by the Postmaster General and the Director of the Budget and provides for a study of the use of the mails by Government agencies by the Joint Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMES M. CURLEY,
JOHN TABER,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of all members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some correspondence between the Navy Department and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and after other special orders heretofore entered, I may be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONS AND PROBLEMS IN THE FIELD OF VITAL RECORDS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 242)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

JUNE 24, 1943.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: In a letter dated July 27, 1942, I indicated that I would ask the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a comprehensive study of organizations and problems in the field of vital records. The Director has reported to me on this subject and I am transmitting his report to you herewith. I am transmitting another copy of the report to the President of the Senate. In view of the relevance of this report to the subject matter of various bills which are now before the Congress, I would suggest that the report and appendixes I-VIII might appropriately be printed as a public document.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

MR. CANNON of Missouri. 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. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I wonder if the gentleman from New York and I cannot agree on an hour of general debate.

MR. TABER. I have requests for 95 minutes at this time, and I do not see how I can pare them down too much. I think we ought to have 3 hours of general debate.

MR. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

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. 3030, with Mr. Pace in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

MR. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

MR. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

MR. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state at the beginning of this statement, but not as a part of it, a few things which you should know concerning my viewpoint and attitude insofar as they affect my utterances today.

I take the floor before you, I assure you, without feeling any animosity toward a single fellow citizen of our country. I have no ax to grind and the only special interest which I attempt to serve to the limit of my meager capacity is the best interest of my countrymen and our allies in the prosecution of this war which today engulfs us, and at the same time looking toward the future with the same interest in mind.

In this inimitable period of stress I do not find it in me to be actuated by any partisan motive whatsoever.

Members of each and every political party are to be found in the armed services on the many fronts where Americans are to be found defending our national right to live the American way.

It is my unwavering and deep conviction, based upon much study and devoted consideration, that paramount in our efforts in these tragic days is the preservation of the public confidence in its entirety of the people of these United States. This public confidence if strong and secure is the mightiest agent in the support of the war effort of our country. Yes, and the war effort of our allies.

Confusion is the enemy of both confidence and attainment; it should be abated as thoroughly and promptly as possible. Uncertainty as to what to do today and as to what we may expect tomorrow breeds confusion.

Vacillation is the inevitable result of the impact of these agencies of the devil, and cohorts and aides of our enemies.

Fear is another of these, and greed still another. And when this array aided and abetted by intolerant and untempered thought, reaction and speech combine, they but add to the formidable array which opposes a successful or approximate conclusion of this world's troubles.

These are days, fellow Members, and I speak to you with all the earnestness and emphasis which I can muster, when a prudent jealousy concerning our future and our rights as free men should be ever exercised; and so, without hate or other vicious inclination toward any person or group living or dead among those who defend man's right to be free and enjoy the rewards of justifiable labor, I bring to your consideration some facts and thoughts upon which, in my earnest opinion, much depends as to our successes today and in the tomorrows to come.

We have now before the Congress some vital legislative matters concerning which I desire to address myself in the exercise of the most emphatic expression of which I am capable.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I am not a pessimist nor am I chargeable with being willing at any time to sell the United States short.

The history of our country is replete with victories over gloom and despair in troubled times and we will emerge again as from those dark days in the past with

that incomparable flag which is your and our background, still unwavering over a free people in the greatest and most blessed land of all.

I desire for the moment to discuss some problems we have before us to legalize the program of so-called roll-back and subsidies and some related matters. If this program recently put into effect under a directive by our Chief Executive is carried on through, it is my opinion that it will be the result of extra-legal action on the part of the Office of Price Administration. In my interpretation of the Price Control Act, may I state at the outset the law clearly provides that any proposals affecting prices on agricultural commodities considered as food must first be submitted to the Department of Agriculture as the law reads and today to the National Food Administration which by directive has taken over that task which at the beginning of the price control was administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. I am reliably informed that the National Food Administrator was not advised of the roll-back subsidy proposal until after the Office of Price Administration had already put the program into effect by proclamation. If this is true there is no question but that this action was extra-legal and in complete disregard of the law of the land as enacted by the Congress.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I should like to call your attention to some things that are going on which, if we do not do something about them, will not only lead to bad results but add to the confusion and bring to naught possibly our major fight on the home front, which has to do with the production of food. I want to give you some examples.

Not so long ago, the senior Senator from Texas, Senator CONNALLY, and I called on Price Administrator Brown about some matters involving the poultry industry. In my district are five or six counties which comprise the third largest poultry center in the United States producing broilers and fryers. The price fixed for those broilers was 25.67 cents per pound. The actual cost involved in the production of over 24,000,000 pounds of edible broiler meat, chicken meat, figuring a broiler at 2 pounds to the chicken, ranges from 31.5 cents to 40 cents a pound, established by affidavits and checked over by auditors at my request looking into the business of several of the poultrymen affected.

We went from the Office of Price Administration to the War Food Administration to inquire concerning the fixation of this price level and the vicious differentials which accompanied it; nothing came of this. Despite the fact that the poultry produced in this center was entirely consumed within the State of Texas by Government camps engaged in the war effort and by industries engaged in the war effort, as well as civilians, one of the producers handling over 125,000 chicks a year went out of business. He went to work at a shipyard started in at \$12 a day. Some in high places think that he did a good job because he could make more money at that than he could if he had stayed in the poultry business.

This producer, who the year before produced 125,000 chicks and 250,000 pounds of edible meat, is now boarded up and out of business. What happened to him happened not to one or two more but to a high percentage of the men engaged in the professional business of raising baby chicks.

Now let us look at some other facts. There is no factual evidence showing that in the last World War or in the present World War the price of livestock, if left uncontrolled, would rise sufficiently to become a dangerous or inflationary force. At the present time this fact is best illustrated by the price of hogs, which has remained at between 14 and 16 cents most of the time, whereas in the last war the price of hogs reached 24 cents.

The only evidence of an extremely high price of livestock is to be found in the black market. The black market is patently the outgrowth of Government regulation, inaugurated in November 1942, at which time all killers not under B. A. I. inspection were placed on a quota of 70 percent of their 1941 kill.

At about the same time that this quota system was inaugurated the wholesale price ceiling was put into effect. This was under regulation 169. Before this was placed in effect there had been no visible evidence whatsoever of an over-the-counter shortage in beef. The housewives in every community in this land could go into a butcher shop or a grocery store and fill their needs.

The drafting of men into the armed services patently does not add to the population of the United States, certainly not with a war going forward.

If you will review the facts contained in a brief inventory of the actual livestock situation in this country, you will be interested in noting that at the time of the 1929 crash there were approximately 68,000,000 head of cattle in this country.

This was a healthy cattle population up to that time. While this cattle population was heavy, the increase of human population in the country made this cattle population fairly low when analyzed on a per capita basis, but everyone knows that it was sufficient to meet all and over the then civilian needs. We had no wartime needs then. In 1934 this cattle population had jumped to something in excess of 65,000,000 head, and on the floor of this House in a debate with a beloved friend of ours who happened at that time to be the leader on the Republican side of the aisle, the Honorable Bertrand Snell. I handled the passage of a \$200,000,000 appropriation bill, devoted to bringing the demand and the supply insofar as cattle were concerned, into a workable balance.

Under that appropriation which was passed in this House without objection, 8,000,000 cattle were slaughtered. Those of you gentlemen who were here at that time will recall this. The Department of Agriculture in recent estimates, estimates that up to January 1, 1944, the population of cattle in this country will have reached 82,500,000 head, and that estimate is low, and I am going to tell you why. A brief analysis of what we had on hand in 1941,

and what we had on hand in 1942 will show that in those 12 months the cattle population of this Nation increased in excess of 3,000,000 head, and it is my honest conviction that today, there are 82,000,000 head and upward in the feed lots and on the ranges and on the farms of these United States.

Let us look at the facts, and I have some of them here for you. All of this is in the name of avoiding inflation. In 1941 the national income based on figures from authentic sources of information stood at \$95,600,000,000, in round numbers. That is the 1941 national income. The 1942 national income was \$119,800,000,000. In 1943, up to date, based on present conditions, the national income is estimated to be in excess of \$138,000,000,000, and if prices continue on the present scale, and wages go on as they are, the estimate shows that that will be in excess of \$140,000,000,000. All right. People in these civilized days do not attempt to eat livestock, but they buy raw meat, and cook it.

Reducing the killing of cattle down to 70 percent level of the 1941 kill, when the income nationally stood at \$95,600,000,000 and expecting 70 percent of that kill to satisfy not only the civilian demands, upon which their kill was based, and which that kill supplied in 1941, because not until the tragic date December 7, did this Nation go to war—in the minds of reasonable men, how could we fail to have a beef shortage with an income approaching a peak of \$140,000,000,000 this year, and expecting the purchasing power of that surplus income to be satisfied with 70 percent of what we consumed under peacetime conditions in 1941, added to the 35 percent reduction of supplies once going to civilians taken over by the Army and lend-lease? Then, today, that 35 percent has been increased to 45 percent, and if it continues, what happens? The 35 percent I refer to is 35 percent of the total kill in the United States taken by the Armed Services and lend-lease.

In servicing the needs of the war and the lend-lease program, every pound of beef purchased by those two agencies was purchased from killers—and the word "killers" means butchers and packers and slaughterers of all kinds—lend-lease and Army needs were satisfied solely through purchases from killers that were under the Bureau of Animal Industry inspection, that is, Federal inspection of beef. These killers, under B. A. I. inspection, were the major packers. And those demands took every bit of the beef killed in those killers' plants, and those killers no longer serviced the civilian needs, and that left the local independent killer confronted with the problem, that while he at his best had never killed over 35 percent of the kill of the Nation, was now required on 70 percent of the 1941 kill, to meet the civilian needs of a population which in the past 20 years has risen 25 percent. And during which time in the entire food picture there has not been a single year when the United States market supplied its own food needs. We have been on a constantly increasing import basis of food during these 20 years.

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

Mr. KLEBERG. I ask the gentleman to please let me go on and present the picture to you, and bring a recommendation, because it has been said that no recommendations have come from the United States Congress, and I propose to give you one, which is not based on the development of untested ideologies which come from the school of economics of Harvard or Princeton or Columbia, or any one of the major schools of economics, but which comes from a long-time effort applied to the production of livestock and food commodities in this country. I was not a synthetic farmer or a synthetic ranchman when I came to this Congress. Believe it or not, there is not a single job performed on a ranch which produced everything in the way of livestock that was produced in that area which produced everything agricultural that was produced in that area from citrus fruit on down through cotton and all kinds of grain that I did not know how to do myself. I have harvested crops. I have slaughtered cattle myself. I have gone with them to the slaughter pen as a shipper, and I have done every single thing done with cattle from the pasture to the slaughterhouse. So I learned it at least in the school of experience.

What I am proposing here is to remember the figures I have just given you and take into consideration some facts that come after those figures. They say this roll-back and subsidy proposal is for the purpose of curbing inflation. Let us see.

We will take \$140,000,000,000 for the purpose of making it easily understood, as the national income of 1943. Of that amount in Federal taxes under the 1941 figure of income and taxes there was paid in \$9,600,000,000 in taxes. In 1942 \$17,400,000,000. In 1943 it is expected to pick up by way of taxes \$24,552,000,000—let us say \$25,000,000,000. Take that from \$140,000,000,000 and what does it leave? One hundred and fifteen billion dollars. In purchasable consumer goods the best estimates from every statistical department we have in this country indicate that the supply represented in cash is from \$80,000,000,000 to \$83,000,000,000. Let us take the higher figure, because it makes the picture easier. Say \$85,000,000,000 worth of consumer goods available. Subtract \$85,000,000,000 from \$115,000,000,000 and what do you have left? Then after going through that let us realize that savings to meet margins and protective devices indulged in by American industry, agriculture, and otherwise, to meet the ravages of depreciation, replacement of equipment, increasing fluctuating prices, and costs of maintaining an operation such as that which occurs on a great cattle ranch or on a small cattle farm. Say you take off that amount 20 percent, down to 16 percent of what is left.

The very best figures available out of this jumble, figured out carefully, would indicate that at the maximum, without reference to money taken out of circulation for bond sales, and so forth, there

remains as a dangerous sword of Damocles to create inflation the utterly insignificant sum of between 15 and 16 billion dollars. With costs going as they are and expenses mounting, how ridiculous it seems to me to continue a program of shortage in the midst of actual plenty as applied, for instance, to the cattle industry, which I am using as an illustration. You Members know the canning picture. I have given you a brief description of what happened on poultry, where, by ill-advised regulation, vacillation, and failure to attempt a solution the American way, but on the other hand attempting to follow out and prove some formula which came from what might be termed higher education, the people have been put out of business as far as poultry is concerned, small packers and butchers closed up and canneries going out of business everywhere. I think education that is too high is education that does not permit those who indulge in its practice to get down to Mother Earth long enough to have it said truthfully of them that they have at least had their feet on the ground. There are in actual round numbers approximately fifteen and one-half million head of surplus cattle on the ranges and farms of this Nation. Indulging for a moment the vivid and accurate recollection of what was done under this same administration in 1934 to bring the law of supply and demand into action—that can be done by a wise government and a wise people and a beneficent Providence. Without the latter of course the other two cannot deliver the goods. But suppose you remember the \$200,000,000 that was spent and the slaughtering of 800,000 cattle, principally culs to improve the herds of the Nation and bring supply and demand into balance.

Suppose you do pay the salaries of a few extra meat inspectors to give B. A. I. inspection a wider spread over the kill and suppose you throw away the ridiculous figure of 70 percent of the 1941 kill, in cowboy parlance I would want to know where in, and I would not use the word "Jehoshaphat", that theory came from, when we need beef. I doubt if there is a single man anywhere connected with this plan who ever thought of the ridiculous and tragic position presented by a great country, shouldered with responsibility the equal of which has never been fixed on a people, when food, the sustaining element upon which our success will finally depend, is pulled down to the level where both the Army and the civilian services find themselves confronted with a synthetic shortage, created by ill-advised regulation. It was not in the law, but yet here it is. We will have an actual surplus by January 1, 1944, if this keeps up, of from 15,000,000 to 16,000,000 head. This surplus will grow and destroy the cattle industry if it still exists when peace comes. If half of this surplus were slaughtered it would supply normal beef requirements for one year to 200,000,000 persons including the population of the United States and 74,000,000 others. Think of that. You could thus reduce by one-half the surplus on the ranges and feed lots at a time when we are short of feed and when we are losing extra poundage because we

are shipping warmed up cattle, if you please, from the feed lots and are not allowing the cattle to have their full complement of gain and full conversion of the corn and grain of this Nation into its utmost realization of cash value and beef.

Now, let me make my recommendation. I want to boil it down to just a few flat statements. If the price is fixed at the point of retail, in reason—not based on any 70 percent of the 1941 kill, which has no possible relationship to what we deal with today—if the price is fixed there and efforts are made to stimulate the slaughter of 6,000,000 head of cattle extra, to take up the gaping holes in refrigerators and boxes of all kinds over this land, you will immediately, because of the supply meeting the demand of the surplus cash, insofar as the prices of livestock are concerned, including hogs, solve your problem. That is the only control that is necessary to hold your price level at a point where it affects the consumer at a legitimate price. The principle of balancing income and expendable money and consumer supplies is the only time-tested cure for inflation of the kind that threatens our country. Also we must rescind that silly quota provision which permits those who slaughter to kill only 70 percent of their 1941 kill.

We should analyze the needs of the armed services to a reasonably fixed figure. Ration civilians to a quantity commensurate with their needs and lend-lease would take the rest. This plan while only outlined will meet the exigencies of our present situation fairly and sanely.

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

Mr. KLEBERG. May I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. There is one thing I want to say in the 5 minutes, if I may do so, and that is to conclude with some thoughts that I think have occasioned some of the errors that we have committed.

I was interested to check up on the fact with reference to our great ally, England. We have had advanced here before us, and certainly before members of the House Committee on Agriculture to which I belong, some statements concerning the amazing success of Britain in closing the inflationary gap. Let me call attention to the food situation. In England today those who have the credentials can get 23 cents worth of meat per week. These are the figures, so far as the civilian population is concerned. Only 7 percent of the people in Britain are producers, farmers.

Of course, Britain, as an industrial nation, with its population divided up in that manner, with its heavy industrial activities, wants to hold its food prices to a minimum. She only produces 60 percent of her food. She has neither the land resources nor the farm labor to do much more than this. Ninety-three percent of the population, therefore, certainly could well afford to subsidize the 7 percent. But when you take one-fourth

of a country's population, as we have it, you have an entirely different picture.

Forty percent of the entire food supply of England in the last 2 years has been mostly imported from the United States of America. One and a half billion dollars worth of food were supplied under lend-lease, which food Britain sold to her people and paid a subsidy of \$730,000,000. She could well afford to spend a little money, half, or about half of the cash represented by the lend-lease food supplies in the payment of subsidies over there to meet the inflationary gap.

What is the situation with reference to consumer goods in Britain? Under lend-lease operations and the situation there from the standpoint of studies which have been made of things which may cause inflation, and the facts as they exist in Britain and what she has used to close the inflationary gap, and some of the conclusions we have reached are these: She does not have to impose a tax on her people to pay subsidies. But today with the earning power of American taxpayers, taxed as they are to the highest degree in the history of this country, with their earning power restricted, with the original source of wealth being decimated by restrictions, how in God's name should they put the restrictions on, which have been put on, in this effort to meet the problem?

I ask you, as sensible men and women, I plead with you to consider this whole problem of simple arithmetic, natural laws, and untested theory which is presented by this silly expression of fear of inflation, on the one hand, and the utterly inconsistent remedy offered until it has increased the inflationary problem to a degree never before realized in our Nation.

As was illustrated in the case of the Ohio wheat farmer whose case was brought finally before the Supreme Court on a question of some payments of overproduction fines. He argued that the law had been passed after he had planted his wheat crop. Therefore his property was being taken without due process of law. The Supreme Court held that it is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

Mr. Chairman, I leave the rest with you. That is an illustration and gives you a picture, one which I am more fearful of than anything else.

Finally let me sum up the situation.

We are told we are in grave danger of inflation. This because of great surplus or excess income over available consumer goods.

Using the plan our Government now has in effect including subsidy and rollback on beef prices—what do we have?

Approximately a \$140,000,000,000 income and approximately \$85,000,000,000 worth of consumer goods.

What do we do about it and what are the facts? We reduce the available supply of consumer goods, in the case of beef, to 70 percent—in the case of civilian needs—of the average supply used in 1941. In this year our income was \$95,600,000,000. Why? On what theory?

In 1941 we paid \$9,600,000,000 in taxes. In 1943 we will pay \$24,552,000,000.

After taxes, \$85,000,000,000 in purchases, and marginal savings we have a sum of about \$16,000,000,000 left without considering what we will spend for bonds.

In the midst of plenty we force a shortage when we should increase consumer goods.

We now propose to continue to roll back prices and provide funds to subsidize some few losers while we permit the rights of freemen in property and free enterprise to be endangered in the future by both famine and Government control and regulation of their property and business.

All of this with no improvement in sight of the food supply situation.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first I want to make an observation inspired by the address given by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. We of the West know that we have the highest population of cattle in the history of this country. I have been informed that the big packing plants of the country are filled with beef, yet we have this anomalous situation, notwithstanding that condition, we are unable, even when we have the necessary points for meat, to get meat in our retail stores right here in the city of Washington and that is true to a great extent throughout the country.

The question is, what is wrong? We have the beef; we have the transportation facilities, not only by rail but by trucks, but we cannot get beef because the retail stores cannot get it.

Yesterday morning I had the experience of applying to three different retail stores here in Washington just to find out if that fact prevailed, and it does prevail. Notwithstanding that we have more beef than the civilian population can use, more than needed to supply the Army requirements and to meet the lend-lease requirements. What is wrong? I have been informed that packers ship direct to the large restaurants throughout the country and sell their beef directly to these restaurants who in turn are not controlled at all in prices and can mark up any price they see fit on their menus for their cuts of beef.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana a question as to this kill of this 70 percent. Is that for domestic consumption 30 percent, or whatever percentage is needed for the Army, or is it a kill of only 70 percent? I understood the gentleman from Texas to imply that they could kill only 70 percent. Would the gentleman from Montana explain that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot explain that because I am not familiar with the figures given by the gentleman from Texas, but from the over-all picture the cut, if there is one, is not understandable with the country full of beef cattle.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. TABER. When they limit the amount of cattle that can be slaughtered to 70 percent of last year and a great lot of that goes to the Army; is not that the answer?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not necessarily; but if they do limit the kill to 70 percent it is nonsensical.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman know whether it is merely 70 percent of last year, or is it not 30 percent reserved for the Army and lend-lease and 70 percent to the civilian population?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the figures furnished by the gentleman from Texas are correct, that there is a limitation of 70 percent of the kill of last year that would not account for present conditions, because there was a big surplus left after the kill of 1942.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman will find that some of the small packers are not even on a 70-percent arrangement. The Lincoln Packing Co., at Lincoln, Nebr., is operating on only 23 percent of its 1942 basis, and out of this it is 50-50, the Government gets one animal for every animal that goes to the civilian trade.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have heard this—I do not know whether it is true or not; I hope it is not—I have heard that the big packers have devised some sort of squeeze play to put the little packer out of business. The price-control program is putting the little man out of business generally throughout the country, and now it seems the same thing is about to happen to the little packers. It is happening to our retail stores. Small retail meat stores in the West and throughout the country are gradually closing up because they cannot get the beef to sell to the people, although there is a tremendous surplus of it in the United States today.

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to talk about a matter that applies principally to Montana.

Mr. Chairman, taken all in all, I think that one of the most ill advised and prohibitively costly proposals to come out of Washington in many a moon was the one that was recently attempted in western Montana in connection with a Federal proposal to obtain additional water in Montana for hydroelectric development in another State. For sheer breathtaking audacity I do not think the proposal can be equaled. It is inconceivable to me that such an utterly destructive and wanton disregard of property, scenic beauty, and States' rights should be conceived of at any time much less in the middle of a very serious war when every

bit of foodstuff raised and energy exerted toward the furtherance of the war effort is of paramount importance.

In fact I do not think such a bold attempt to strip Montana of one of its greatest natural resources would ever have been made if those responsible for this proposed deal had not thought that in the hurry and confusion of war their plan would be a fait accompli before anyone could protest. But in that assumption they erred.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of Montana and Montanans that once again that old vigilante spirit, which manifested itself about three-quarters of a century ago to assure the first settlers of that day their right to a peaceful and law-abiding existence, that that spirit still prevails. The perpetrators of this folly overlooked the fact that these people who would be ousted from their homes and farms, were such a proposal followed out, are the sons and daughters of those hardy pioneers who went into that section of Montana when it was nothing but a timbered wilderness filled with then hostile Indians and lawless bandits, there to carve out and develop homes for themselves and their posterity. Those pioneers had to face and overcome tremendous adverse odds and it took a great courage and determination to build for the future, to uproot the trees and bushes, to till the soil, and to build homes for their loved ones and those who would come after them. That those noble men and women who spent a life of hardship and toil in order to leave a better place for their loved ones to live in, that they and the sacrifices they made have not been forgotten was attested to admirably in the spontaneous and determined way in which their descendants, and others, who realize and appreciate the beauty, grandeur, and productiveness of this valley that would be destroyed, have rallied to the call to defend that valley as they know it today.

Specifically, I have been referring to the recent attempt made on the part of Federal authorities to raise the level of Flathead Lake 17 feet with all its ensuing and devastating consequences.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It might be well to point out that this attempt on the part of the Federal authorities was not only to raise the level of the lake 17 feet by 1945 but eventually to 37 feet. This would result in the inundating of several of our large towns, the loss of 50,000 acres of good agricultural land, the decline of a large lumber industry, and a destruction that would be of no benefit whatsoever to the State of Montana. Furthermore, this proposal, if allowed to go through, would affect 25,000 people directly and 50,000 people—one-tenth of the population of my State—indirectly. The most beautiful scenic area in the United States would be desecrated as a result. It might be well to add further that there was no one in the State of Montana in favor of this proposal and that as far as the Montana congressional delegation in

both the House and the Senate are concerned we are 100 percent with the people of the State in this respect. This solidarity on our part is an indication of how strongly we in Montana feel about this proposed infringement of our rights.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman because everything he has said is true.

Apparently it was of little consequence to those responsible for that idea that hundreds and hundreds of homes would be destroyed; that the beautiful city of Kalispell would be isolated if not inundated; that some 50,000 acres of the most fertile farm land in America would be inundated; that lumber mills and millions of feet of valuable timber would be forever and irreplaceably lost; that the scenic wonderfulness of Flathead Lake, a great national asset and beauty spot, would be seriously marred; and that the cost to the State of Montana in property loss, resources lost, highway replacement costs, plus the cost of litigation involved would be tremendous and staggering to the imagination. And all for what purpose? As I have said, and now say again, simply to take from the State of Montana one of its greatest natural assets for the benefit of another State.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that the Flathead Indians would also stand to suffer greatly by such a transaction, and I think all will agree that the Indian has been treated shabbily enough in the past without this further thrusting of the Indian down the economic scale. What is known as the Kerr Dam was constructed on the Flathead Indian Reservation. The Montana Power Co. pays a royalty to the Indians of \$175,000 per annum for the use of the Indian property. Should the Government take this dam the Indians would be deprived of this royalty unless compensation was secured from the Congress of the United States, and in view of past experience in getting appropriations for Indians I would say that it would be a man's job to secure this compensation.

Every excuse was put forth in justification of this proposal except the real reason back of the desire to get the use of this Montana water. The people of Montana were told that the use of this extra water diverted into Grand Coulee and Bonneville dams would save tons and tons of structural steel. No mention, however, was made on their part as to the resulting loss of 25,000 tons of vitally needed foodstuff produced annually in this section. Nor has any mention been made of the fact that thousands of dollars' worth of property damage would be sustained by Kalispell people who, because of the wording of the law, undoubtedly would be in a position where their property was worthless, as a consequence of the raising of the lake level, but at the same time find themselves unable to collect any damages because their property was not taken or actually damaged. Nor do I think we should overlook the fact that no less than 70,000,000 board feet of lumber is produced annually in this section, which production gives employment

to about 750 persons and that pay rolls, and so forth, totaled almost \$3,000,000 in 1942.

It looks very much to me like the real and only reason for this attempted rape of one of Montana's resources is that Bonneville and Coulee now find that they need more water to operate on. However, I cannot see where Montana should be forced to be the means of supplying most of the Pacific Northwest with power. That problem should have been taken into consideration when these dams were being constructed. The people of the northwest section cannot understand why the Bonneville Power Administration and the Army engineers, instead of endeavoring to make a storage reservoir out of Flathead Lake, did not look to Fort Peck. A world of power could be developed at Fort Peck if power generators were secured for the latter place. The development of additional power at Fort Peck could be had at very little cost. We of Montana cannot understand why, if additional power is needed in the Northwest, Fort Peck is being overlooked.

The attempt to raise Flathead Lake is clearly an attempted violation of the sovereignty of the great State of Montana and we are all proud of the manner in which our Montana people resisted such an unheard of effort to invade and destroy the rights and property of the people of Montana.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of expressing my satisfaction at the reporting of the Fulbright resolution. In the campaigns which led to my election to this body, I uniformly stressed the point that the aim of this country was the recovery of national security, which we had had for a short time following the year 1918, and had negligently lost for lack of any active or precise foreign policy—indeed of any foreign policy at all—in the succeeding years. I did everything possible to emphasize to the electorate my conviction that the attainment of national security meant, first, the defeat of the Axis Powers and, second, the perfection of international arrangements which would insure the continuance of our national security. This country would be secure if there were a just and lasting peace. It would not be secure if there were an unjust or ephemeral peace; any unjust peace would probably prove ephemeral, and any war of any consequence would certainly involve the United States.

I acclaim the Fulbright resolution as a succinct statement of a policy indispensable for the integrity of American institutions and the safety of our children, not merely from the steadily increasing horrors of total war, but from something worse—the overthrow of this Republic by enemy powers which, without suitable preparations, both in policy and armament, we cannot resist.

For generations there have been people in this country who believed that a foreign policy was a sort of immoral lace

frill on the sober flannel petticoat of domestic virtue. This is a tempting view but not a sound one. Last Monday we appropriated over \$75,000,000,000—more than half our national income—because we threw away our alliance with the European democracies in 1919 and created nothing in its place—not an army, not an air force, not a fleet. Indeed we even scrapped the ships that might have saved the Philippines, just as in complete thoughtlessness we suffered Japan to take possession of the island bases which made the Philippines indefensible.

In proclaiming the Fulbright resolution, let me emphasize the things which, in my opinion, it does not mean:

It does not mean an international W. P. A. or an international N. Y. A. On the contrary it looks to the abolition of future O. P. A.'s. It does not mean a conspiracy of the starry-eyed who yearn with Wallace to elevate the wages of the tin miners of Bolivia and the living standards of banana growers of Nicaragua. Still less is it a scheme to override our immigration and naturalization laws with new and hazardous forms of world citizenship. It is not a project to subordinate the interests of the United States to any nation or group of nations. On the contrary it is merely a commitment to study with other friendly interests the most appropriate and safest insurance policies against the recurrence of the disasters which now have our sons dying on more battle fronts than can readily be counted.

There is no cause to fear that the passage of this resolution can diminish the part which our soldiers of today can take in the conduct of our affairs tomorrow. They must be given a voice on the best ways of securing the American sovereignty and freedom for which they have already fought. But I do think that we of our generation should tell them out of our experience that America's security does not consist in ignoring the dangers that beset it.

And let me say that I think no harm can result from considering this very human question in this body which is never more than 2 years from the heart of the people, instead of leaving it as a mystery so deep that only more august minds can hope to comprehend it. In fact I make bold to say that we should be better off if all international arrangements could be left to a simple majority of both Houses instead of being controlled as at present by a minority in one.

I hope the Fulbright resolution will be adopted in this House by a sweeping vote. It springs from a real instinct for national prudence and not from what Edmund Burke called the false and reptile prudence which seeks to avoid national hazards by disregarding their existence.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] concerning the vast supply of cattle in this country. The New York Times of yesterday morning called

attention to the vast cattle surplus that is piling up as the meat famine, particularly in New York City, increases. The subheading reads:

If half the excess were slaughtered it would supply 200,000,000 persons with beef for 1 year the rangers say.

What is happening to all this beef? We cannot get it here in the eastern industrial area. The consumers in my district and the industrial cities are hungering for beef; we are starving in the midst of plenty.

The gentleman from Texas says that all he wants by way of solution of the problem is to put a ceiling price upon retail beef and leave beef prices in the hands of the packers and the cattle growers uncontrolled. He wants the law of supply and demand to operate. The experience of every belligerent country is to the effect that you cannot control inflation and cannot prevent the spiral of inflation unless you control all along the line wages, rents, prices of commodities, prices of services, and prices of everything that go into the usual standard of living. No halfway measure can succeed. The law of supply and demand is out the window.

If you, for example, control only the retailer, then the packers under no control could raise their prices at will to the retailer and the retailer could not do any business because he has a ceiling beyond which he cannot go. He could be the subject of a squeeze of the packer. The cattle grower could likewise charge anything he wished to the packer or he could hold back the carcasses of beef at will, as he is doing now. The packer, in turn, would be at the mercy of the rancher.

This same article in the New York Times, which is in part an explanation of what is happening to this vast quantity of beef, states as follows:

The spokesman for the Ranchmen's Association emphasized what he thought was the black market and said he thought "black market" was a misnomer for the thousands of small slaughterers and customers who are determined not to be deprived of beef artificially by Office of Price Administration regulations.

Throughout the West an increasing number of individuals are buying and storing in freezers whole carcasses of beef, and these people are not comparable with the members of the old prohibition bootleg trade. They are patriotic, but they are determined that they shall not go hungry.

I take exception to that statement and I am inclined to the belief that since they are indulging in a bootleg market contrary to the law of the land and the regulations promulgated thereunder, they are not patriotic. When they do not live up to these regulations they should be punished. This hoarding of vast quantities of beef to get higher prices for reasons best known to their own selfish interests, which interests are contrary to the interests of the consumers throughout the length and breadth of the land, is something to be deprecated and I emphasize the thought that these ranchmen who are holding back all this cattle are doing the country a grievous wrong.

The livestock producers want the free law of supply and demand to operate. The Livestock and Meat Council so indicated. And they practically say, "Unless it does operate we will hold back." That is like pointing a gun at the administration, to vary the simile. It is a strike against the consumers.

Just see what happened in the Revolutionary War with reference to the operation of the law of supply and demand. Note what Washington said with reference thereto during the Revolutionary War when he wrote John Jay as follows:

A wagon load of money will scarcely purchase a wagon load of provision.

The Commander in Chief was gravely concerned that the American cause would be lost not in battle but from the high cost of living and the high cost of supplies for his army. Why? Because of the operation of the ordinary laws of supply and demand. The packers of those days and the moneyed interests of those days, if I may put it that way, in New York and in the East, were demanding that the law of supply and demand operate.

What did Washington say concerning price raising and price fixing? He said:

That which is usual and customary in such cases is to fix the prices of the several articles; bearing a proportion to what is the ordinary rate, and if persons will not comply the great law of self-preservation must authorize us to compel them.

Meaning that the law of self-preservation comes ahead of the economic law of supply and demand and "We must," said Washington, in effect, "compel people to disregard the law of supply and demand in emergency in the interest of the law of self-preservation." I commend these admonitions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] and to all ranchmen.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. According to newspaper reports we are told that it is contemplated importing Argentine beef into this country regardless of the sanitary laws. Does a policy of that kind make sense when we have more beef on the hoof and in the packing plants than we have ever had in the history of the country and no place to go with it? In other words, we cannot get it even though we have the points.

Mr. CELLER. It does not make sense if we have this vast store of cattle and we cannot get it to the hungry mouths that need it, particularly of the industrial workers who need the proteins and vitamins contained in the meat. If we cannot get it, we must be pragmatic. We will be compelled to import Argentine beef. I may say to the gentleman from Montana that some Argentine beef is not subject to the foot and mouth disease; for instance, that which is grown in Patagonia is not. We can import it corned and we can get it in cans where it is not subject to that disease.

The law of supply and demand does not operate in England as the result of artificial restrictions. In England they have been eminently successful in controlling prices and in making wages meet prices. The gentleman from Texas says that England is not an agricultural nation. Of course, it is not. It is an industrial nation importing most of its food, but we cannot blind ourselves to the experience of England with its roll-back, with its subsidy, and so forth. In a way we can pattern after England. Canada is not an industrial nation. It is an agricultural nation and has been eminently successful in doing that which we have been trying to do and what the O. P. A. is trying to do in getting carcasses of meat to the city populations. Canada has held back prices of rationing, enforcement, ceilings, roll-back, and subsidies. It has "held the line." We must hold the line by doing the same. If we do not hold the line, wages again will lag and will not enable the wage earner to maintain decent living for himself and loved ones. He will demand and get higher wages. Higher wages—higher prices. Then higher wages again. Higher and higher rises the spiral of inflation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to correct a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I realize that my good friend does not know very much about price-fixing or prices except what his consumers have to pay. He said awhile ago that the great trouble at this time is that farmers will not sell their hogs and cattle, although farmers have plenty of hogs and cattle. It is true in certain areas we have an increased production of hogs and cattle. The trouble is that right recently since O. P. A. has been talking about rolling back the price on meat, hogs and cattle have gone down about 2 to 3 cents a pound, and packers are not buying and therefore farmers cannot sell; or if they do it is at reduced price. Do you think the farmers would go running all over each other under these circumstances to force the sale of their hogs and cattle when they are going down every day?

Farmers operate as individuals. They have not any say-so as to what price they are to receive for their products. They are as helpless as consumers. There is no definite price fixed to the farmer's products by the O. P. A. like they have fixed for everybody else. The farmer has to take whatever is offered. The packers are absolutely refusing to buy, and if so it is at a reduced price. Farmers are willing and anxious to sell, but they do not want to sell with prices rolling back on them. Feeding hogs after they become top hogs is an extra expense to farmers. I am selling hogs from my farm now at 13½ cents that some weeks ago sold for 15 cents. In the meantime my tenants are short of meat but O. P. A. will not permit me to kill and sell my own hogs to these tenants.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact that there are hundreds of farmers who have spent a half century or a quarter of a century feeding and producing beef who cannot longer stay in business because of the conditions that exist today?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am getting letters and telegrams daily stating, "I am being forced to sell out—I am reducing my production of hogs and poultry because I cannot get any feed." One of the best producers and one of the most intelligent farmers in my district, Mr. Moss, of Cameron, S. C., who has been a producer of purebred hogs, wrote me the other day, "I wanted to increase the production of hogs, but I am forced to reduce."

It is not the farmer's fault. If the O. P. A. had started out its operation on a sound, common-sense, practical basis, that is, from the farmer, the bottom up, with proper differentials with processor and all handlers, including the retailer, then everyone could have operated on a fair and normal business basis. No; they fixed the price of meat to the packer and retailers, and hogs and cattle kept going up. Now they want to roll back prices and pay packers a subsidy and the packers are pushing the prices of hogs and cattle down.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman. It may be that the packers are endeavoring to prevent the farmers getting a proper price. I want the farmers not to sell at a loss. If a roll-back is necessary for the consumers to get food at a proper price and to make up for that loss the farmer should get some sort of a subsidy; I am willing to do that. Let us get together and work something out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. If you are going to roll back prices and pay packers a subsidy, believing you will help consumers, then the farmer's prices should be fixed, so the packer cannot roll back the price on the farmer. May I say to the gentleman that I do not believe there is a Member on the floor of this House any more interested than I am in wage earners and the consumers of this country. Many people in my part of the country live in poverty and raise their children in ignorance because of the type of wages they have been paid and because of unfair prices they receive for their farm products. Before we passed labor legislation, for instance, the textile workers in South Carolina received only about 10 to 12 cents an hour, and they and their families went around in rags. Not a single boy or girl able to go to college, yet on these factory lists we have many boys and girls that would be able to make a name for themselves if they only had a

chance. But the trouble is that a great many Representatives of the city districts like my good friend representing consumers and labor do not know the many problems of the farmers. If there is any two groups that should get together it is farmers and wage earners. The farmer, like labor and the consumer, in selling and buying farm products has no power whatever in demanding or fixing fair prices. The packer fixes his price and then fixes the farmer's prices so as to pay all expenses connected with his business, including his taxes and a fixed profit. Then this product passes through many middlemen, all able to fix their prices with many additions between the farmer and the consumer. Naturally the consumer has to take it or leave it.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman would have control all the way along the line?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely, from the bottom up and I would weed out many of these useless middlemen who operate as parasites on farmers and consumers.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman and I agree.

Mr. FULMER. You cannot do it from the top down. As previously stated, when they put a ceiling price on meat some time ago, hogs went up. You have to start at the bottom with proper differentials and if I had my way about it, I would definitely fix all prices, including labor, on a fair basis for the duration and quit so much foolish experimenting. I begged them to do it, and they would not do it.

Mr. CELLER. We are in absolute accord on that.

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

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. In the final analysis, just who is responsible for the conditions that exist now?

Mr. FULMER. Under the present situation, perhaps you cannot hold any one person or any one agency responsible, for we have a half dozen agencies running all around over the lot with no one with any definite power. When you check on O. P. A. you are referred to someone else. When you talk to Chester Davis, he will tell you, "I have not any power," and finally you are referred to Mr. Vinson, and he will tell you "We are working on it."

My committee reported a bill today to place sufficient power in the hands of the Food Administrator, that which he thought he had when he was appointed, in connection with production, distribution, rationing, and price fixing.

Let us cut out red tape, lost motion, and confusion before we wake up too late with too little.

Mr. BISHOP. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the estimate from the Bu-

reau of the Budget on an item of \$8,000,000 for airports did not arrive in time for the committee to incorporate it in this deficiency bill. It would have enabled 28 communities in the United States to complete their airports which were started by the W. P. A.

Originally, the Work Projects Administration had 267 airports. When the W. P. A. ceased functioning, 103 of these airports were completed; 65 have been specified by the Army and the Navy as being of military necessity and will be completed by funds otherwise provided for; 71 of these airports are now being operated by the Army. However, there are 28 airports which are not completed and a huge investment of not only the Federal Government, but the State governments and local municipalities, is wasting away. In this category is the air port at Beatrice, Nebr.; also the one at Fremont, Nebr. The other 26 airports are scattered over the States of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, these communities have completed their part of the contract that they made with the United States Government to build an airport and thus advance aviation, aid in the pilot-training program, and improve the national defense. As the matter now stands, the Federal Government is a defaulter in its arrangement with these several communities in regard to their airports. Most of these airports are far along on the way to completion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to a letter received from Mr. W. W. Cook, secretary of the airport board of Beatrice, Nebr., bearing date of January 12, 1943, which is as follows:

BEATRICE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT BOARD,
Beatrice, Nebr., January 12, 1943.
Mr. CARL CURTIS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to give you some information regarding our local Work Projects Administration airport project. As Work Projects Administration stops February 1, we have been notified that the work on our airport will cease as of that date.

The airport is a municipal airport, the land being owned by the city. It is located 2 miles north of this city on paved highway U. S. No. 77. Last April the citizens of this city voted by a majority of 2 to 1, \$60,000 for the purchase of the land and to pay the sponsors' contribution for a class 3 airport. The cost of the land was approximately \$45,000 for 395 acres.

The city entered into a contract with Work Projects Administration for the development of this tract of land as a class 3 airport. The amount of money necessary for the city to spend, according to their contract with Work Projects Administration, was about \$80,000. This included the purchase of the land, the sponsors' contribution, and the engineering fee. The city has cooperated with the Work Projects Administration 100 percent. We have furnished everything that we have been asked to. We have even gone further than our contract agreement. When Work Projects Administration labor became scarce, the city furnished high-school boys to drive trucks. The city paid these boys as, of course, they could not be paid by Work Projects Administration. We have fur-

nished lumber, sand, and other materials, the cost being paid by the city. All of these things being over and above the amounts called for in the contract.

At the present time the field is in much worse condition than if the improvement project had never been started. There was grading done and ditches dug which have not been filled. Before Work Projects Administration started there was 160 acres of this tract that was a usable airport. The field, in the condition it is now, leaves us very little of even the original 160 acres that we may use.

The drain tile is being put in place at the present time, the city having agreed to furnish and pay for the necessary labor. This also is over and above the contract agreement. Work Projects Administration awarded a contract to the Robert Construction Co., of Lincoln, for grading and moving of dirt. The amount of this contract was approximately \$101,000. The Robert Construction Co. have moved a great deal of equipment and machinery to Beatrice. They have done very little work. Of course, if their contract is terminated, there will be a large amount of money due them as liquidating damages for which the Government will get nothing in return. They, of course, are rightfully entitled to the liquidating damages as they have been to considerable expense.

We have trained approximately 50 students here in Beatrice under the Civil Aeronautics Authority War Training Service. The majority of these people are now either in the Army or the Navy. We are still training these students, although it is quite difficult with our limited runway.

I am enclosing photostatic copies of some letters received from the Store Kraft Manufacturing Co., of this city. They are large subcontractors under the Cessna Co. As you can see from the letters, they need the airport continually. As a matter of fact, Cessna many times have flown parts and supplies into the Store Kraft Co., and if they had not been able to do this, it would have greatly delayed the program of the Store Kraft Co. in their vital war business.

I am also enclosing information compiled by our engineers showing the summary of the work planned, the work accomplished, and the work yet to be done. This was all approved by the Work Projects Administration.

We are calling upon you to help us in any way that you can to get some other agency to take over and complete this work. We need it very badly. The city has at the present time spent in the neighborhood of \$70,000, fulfilling their part of the contract. It does not seem fair to us that the city, having spent their part of the money, that the Government should not complete this project.

Anything that you can do for us will be greatly appreciated. If there is any additional information that we may furnish you, please let us know.

Yours truly,

W. W. COOK,
Secretary, Airport Board.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the weeks and months since the termination of the W. P. A., I have been endeavoring to get some action that would bring about the completion of this important airport at Beatrice. Many contacts and conversations have been had with officials in the C. A. A. and the Army and Navy. Up until now, the Army and Navy have not seen fit to take over this airport or aid in its completion. It is my belief that the C. A. A. wants this airport completed and that their request is now before the Bureau of the Budget.

The city of Beatrice has done everything that they could do. In fact, their expenditures at the present time apparently exceed the amount mentioned in the above-quoted letter of Mr. Cook.

On June 14, Mr. M. S. Hevelone, an attorney at Beatrice, advised me by telegram, "Beatrice fulfilled its part of original contract with W. P. A., including furnishing land, all engineering, and other items, totaling over \$80,000. W. P. A. agreed to complete port in three phases but did not complete phase one. Airport in worse condition now than before. Besides, Government defaulted on contract. Beatrice has three industrial plants devoted to war production. One plant working under subcontract with Cessna Aircraft of Wichita. Beatrice port in incompletely condition not usable by men flying here on war work."

State Senator Ladd Hubka of Beatrice has been very active in promoting the Beatrice airport. He, too, advises that the city of Beatrice has done everything required of them and more, and urges that the Federal Government complete its agreement.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of economy and fair dealing on the part of the Federal Government with these 28 communities having unfinished airports started by the W. P. A., I urge that this Congress, at an early date, take the necessary steps to bring about their completion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we are presenting this morning the last of the annual appropriation bills. The pending bill, the second deficiency appropriation bill, closes the appropriation program for the session. We are at last able to approximate in general terms the total amount carried by the annual supply bills for this session of Congress. Of course, it is impossible yet to say definitely just what the amount is, as a number of the bills are still subject to change in the Senate and in conference, but, under the present status, the annual supply bills and the supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills aggregate approximately \$111,000,000,000 for the first session of the Congress. An approximate estimate of the permanent appropriations, special and general accounts, not including trust funds, for 1944 is \$4,000,000,000. So we reach a grand total at this time, under the present status of the supply bills, of \$115,000,000,000 for the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

This is the largest amount of money ever appropriated by the American Congress, with one exception. The second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress appropriated a total of \$147,000,000,000. We are falling short of that amount this session by some \$32,000,000,000.

And that is as it should be. There is an encouraging note in the fact that the appropriations for this session make it the second largest appropriating session in the history of the Nation. There is reason to believe that it indicates we are over the hump, that the biggest job of getting our production geared to war needs is

done, and that we have now reached the point where we have practically completed capital investments. All major factories are built; all major plants are in operation; all patterns, jigs, and dies have been supplied; our personnel has been mobilized and organized. From now on we need production, replacement, and maintenance, as far as we can see now; and from now on, the trend should be to keep producing to the limit. There is heartening evidence in this decrease in appropriations for this session under the appropriations for the last session—that we have passed the turning point in the war. It is an encouraging and optimistic augury. At last we are definitely headed toward ultimate victory. We are winning the war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope everything the gentleman has said will prove to be true. If the gentleman has not read it, I should like to have him read in the current issue of *Life* a description of the Battle of Attu. It will give him a vivid idea of what this country is up against before we lick the Japs, which we have to do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am very glad to have the gentleman call attention to that phase of the situation. I trust no one will get the impression that victory is either near or easy. While this is an encouraging omen, it does not mean that the war is over or that any material part of the incalculable price has been paid. Anyone who took note of the very informative address made by General Marshall this week, must realize that there are long days of hard and strenuous battle ahead, and that it is to be battles in which we must expect to suffer frequent reverses and severe losses; but we can begin to take heart in the knowledge that the processes of preparation for war are now secure.

We are just beginning to realize, just beginning to catch a glimmer of light on how close we came to tragic and irretrievable defeat. We are beginning to realize that if the enemy full-panoplied, full-armored, ready to the last buckle, had been able to throw his mechanized might against us as against France before our plants were built, our troops equipped, our personnel mobilized, that, regardless of our resources, regardless of the dauntless spirit of the American people, we could not have protected our shores or defended our centers of production.

We are now in a position through the capital expenditures of the last Congress and this where we can be assured we are as well or better armed, as well or better equipped, our armed forces as well trained and disciplined or better trained and disciplined as any force which the enemy can bring against us. From now on our job will be to keep our present plans and factories in production. As a matter of fact, it has been developed in our hearings that we are producing so effectively that we can now turn some small part of our energies and facilities

to civilian needs and divert some of our war plants to the production of materials for civilian consumption. That is one of a number of encouraging conclusions reflected in the substantial reduction in the amount of the total appropriations for this session under the peak appropriations of the last session.

It must be understood, of course, that all appropriations here tabulated, either for the last session or this session, are not devoted to war purposes. In the last session, and in this session, about six or seven billion dollars have been devoted to the maintenance of the ordinary functions of government, including interest on the public debt, which for next year amounts to something like \$3,000,000,000; but outside of the six or seven billion dollars in the last session and this session the entire appropriation of \$147,000,000,000 for the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and \$115,000,000 for the first session of the Seventy-eighth has been for war.

The second deficiency appropriation bill contains comparatively few items and comparatively small amounts to take care of the ordinary odds and ends of deficiencies that ordinarily appear at the end of a session. We have here appropriations for the Postal Service, the bulk of which is for the pay of personnel, for clerks, for postmasters, and for Star Route Service, and the deficiency is occasioned by the tremendous increase in the volume of mail and to mail carried free for those in the armed forces.

Under the Federal Works Agency we have an appropriation of \$7,000,000 to carry on a work-relief program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands from July 1 to November 30, 1943, under the act of June 22, 1943, legislation which came unanimously from the Committee on Insular Affairs. This \$7,000,000 is a reduction of \$1,000,000 from the \$8,000,000 recommended by the Budget in respect to this legislation to provide a stop-gap to take care of unemployment and destitution conditions in the islands, much of which is due to war conditions, and the disappearance of commerce occasioned by our war activities.

Under the Treasury Department we provide \$2,700,000 for payment to Panama and the Export-Import Bank on account of Panama's share of the cost of constructing the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway. When this road was projected the original cost was to be \$4,000,000, of which the United States was to pay one and a half million and Panama would pay two and a half million dollars. Panama borrowed her share from the Export-Import Bank at 4 percent interest. The work was to be done by Panama under advice of the United States engineers; but with the coming of the war, and the imminent necessity of prompt defense of the Canal and the locks in Panama and other installations, we took over, with the consent of Panama, the building of the road, changed the specifications, and agreed, for other important considerations, to assume her part of the cost of the road. We here provide for a refund of the part of the amount of the loan which Panama has paid, principal and interest, and to pay the bank the

remainder due from Panama on the two and a half million dollars in the original loan.

Under the Civil Service Commission we provide for the Board of Legal Examiners, with which the House is familiar, and for the liquidation of the National Resources Planning Board.

The bill as presented to the House carries a total recommendation of \$36,245,360.60, a reduction from the amount of the Budget estimates of \$2,255,500, as large a retrenchment as we felt the program could afford.

It is to be regretted that time could not have been afforded for inclusion in this bill of an appropriation to take care of distress conditions occasioned by floods in the Missouri, Mississippi, and Ohio Valleys. Conditions in these sections are so severe that 3 weeks after the first inundation, the Army engineers have not yet been able to make an accurate estimate of the damage or of steps to be taken for alleviation of flood conditions in these devastated valleys. The loss has been very heavy and will be greater unless early assistance can be given to rehabilitate farm facilities and to start production before it is too late to take advantage of the season.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. On the Missouri River flood situation we have no funds for a survey based on the damage done this year, have we?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill carries no provision of any kind. There has been no time to secure estimates.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman understand that there is a new section to the new road bill passed in the Senate yesterday providing for some construction of damage done to bridges and roads in the recent flood? Will we get that bill here before we recess?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is to be hoped that some such provision will be provided before the recess. It is the most distressing flood we have had in the Middle West in a generation, and the crest of the flood had not reached the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi at last report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 17 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I was intensely interested in the statement made by my good friend—and he is a good friend—the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to the effect that the total appropriations at the last session of the Congress aggregated \$147,000,000,000, and that the appropriations for the present session of this Congress had aggregated \$115,000,000,000, making a total appropriation for the two sessions of \$262,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

On May 27 I placed in the RECORD a statement giving the latest available records on the assessed valuation of each of the 48 States of the Union. That record

shows that the total assessed valuation of the 48 States of the Union is \$150,000,000,000. I fail to find anything that is very encouraging in the picture. We have passed appropriations for \$262,000,000 in two sessions of the Congress, and this session is not over yet. That amount is almost twice the assessed valuation of every piece of property, real and personal, tangible and intangible, in the 48 States of the Union.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

WHAT IS AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, recently there has been unanimously reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee a resolution, which I hope will be unanimously passed when it reaches this floor. I read that resolution:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

Since this resolution was reported a number of people, including to my astonishment one or two Senators, have spoken as though the foreign affairs of this country were not the business of this House. I can imagine no conception of foreign affairs which betrays such a complete lack of understanding of what foreign affairs are all about. To talk as though this House had no concern with foreign affairs, is to talk as though foreign affairs were some sort of esoteric parlor game, some pukka-sahib sport, a sort of private political monopoly which has no vital relation to the vital interests of the people. Is this House, then, to raise the most staggering taxes in all history, for a \$300,000,000,000 war, and to have nothing to say about what we win when we win that war?

Such indeed seems to be the attitude of a few people in high offices who have always sought jealously to maintain a monopoly of foreign affairs. They have cozened and propagandized the people into thinking that foreign affairs is a delicate abracadabra which the people had better leave to their betters. This is also the doctrine of those who preach a century in which there will be 129,999,000 common men but only 1, or perhaps 2, very, very uncommon men who will do all the thinking about everything foreign for you and for me.

Mr. Chairman, I know, and every Member of this House knows that the future foreign policy of the United States is a matter of profound concern to all the people. To be sure the people are confused about it now. They have been deliberately confused by those who have claimed a monopoly of wisdom in this field. The catastrophe of this war is the very measure of their wisdom. This, the people have begun at last to realize. So, while the people do not yet know what they intend their future foreign policy to be, they do intend to be the architects of it. If, in spite of their

desire to do so, the American people are denied the chance to determine their own foreign policy, there will have been committed the greatest crime that was ever committed in this Nation against government by the people.

It is in response to the demands of the people that their representatives in every branch of government contribute to this task of shaping America's foreign policy by every available means that the Fulbright resolution has been brought before us. Wisely, I believe, it has been determined to postpone the vote until after every one of us shall have had an opportunity to consult again with our people who have sent us here. When we return here, I have no doubt that we shall pass this resolution unanimously.

But though this step is all, perhaps, that we can wisely take at this time, it is only a first step toward an American foreign policy. For actually the Fulbright resolution is only the expression of a national sentiment. And there is a world of difference between sentiment and policy.

My argument is that, even at this late date, America has no foreign policy; that we must shape ourselves a policy soon; and that without a foreign policy we in this House can do nothing in the future with intelligence or success. Without some idea of the shape of American foreign policy, our attempts here to deal with the problems of finance, labor, agriculture, currency, social security, lend-lease, demobilization, rehabilitation of stricken countries, feeding of starving nations, and disarmament can hardly be more brilliant than the attempts of blindfolded children to pin the tail on the donkey.

To show how we may go about getting a foreign policy, may I with your kind permission propose a base point in a true American foreign policy? But let me say one thing, first: I do not care what foreign policy all the American people finally determine—provided they determine it on the basis of the facts. For I know this—and each of you knows it—that after all the argument is done, a policy which stems out of the true character and vital interests of the American people is not going to differ very much from what I want or from what each of you wants, on either side of this aisle.

How then do we proceed from vague verbalisms to concrete decisions? How do we proceed from sentiment to policy?

At the risk of sounding schoolmarmish, let me press the distinction between the sentiments of a nation and its policies, by defining the word "policy" itself. Here the ordinary Webster's Collegiate Dictionary will do. There policy is defined as "procedure based primarily on temporal or material interest, rather than on higher principles; hence worldly wisdom in the conduct of a nation's affairs."

This, Mr. Chairman, is the specific sense in which I use the word "policy." This is also the sense in which it has been used for hundreds of years by statesmen and diplomats whenever they have spoken of any nation's domestic or foreign policy. By historic use, as well

as by dictionary definition, the philosophy, the ethics, the morals, the principles, the sentiments of a nation are not the same thing as its policies. Indeed, policy, which is procedure, based on temporal or material interests, in short, procedure based on self-interest, may be at total variance with the accepted principles, or spiritual concepts of a nation. Or it may be in accord. Benjamin Franklin made clear for all time the nice distinction between principle and policy, as well as the great importance of harmonizing them happily, when he said, "Honesty is the best policy."

Policy is, to put it another way, the pursuit of national or international ends by a choice of national means. A wise and honest nation will always demand that the international ends it seeks should be open and aboveboard, just and honorable, and so also should be the means to these ends. That is what Woodrow Wilson meant when he said, "Open covenants, openly arrived at." Secret means, used to achieve secret ends, midwifed by secretive diplomacy are not the ways of a democracy. These are the ways of totalitarian and Fascist powers. These are the ways of dictatorship. And when they are practiced or embraced by democratic statesmen, they are the ways that lead a democracy to its own doom.

Now the effort during the past 40 years of millions of Americans in high places and low to avoid having any foreign policy at all has come to be known in our day as "isolation."

Your extreme isolationist of yesterday was a citizen who believed that his country could develop peacefully and prosperously with nothing but a domestic policy, regardless of the foreign policies of other nations.

At this point let me say, every American realizes that we do have a procedure and do practice a foreign policy toward Canada and Mexico and the Central and South American countries. In short, he has long recognized and accepted the need of stating his material interests in the Western Hemisphere, and pursuing them there intelligently and vigorously. But in the past 40 years the average American had come to feel, for some strange reason, that our thinking about Europe and Asia could stop at the water's edge. And he has twice been doomed to ugly surprises. He is doomed for uglier and even more tragic ones, if he has failed to learn the lesson of two World Wars. I do not think he has failed to learn it. I believe there are few isolationists, by my definition, left in this Nation.

Now it has been noted, I believe, that I am no proponent of "globaloney." But it has not been generously noted that I am equally a bitter enemy of "globblindness", and a stanch friend of "glob-alliances."

I know, as most of my colleagues do, that the policy of no-policy toward Europe and Asia ignores one hard and woeful fact. All the other nations—European and Asiatic—do have foreign policies. They do assiduously and tirelessly pursue their international ends by

the choice of national means. What the isolationists had failed to realize is that all these other foreign nations—both our friends and our enemies, put the United States' foreign policy—which is paradoxically to have none at all—at the very top of their agenda. For example, for a hideous example, the whole foreign policy of the Germans and Japs and the Axis Powers was carefully built and secretly pursued in the justified belief that America would not take the trouble carefully to inspect ultimate Axis aims, and would therefore never realize in time the nature of Axis designs on America. In short, during the past 40 years, our lack of any alert and positive foreign policy toward them allowed them safely to pursue their own toward us. Thus, we see an ugly paradox; our lack of a foreign policy not only became an irritant, a worry, a headache to our natural allies, forcing them into appeasements and uncertain alliances, but it became a comfort and an encouragement and a very real aid to our natural enemies.

Mr. Chairman, twice in our lifetime America's lack of a foreign policy has discouraged our friends, encouraged our enemies, weakened the forces of peace, fanned the flames of war, and plunged the world into catastrophe.

So isolation has twice proven to be a disastrous attitude for America. But what, you ask, of intervention? If isolation is the lack of an American foreign policy, is what has come to be called intervention the presence of an American foreign policy?

The answer again is an unequivocal No. Intervention, as it also has been twice practiced in our lifetime, is no more of an American foreign policy than isolation. Intervention, both under Woodrow Wilson and under Franklin Roosevelt, was simply the adoption in extremis of another nation's foreign policy. Twice before this isolationist nation, belatedly seeing that its many moral and material commitments abroad and on the high seas were menaced, and its shores therefore ultimately endangered, has been plunged into a world war, prepared neither with war aims nor peace goals, and barely prepared with sufficient arms to defeat those of its enemies.

Neither the avowed interventionists nor the avowed isolationists can conceal the appalling fact of their own paucity of ideas about American international aims. For neither interventionists nor isolationists had any clear pre-war international American policy.

I believe that an American interventionist who adopts lock, stock, and barrel another nation's foreign policy when the threat of war is fully revealed is no more to be admired as an American patriot than the isolationist who denied the need of any policy when the threat of war was not visible. The interventionist is just a renegade isolationist, the isolationist an unconverted interventionist. Neither has honestly thought through his own country's true interests.

Now, let us, since the question of isolation came first, take the so-called foreign policy of the President. Until 1937

Franklin Roosevelt was the world's outstanding isolationist. For years he was famed for his blithe indifference to the oneness of the world in every chancery in Europe and Asia. His public approval, for example, of Munich is a matter of public record. This administration's isolation from Europe and Asia until, and even after, that very day is a fact that no historian disputes. Hitler and Mussolini thrived and waxed strong in those balmy days of the isolationist New Deal. In those days, too, Hirohito, slowly encompassing the conquest of China, bought the scrap and steel from us with which to beat our only potential ally in the Far East to her knees. And even then Hirohito was planning the conquest of American possessions in the Pacific. Until 1931 America had had a coherent, if not a vigorous, far eastern policy. From then on, under New Deal statesmanship, that policy was allowed to deteriorate slowly but inexorably; a fact that was memorialized by our piled dead at Pearl Harbor.

But after Munich the evil tidings out of Europe and Asia began to swamp the State Department. No President fit for office could any longer ignore them. Slowly, reluctantly, hesitantly, Franklin Roosevelt abandoned his isolation. Little by little, cautiously, compromising always uninformed public opinion with his own bitter State Department information, Roosevelt, the world's outstanding isolationist, became Roosevelt, the world's outstanding interventionist. Which is to say, insensibly he began to adopt another nation's foreign policy. He adopted that of our greatest and nearest and most friendly neighbor—Great Britain. Fortunately, he adopted something, and better late than never. Though, may I point out here, even that policy was never forthrightly adopted by him, but rather thrust upon him at long last by Pearl Harbor and the German declaration of war upon America.

Now, right away you ask, Was Mr. Roosevelt's acceptance of British foreign policy a good thing or a bad thing for the U. S. A.? I want to be quite clear about this. The acceptance of any coherent, functioning foreign policy, long contrived to preserve the material welfare of millions, no, hundreds of millions of people, above all, the acceptance of the foreign policy of a powerful and friendly and kindred nation is far, far better than having none of your own. And Mr. Roosevelt had no foreign policy for America before Pearl Harbor—and he has no foreign policy for America now.

But as we all know, for many divers reasons, many Americans who were against Roosevelt's domestic policy were entirely willing to follow him in so-called American foreign policy. Those who did so for the best reasons were the thoughtful, unselfish, patriotic Americans who wanted above all things for America to be physically safe, not only today, but tomorrow. They knew, in short, their geography. They knew that for purely geographic, utterly materialistic reasons, lacking a foreign policy of our own, the foreign policy of Great Britain was the policy of all those in the world best calculated to preserve Amer-

ica from direct attack. They were the people who also knew that the Monroe Doctrine itself would never have been tenable without the existence of a strong and friendly British Navy. They knew that for time out of mind, the British, who kept the seas open and policed, had coincidentally kept them open for American trade, American defense, American ideas. They knew and saw what people do not yet see clearly enough—though there is nothing whatsoever to keep them from looking at the map—that the British Empire is America's natural buffer state.

As France has stood between England and Germany for centuries, as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans have stood between Russia and Germany, so there, my colleagues, on the globe stands the far-flung British Empire between the United States and all its real or potential enemies, in Europe and to some extent in Asia.

We have been attacked by the Germans and the Japs. Where are the great masses of our American troops gathered or fighting? Not on American soil. In Australia, the British Isles, the Near East. We have had to borrow everywhere Empire soil to get at our enemies. Even in the Far East, now that the Philippines are gone, to aid our Chinese allies we must pass for thousands upon thousands of miles through commonwealth land to India. Conversely, if our enemies today or tomorrow want to get at us, they too must always borrow British soil, or first subdue all or parts of the British Empire.

To repeat, with the exception of Japan, there is not one country in this whole world—again I am omitting South America, for obvious reasons—which could get at the United States of America, or at which the United States of America could get without passing over or through some part of the Empire and commonwealth. America's geographical armor, its eternal physical shield are colonial parts or commonwealth components of the Empire and its many Gibralters. Even Japan had first to dispose of British strongholds in the southwest Pacific in order to secure her lines of attack on our loosely held outposts in the Pacific.

Let us say that mighty Russia might be our next enemy, which I do not for a second believe. Attacking from the polar cap, even Russia would have to pass through, or over, Canada to get at us. Attacking out of Siberia past Japan, striking at Alaska, Russia would still have to go through Canada to reach American heartland. Therefore, Mr. Roosevelt was right, so far as the question of sheer self-defense of the United States of America went, in the early stages of the war to embrace Empire policy and strategy. He saw, as any child who consults his maps can, that if the Empire were to be destroyed America must eventually become physically vulnerable to a score of nations. For yesterday, today, tomorrow this country must always deal with immutable geography. We have the neighbors we have. And this must always make our foreign relations to the British Empire of paramount importance to the United States of America.

Therefore, it is, I think, obvious beyond dispute that the base line of our search for an American foreign policy must be our relations with the British Empire. I believe that the American foundation stone of an American foreign policy ought to be a military alliance, or nonaggression pact, with Great Britain and the self-governing members of the Commonwealth. The high-minded, sincere internationalists, or the deliberate makers of political confusion may talk all they want about world organizations, regional federations, leagues of nations, and other mechanisms of collective security. I submit that in this epoch of history, collective security is meaningless without the firm and clearly established military, as well as economic and spiritual, collaboration of the United States and the British Commonwealth.

Today and tomorrow the question is not paramountly the peace of Europe but of the world. In the world scene, any scheme, however noble in concept, to maintain peace will in the last analysis be no better than the character and clarity of the relationships between the United States and the British Commonwealth.

I speak, at this point, not of a foreign policy, but of the search for a foreign policy, and I say that this search must be enormously speeded up. It is for the people of America to determine their future foreign policy. In foreign affairs, as in domestic, politics is the art of the possible. The American people have a right to know what is possible in foreign affairs and what is not. It is the business of the executive branch of this Government to serve the people. In foreign affairs, as in all else, it is for the President of the United States to be the servant of the people, not their master, and certainly not their Delphic oracle. Let us then call upon the executive branch to serve us and all the people by ascertaining without further delay the broad limits at least within which a permanent alliance with the British Commonwealth may be obtained.

There are, I believe, no insuperable difficulties in the way of an Anglo-American alliance. But no doubt there are difficulties. Some of these difficulties certainly exist in the sphere of our worldwide material, commercial and economic interests, such as currency, aviation, shipping, communications, oil, and so forth. All such questions need not be settled at once, though they certainly should be explored at once. The question to be determined today is whether we and the British are willing to work out these problems in a generous spirit of give and take. Senator Lodge has ably pointed out that all of our allies are definitely pursuing, in their policies, their own material and temporal interests. I do not for 1 minute object to Great Britain pursuing her own interests with vigor and selfishness, so long as she is threatened, and the world is threatened by the possibility of recurrent American isolation. So long as the Government of the United States is not prepared to get down to brass tacks—so long as high officials of this Government continue to make windy words and sentiments and vague principles such as the

"four freedoms," a substitute for the hard but patriotic business of statesmanship, Great Britain cannot do otherwise. Nor can the rest of the United Nations. But if our Government would ever get down to brass tacks, and help to give the American people a clear conception of what are the vital interests and needs of the United States so that we could all agree to our foreign policy—then surely the British Government would, for the first time, be willing and glad to deal with us on the basis of a high regard for our material interests and our spiritual aims of world freedom. I cannot conceive that any government of His Majesty would want to jeopardize the security of the commonwealth or the peace of the world by undue opposition to American interests and ideals. His Majesty's Government would, I am certain, wholeheartedly welcome a Government of the United States which would be able to make plain in sensible, common-sense fashion the continuing and vital interests of the American Nation, in Asia and Europe. Benjamin Franklin might well have said: "Fair play is the best Anglo-American policy."

I have said that policy must be sharply differentiated from principle. Policy cannot always achieve, indeed policy can never wholly achieve the perfect fulfillment of principle. At the same time, when there is too big a gap between policy and high principle, we are plunged into an abyss of moral confusion—the very kind of confusion from which America now so deeply suffers. For instance, either in the vacuum of an American foreign policy, or even with an American foreign policy, the "four freedoms" for the whole world are impossible of application. But implemented by a clear Anglo-American accord, the application of them to many parts of the world, where they do not yet exist, becomes infinitely more possible. In fact in these circumstances we may even be able to achieve the "four freedoms" for the United States of America.

For my part, I believe that the greatest of our principles does not separate us from the British Commonwealth, but rather binds us together: namely, our mutual faith in government by the people, for the people, and of the people, and our determination to maintain it for ourselves, whatever else happens.

The people of the British Commonwealth are utterly devoted to this principle. In the course of two centuries, however, they have acquired the tremendous problem of the application of this principle of self-government to vast areas of the Empire where self-government is not fact nor even, in some cases, an active theory. Today many British leaders tell us they are determined to apply the principle of self-government everywhere in the Empire as rapidly as possible. Certainly the United States ought not to be a party, directly or indirectly, to any unjustifiable delay in the expansion of political freedom for all peoples. But an Anglo-American alliance would, I believe, give great impetus to the expansion of world political freedom.

Finally, we cannot enter into a basic alliance with the British Empire if to

do so would provoke the reasonable enmity of or suspicion of other peoples, such as the Russians and the Chinese, with whom, as with the rest of the United Nations, we are also determined to establish enduring relations of fruitful co-operation.

Let me now summarize my argument: In the long and tragic absence of any American foreign policy, vis-à-vis Europe and Asia, Mr. Roosevelt did the "second best thing" when he adopted that of Mr. Churchill. But second best it was, and is, and will be.

Until America finds and proclaims a vigorous policy of its own, our isolationist Presidents, in times of stress and war, will always be faced with either the disastrous choice of letting the British Empire go under at the hands of its aggressors—and our potential enemies—or of becoming interventionists and jumping in at the last desperate moment on Britain's side—and in that scramble of accepting, in a vacuum of all else, Britain's foreign policy, her ways and means of waging war, and her ways and means of shaping the post-war world. For we shall never, never, in material things, or spiritual ideas, be prepared for anything else.

How shall peace finally be brought to the world? By what—to use the words of the Fulbright resolution—"appropriate machinery"? Well, first, by using the machinery of our minds. Let us here in this House make it clear that it will be no longer an advantage to statesmen who wish to remain in power to make America's foreign policy seem exclusive, mysterious, and complicated. The Greeks invented the painless trick of the maze to drive ordinary men insane. It is the trick of politicians in high places today to raise a terrible dust of words about police forces, leagues of nations, world federations and so on, and then to complain that people do not see. It is a trick of these politicians to egg on every man to call his neighbor who is trying desperately to think things through from any American point of view, either an isolationist or imperialist, a warmonger or a pacifist. Let us put an end to this nonsense by proclaiming the simple obvious fact:

What is most wanted in America today are statesmen and legislators who can formulate a clear, honest, all-American foreign policy for the United States of America in Europe and in Asia. I predict that any such clearly announced American policy will at no point come into harsh conflict with the best interests of China, Russia, Great Britain, or any of the United Nations. Once we see this clearly, each of the great nations will give a little and all the nations will gain more. Only in this way will we be able to work out our destinies peacefully at home and abroad.

One more point and I am done: A foreign policy never should be and never can be at odds spiritually or economically with a domestic policy. The same spirit and philosophy that informs one will inevitably inform the other. Laissez-faire tycoonery, economic isolation and reaction at home before 1932 bred the same sort of disastrous American

foreign policy abroad. Today "W. P. A.-ism," "poppa-fixism," "mama-do-goodism" will breed the same kind of American policy abroad—and with inevitably the same results on the foreign scene that it has had on the domestic scene.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, Where are today's Jeffersons and Franklins and Adamses? Where are today's Monroes and Washingtons? Where are the men who believed in helping those who help themselves? In equal opportunities for all men and all nations? In vigilance being the eternal price of liberty? In America creating its own destiny? Where are the men, such as those I have named, who had both a policy for America and an American policy for other nations, and who put them squarely and honestly and without apology before the people and the world? Where? Where? Well, when they come—and come they will, perhaps on the very floor of this House—they will bring order out of our national and international chaos. They will set an honorable and yet realistic American foreign policy before us, and to that policy we will pledge our words, our honor, and our arms; and having done so, our words will never haunt us, our honor will remain unsullied, and our swords will stay bright in their scabbards—bright and unused.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Out where I live we have a port. For 5 or 6 years before December 1941, out of that port went hundreds of thousands of tons of scrap steel; and the same thing out of San Francisco. It went to Japan, and at the very same time we were shipping those thousands of tons of steel we were befriending, or supposed to be befriending, China. What kind of a policy was that?

Mrs. LUCE. That is the isolationist policy of Mr. Roosevelt which I am presently going to describe.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I have a distinct recollection of the campaign of 1940 when some of us were charged with some of the things the lady is now announcing. Is it not true that even the President of the United States then announced that the boys of this Nation would never fight on foreign soil?

Mrs. LUCE. That is perfectly true and I thank the gentleman for making the point.

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

Mrs. LUCE. Please let me finish. It is quite true, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] says, that in the last election the President out-did Mr. Willkie in telling the people of the United States that their boys would never be put on troop ships and sent overseas. What safeguarded his political position for him at that time was that the insiders all knew he was talking with his tongue in his cheek. Now, it is one thing for a private citizen to talk with his tongue in his cheek, but

it is quite another thing for the President of the United States to talk with his tongue in his cheek, of the whole American people. Mr. Roosevelt was in reality an interventionist talking like an isolationist.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that the President himself became the leading isolationist when he espoused and put through the so-called neutrality bill of 1935 and 1937?

Mrs. LUCE. That is perfectly true, and I thank you for making that point, too.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentlewoman will read the New York Times the day after the Munich conference she will find in that paper a statement giving Franklin D. Roosevelt equal credit with Britain and France for having established the peace of the world by enforcing or participating in the Munich conference.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for making still another point in my argument that Mr. Roosevelt has been the world's greatest isolationist in his time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The statement which the lady made that the President inspired neutrality legislation is not in accordance with the facts. Neutrality legislation was not looked upon with favor by the President and the Secretary of State, as I happen to know. That was an act of Congress.

Mrs. LUCE. The President of the United States for 10 years had this House in the hollow of his hand. There was seldom any piece of legislation he wanted that he could not get here. If he did not at the time inform the people of the United States what an insane policy the Neutrality Act was, then it was because he did not choose then to upset the overwhelming political balance of power which he had in this House.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me say to the lady that familiar as I am with the facts, the statement that the President of the United States or the Secretary of State inspired neutrality legislation, is not supported by the facts. I speak as one who led the fight for neutrality legislation, and I was wrong and I have apologized since to Secretary Hull for differing with him upon that very issue.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman is a typical example, as the President himself is, of an isolationist, which is to say he was an unconverted interventionist. Conversely, an interventionist is nothing but a renegade isolationist. What America wants are men who have a positive foreign policy for the United States, who will see clearly enough ahead so that they cannot possibly make a mistake about a thing as serious to the United States as the passage of the neutrality act.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me say to the lady that if I am guilty of that

name, whatever it is, the Members on your side of the aisle voted just as numerous and in just as large proportion for neutrality legislation as those on this side of the aisle.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman misunderstands my words completely if he thinks I am supporting either interventionists or isolationists. I say that neither is good for America. Neither has a foreign policy for the United States.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was very much interested in what the gentlewoman had to say about the period 1932, 1933, and 1934.

Does the gentle lady believe that any one person, no matter how popular or with what authority in this country could have sold the American people the idea we must intervene to protect China or any other country?

Mrs. LUCE. I believe great leaders can sell the people anything. I believe that great leaders have in times gone by sold the American people great new forceful ideas; I believe Thomas Jefferson was such a leader; Washington was such a leader; Abraham Lincoln was such a leader. We have had them in history before. And when we have again men like Monroe and Jefferson, men who have both a foreign and domestic policy for the United States of America, and when that day comes people will fall completely unified behind such a leader.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not true that the present administration has no foreign policy to sell to the people?

Mrs. LUCE. Precisely; you have made the very point my whole argument is based on. This administration never has had a clear foreign policy.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentlewoman have any hope that the President will announce any foreign policy until about 2 weeks or so before the election in November of 1944?

Mrs. LUCE. It is to the interest of those in political power today to keep a monopoly on foreign affairs. The Greeks invented the maze, a very painless way of driving a sane man insane. It is therefore certain that this administration will not reveal its foreign policy, if any, before election, but will rather, induce the American people to lose itself in a maze of terms like collective security, world federations, regional federations, and so on, so that the people will become so confused that they will believe no one but the President can show them the way to go home.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The distinguished gentlewoman has frequently referred to isolationists and interventionists. I think those terms are largely inspired

terms. I do not think there was such a person in the United States as an isolationist so far as war was concerned.

Mrs. LUCE. Peace, sir, is not a policy; peace is an expression of hope.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Pardon me just a minute, may I continue?

Mrs. LUCE. Is the gentleman asking a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes. I now propound a question: If a man believes in trade and friendliness and neighborliness with foreign nations but if he did not want to participate in war would the gentlewoman call such a person an isolationist?

Mrs. LUCE. Certainly not. I did not want to get into this war; the gentleman from Montana did not want to get into this war; even Franklin Roosevelt did not want to get into this war. If that was isolationism, then we were all isolationists and, so long as we hate war, will continue to be.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentlewoman will permit me to continue with just one further observation: In the campaign of 1936 the President of the United States made this statement: "We are not isolationists; none of us are except insofar as war is concerned." Would you call him an isolationist at that time?

Mrs. LUCE. The man who sent the message of congratulation to Chamberlain at Munich was an isolationist—by my definition he had no American foreign policy. The man who said that America could stay out of this war and that he would keep this country out of this war in the face of the information that was piled up in his own State Department—I refer you to Mr. Hull's own white paper on the subject of the inevitability of war with Japan—was an isolationist; he had no positive American foreign policy.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I remember with much interest the statement of the distinguished gentlewoman when she made her first speech on the floor of the House to the effect that Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt could not agree on a foreign policy until they knew what was in the mind of Joseph Stalin.

Mrs. LUCE. I should think they should no longer be in doubt.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Has the gentlewoman any reason to believe now that they knew what was in the mind of Joseph Stalin, or if she knew what was on his mind which makes her think that they can now enter upon a foreign policy?

Mrs. LUCE. It was and is of the utmost importance that Mr. Roosevelt should have sought and should continue to seek what is in the mind of Mr. Stalin. I believe without any reasonable doubt he knows now what is in Stalin's mind. From here out he can proceed to act in the formulation of a policy toward Russia.

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

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentlewoman to say a few moments ago

that Thomas Jefferson had a sound, definite foreign policy; is that correct?

Mrs. LUCE. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Jefferson expressed that policy in his first inaugural address in these words:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.

Is that what the gentlewoman alludes to?

Mrs. LUCE. That is quite correct. I do not wish any entangling alliances with any foreign country that are not alliances based on the physical security of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. I am a Jeffersonian Democrat and, of course, I agree with his views as expressed in that historic address.

Mrs. LUCE. The British Navy is the one thing that made Jeffersonian internationalism, and later the Monroe Doctrine, possible.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am trying to reconcile the gentlewoman's statement with reference to a military alliance with her answer to the gentleman from Mississippi when she said—

Mrs. LUCE. Does the gentleman consider that our relations with South America are entangling alliances? That our relations with Canada is an entangling alliance? Is that the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am trying to find out the type of alliance the gentlewoman desires with Great Britain.

Mrs. LUCE. I would encourage the exploration of a nonaggression pact with Britain, which is our natural buffer state. Look, please, at the map; and remember at the same time this is an air world we are living in, and that in future we shall need to surround ourselves with as wide a margin of physical protection as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], who always comes prepared with beautiful and devastating phrases based largely upon her own views and frequently unsupported by logic or facts, has just entertained the House with one of her clever addresses. Unfortunately, I did not know that she was to address us upon this occasion on the subject of our foreign policy and only came in the Chamber while she was in the midst of her address. I can only secure 5 minutes of time, but I do want to consume that 5 minutes, if I may, in correcting, if I can, some of the unjust criticisms and some of the illogical statements based upon

conclusions which are not justified by the record.

It is easy for one who has not been a Member of the House until this session and who has never voted upon any measures coming up in the House during the past 10 years, like the distinguished gentlewoman, to be free to criticize all votes because she has no record to commend or to condemn. Had she been a Member of the House for the past 12 years, during that critical period through which we have been passing and had served upon the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House and had seen these various transactions unfold themselves, she would not have made some of the statements which she made here today.

I think she was rather unfair and manifested a spirit of extreme partisanship when she leveled her criticisms at the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his great Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull. It is easy to criticize; it is difficult to construct. The question of a foreign policy is not a static thing, just as the domestic policy is not static. Domestic legislation and domestic policies depend upon conditions existing in a country at the time, and our foreign policy just as naturally rests upon conditions that confront us abroad. None of these great leaders of the past of whom she has spoken ever had an inflexible domestic or inflexible foreign policy. The foreign policy has always had to depend upon the conditions existing throughout the world at the time.

I resent the charge or the implication that Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull are responsible for this war. On the contrary, they have both done everything within their power to prevent it and I dare say that the historians of the years to come will not point, as the lady did today, the finger of guilt to them as being responsible for this great global war.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. For a question. What has the lady on her mind?

Mrs. LUCE. I wish to know if the gentleman misunderstood me? Does he think that I blamed one man for the isolationism of the whole country? I do not think I blamed the President alone. The almost unanimous attitude of Americans for 40 years has been isolationist.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The lady does not blame the President alone then?

Mrs. LUCE. Definitely not.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I wonder if the gentle lady is aware of the fact that only 27 Members of her own party voted for the lend-lease bill?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that reminder and I was going to say something in that connection, which brings to my mind this: She condemned the neutrality legislation as being responsible for the war, but I call her attention to the fact that when we voted to repeal that neutrality legislation, when that became necessary by reason of conditions

abroad it was the Members on her own side of the aisle who tried to defeat it and we had to depend on this side for the votes to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Does the gentleman again misunderstand me? Does he think I was defending Republican isolationism? Because, if he does, I want to correct him. I am against and was against both the isolationists and interventionists—neither of which had a foreign policy—on both sides of this aisle.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The lady not having been here, we do not know how she would have voted. It is very easy for her to criticize now the votes of others who were here when we voted upon many measures affecting our foreign policy.

Talking about isolationism, when did isolationism begin? It was back in 1920 after that great leader of ours, Woodrow Wilson, left the White House, and Harding and the Republican regime came into power. Aye, it began even before that, when the Republicans in the Senate, aided by a few isolationist Democrats, turned down Wilson's request that we become members of the League of Nations and the World Court, and I doubt very much today whether the world would be at war if this country had not turned its back on Wilson's leadership and his plan to preserve world peace. I want to remind the gentlewoman that in my opinion one of the reasons responsible for this war and which helped to produce it was the disarmament conference under the Harding administration when the other countries of the earth scrapped their blueprints and we scrapped our ships and found ourselves without a Navy sufficiently large to make the Axis Powers respect us. That was not caused by Franklin D. Roosevelt or Cordell Hull.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. To be accurate, historically accurate, what does the gentleman have to say about this last World War having been started by the peace of Versailles? That was framed by President Wilson. There is where it started.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; I have no such delusion, I do not think that this war started by the Treaty of Versailles. That is the reason Hitler gives, but I do not accept his alibi as the cause of this war.

I want to talk a little about this neutrality legislation because I do know something about the history of that legislation. I was chairman of the subcommittee that framed the first bill upon that subject and I know the attitude of Secretary Hull and I think I know the attitude of President Roosevelt with reference to it. It was not recommended

by the President to the Congress or submitted to the Congress by him. The Congress, and not the President, initiated it and passed it without any nod from the White House. I do know that Secretary Hull was against it, and there was considerable doubt at the time whether or not the bill would be signed by the President after we passed it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think I had better not yield to anybody now. I wanted to talk a little more about this neutrality legislation, because that has been injected into the debate. Inadvertently I said campaign instead of debate, and my friends on the Republican side, by their laughter and applause, indicate that they recognize the speech just made by the gentlewoman from Connecticut as being a part of a political campaign, and it was evidently made for that purpose.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. At the gentlewoman's insistence.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman, for the remainder of his time describe quite clearly and simply what he thinks the foreign policy of the President of the United States is?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am not going to be diverted by the lady's telling me what to talk about. I am going to choose my own subject, and talk in my own time. On some other occasion when my time is not consumed in answering a speech of the gentlewoman, I will be glad to discuss at length the foreign policy of this administration.

What I was starting to say was that the neutrality legislation was conceived as being legislation which was designed to keep us out of war and keep other countries from going to war. That was the whole inspiration on which it was based.

As I said a moment ago, I was one of those who so believed and supported it. I believed that we should set an example for the rest of the world by refusing to sell arms so that they might follow our example and we might thereby encourage peace and prevent war. But I am convinced now, and I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] who was here a moment ago, and who led the fight against the neutrality legislation, that he was right and I was wrong. It is not a popular thing to admit that you are wrong, but in the light of subsequent history I want to say that that legislation, in my judgment encouraged rather than discouraged the Axis Powers in bringing on the war in which we are now engaged. They interpreted it as a license from us—that they could rob, murder, and pillage, and attack the rest of the world and we would do nothing about it. And that after they destroyed the rest of the world they could then destroy us. Republicans and Democrats both voted for it. It was enacted by Congress not at the instigation of the President or his Secretary of State.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I know the gentleman has an intimate knowledge of the neutrality legislation. The gentleman will recall that in the fall of 1939, after war had started, we were called into special session to change our neutrality law.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I remember the Vorys amendment, too.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The arms embargo repeal was involved. Let me remind the gentleman what the President's attitude was on September 21, 1939. In his message he said:

The step I recommend is to put this country back on the solid footing of real and traditional neutrality.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman can put it in the RECORD. I am not going to take all my time letting the gentleman read the RECORD. I decline to yield further.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. He said he was for neutrality.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. By traditional neutrality, the President meant the kind that we had before we passed the neutrality law.

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

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder if the gentleman recalls the vote on the Republican side on the repeal of the arms embargo when we came back in September 1939 for a vote on that issue.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; I remember it. I was in there fighting for its repeal and a large majority of the Republicans voted against the repeal of the arms embargo, as they did against all bills to modify or repeal any part of the neutrality law. Many Democrats and many Republicans may have made a mistake in enacting the neutrality law back in 1935, but many more Republicans made a greater mistake when they voted against its modification or repeal when the storm clouds were breaking over Europe. While it was a mistake to pass the neutrality law in 1935, if we had repealed it or modified it before the European war began, it would have done much to have averted the present global war. Those who prevented its repeal or modification before the war began erred far more grievously than those who originally enacted it.

On June 30, 1939, 2 months to a day before Germany invaded Poland, the House voted on the repeal of the arms embargo of the neutrality law and failed to repeal it because an overwhelming majority of the Republicans voted against its repeal.

The President felt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull felt that if we could repeal that arms embargo before the war started in Europe it would be notice to Adolf Hitler and to the Axis Powers that these countries who were attacked could

secure arms from us, and Congress was urged by the President so to do.

We had that session here which I well remember. Unfortunately—I say unfortunately, I think tragically unfortunately—we failed to repeal the arms embargo in June 1939, and on September 1 Hitler invaded Poland and the World War began. I have always felt that if the Congress of the United States had at that historic session on June 30 repealed the arms embargo it would have given notice to Adolf Hitler and to his cohorts that we were not going to hold ourselves aloof, and that countries that were attacked could come here and get munitions with which to defend themselves, and Hitler might not have invaded Poland, and the present war would have been averted. The special session of Congress, after the invasion of Poland, did repeal the arms embargo, but it was too late to prevent the beginning of hostilities in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I say in the light of history, in the light of what has happened in the last 10 years, in the light of the history of our country and its relations with other countries, no one familiar with the facts and with the events as they have happened can criticize the President of the United States as not having done all that he could to keep us out of war and to help win it after we were attacked.

I do not believe in all of the domestic policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and have not supported all of his domestic policies with my vote, and on his domestic policies I think he has made mistakes; but I say to you, and this is what I have said many times elsewhere, that on foreign policies throughout this crisis, President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have been right 100 percent, and the verdict of history will so record.

REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, in a well-prepared address and in her usual suave manner, opened the 1944 Presidential campaign with a somewhat related rear attack upon the President of the United States. She found considerable criticism with his foreign policy, or his lack of foreign policy.

But somehow or other the leading newspapers of this Nation—many of which opposed the President on the domestic front—supported his foreign policy. Our distinguished colleague from New York, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, a Republican, but an outstanding American, has been one of the greatest supporters of the President's foreign policy. Certainly President Franklin Delano Roosevelt pledged to all Americans that he would make every effort to keep America out of war. As early as 1938, the President warned America of totalitarian dangers. In 1939 he again warned us of the danger of Germany and Japan. He was called a war monger and an interventionist by Republicans and by some of the press of the Nation. Reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will clearly establish to the satisfaction of the gentlewoman from Connecticut who favored and who opposed preparedness. Apparently in 1939 the gentlewoman

from Connecticut must have been in China or somewhere on one of her many international sojourns—unaware of the solid isolationism of her own Republican Party.

Let us look at the record of both major parties since Congress sensed the danger of impending war. Let us see how the Democrats and the Republicans voted to prepare America:

June 30, 1939: House Joint Resolution 306, Neutrality Act of 1939, passed the House 201 to 187. One hundred and seventy-five Republicans opposed this measure.

September 7, 1940: House Resolution 10132, a bill to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service—selective service—passed the House 263 to 149. One hundred and thirty Republicans opposed this measure.

February 8, 1941: House Resolution 1776, a bill to further promote the defense of the United States—Lease-Lend—passed the House 260 to 165. On this measure, considered the most important of our entire foreign policy, 137 Republicans voted in opposition.

October 17, 1941: House Joint Resolution 237, a joint resolution to repeal section 6 of the Neutrality Act by permitting arming of merchant ships, passed the House 259 to 138. One hundred and twenty-eight members of the Republican Party opposed this measure.

November 13, 1941: House Joint Resolution 237, a joint resolution to repeal the Neutrality Act of 1939, passed 212 to 194. One hundred and seventy-six Republicans opposed this important measure less than a month before Pearl Harbor.

In view of this conclusive record of Republican isolationism, the very partisan address by the gentlewoman from Connecticut, opening the 1944 Presidential campaign, sounds like some more "globaloney."

Let me remind the charming lady from Connecticut that when she "aired" her first "supremacy of the air" address, she stated then that we—Great Britain and the United States—should not formulate or embark on any foreign policy until we knew what was on Joe Stalin's mind, and in that premise she was absolutely correct. Let's move slowly on any new foreign policy. Let us try to make it as flexible as possible, depending on the day-by-day turn of world events.

The gentlewoman's endorsement of the Fulbright resolution to which I heartily subscribe was the sole bright spot of an otherwise ill-timed address.

For 4 years, I was the quarterback of the football team of my university and real generalship demanding instant decisions necessitated by the game's circumstances meant the difference between victory and defeat. It is easy to find fault with the plays called or strategy used by the quarterback the day after or the following Monday morning by the sideline all-American. In my opinion, the gentlewoman's criticism of the President's foreign policy sounded like "Monday morning quarterbacking."

The gentlewoman from Connecticut would certainly be making a greater contribution to the war effort if she and the Republican Party which she represents, would rally behind one of the greatest leaders of all time comparable to Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson; yes, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of all Americans—Republicans as well as Democrats.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] will feel indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] because he has confirmed her thesis that the President has no foreign policy, the gentleman from Texas having stated that the foreign policy of this country during the last 8 or 10 years had to change as conditions changed. I take it that the policy of opportunism as enunciated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] is still the foreign policy of this Government, changeable, variable, turning with each wind of public opinion, and that we still have no foreign policy. The symbol of such a policy should be represented, not by the American eagle, but by a weathervane. I am glad, as I say, that the gentleman from Texas confirms the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some comment with reference to an item which is carried in the bill on page 7, and which has to do with Puerto Rico, and after all of this discussion on international affairs, perhaps we can go back to one of the milk bottles that is on our own doorstep, from a continental standpoint. On page 7 of the bill we have an item of \$7,000,000 which the committee has recommended that we provide, with which to carry on the Federal Works Administration program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, during the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending with November 30, 1943.

A committee from this House, under a resolution of instructions passed by the House, has just returned from Puerto Rico, and that committee will in due course file, for the benefit of the House Members and the interested public, a committee report. Of course, I shall not at this time attempt to give a report for the committee, but my only purpose in coming before you at this moment is to discuss rather briefly and in a preliminary manner, this item of \$7,000,000 and the course that this Congress may have to follow on this particular part of our relief program, as related to those two areas, beginning next December 1, because this appropriation expires as of November 30, 1943. You gentlemen may wonder how the \$7,000,000 got into the bill. The Puerto Ricans asked for \$50,000,000, \$25,000,000 to be spent during the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1 next, and \$25,000,000 to be spent during the following fiscal year. That request

came before the Insular Affairs Committee of the House at about the time we were prepared to go to Puerto Rico for this investigation, and it was the judgment of the committee that the \$50,000,000 should not be provided before the investigation was made. So there came to that committee a recommendation for \$8,000,000, to be used during the coming 5 months, and to prevent the destruction, we will say, of the Public Works Administration in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I understand there was a division in the Committee on Appropriations with respect to whether this \$7,000,000 should be left in the bill, so I want to give a few thoughts on the whole program.

Puerto Rico has about 1,800,000 people who came under our control after the Spanish-American War. The Virgin Islands are some 1 or 2 hours travel distance from Puerto Rico by air. We purchased the Virgin Islands from Denmark in 1917 as a matter of national defense. In those 3 islands there are about 26,000 or 27,000 people. On 1 island there are 12,000 or 13,000 people, on another about 700, and on another about 13,000. It is my frank, blunt opinion that our program as related to the Virgin Islands has operated to turn the entire economy of those islands into a ball of wax. When I say we, I mean the Congress and the administration. How that is to be "unballed" and put back into order I do not know. The Virgin Islands are included in this bill, and in this \$7,000,000 item. I make that observation because unfortunately the amount that is to go to the Virgin Islands is not segregated, and in my opinion the Virgin Islands is in a different world to that of Puerto Rico, from the standpoint of nature, from the standpoint of production, and from the standpoint of present economic conditions. Puerto Rico has a budget which is divided into three general heads—what is called the general fund, and the special funds, and the trust funds. The total revenue that will flow in under all of these funds during the coming fiscal year will perhaps approximate \$70,000,000 or maybe \$75,000,000. There is a population as I say of about 1,800,000 people. This side of Puerto Rico, and largely under our jurisdiction, is the country of Haiti, with about 4,000,000, with a budget which will probably run \$5,500,000, during the coming fiscal year, maybe \$6,000,000. Note the comparison there—4,000,000 people with a \$6,000,000 budget, and 1,800,000 people with a \$75,000,000 to \$80,000,000 budget. What are doing to Puerto Rico when we supplement budgets like that with \$7,000,000 for 5 months or \$25,000,000 for a year, or with an average, say, of about \$30,000,000 for the past 10 years?

What have we done to the Puerto Rican people? After I have read the investigating committee report I will have something to say about that. Do we wish to give the Puerto Rican people this \$7,000,000, and through this debate indicate to them that at the end of this 5-month period they may not receive any more from us while present conditions continue; or do we wish to leave

the record in such shape as to lead the Puerto Rican people to believe that when this \$7,000,000 is exhausted and the 5 months have expired they will receive another \$18,000,000 to carry them through the remaining part of the fiscal year and which, added to this \$7,000,000, will give them the \$25,000,000 they asked for before the committee went to Puerto Rico?

Those are basic questions with which we should deal and about which we may wish to say something in this debate in the final disposition of this \$7,000,000.

At the present time, as the Appropriations Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, and the Military Affairs Committee particularly know, the Federal Government is releasing into Puerto Rico an enormous flow of dollars. Do you want to make your appropriations for public works after the Army and Navy cease to turn these many million dollars loose, or do you wish to supplement this fantastic budget with the Federal expenditures by the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, and, in addition, give appropriations such as this bill carries? That is something for us to think about.

Here is another thing that enters into this proposition: As many of you no doubt know, the distillery industry in this country has ceased to manufacture intoxicating liquors. That means to say that insofar as boats are made available the West Indies—Cuba, Puerto Rico, Haiti, Santo Domingo—and some of the other countries down there will have access to the intoxicating-liquor market in this country up to their capacity to produce. Puerto Rico is in an unusually favorable position to produce rum and ship it to this country. The boys who like rum tell me it is a pretty good product. As the rum flows out of Puerto Rico it creates an export tax. For the month of May, I was informed this tax exceeded \$2,000,000. Mr. Tugwell estimated it would probably be \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, and the largest rum manufacturer down there, who produces a product under the name of Bicardi, told the committee that with favorable shipping he thought it might reach \$25,000,000 a year. That is a very unusual and a very peculiar position in which Puerto Rico finds herself at this particular moment from a revenue standpoint. Do we want to go further and supplement the income of Puerto Rico with appropriations of this nature, with Puerto Rico benefiting by the heavy flow of export taxes on rum? There is something else we must think about and that is the increased income from new taxes.

You have down there four or five basic crops—sugarcane, coffee, tobacco, coconuts, and rice. Every man who is attempting to farm in Puerto Rico is competing with the Federal Government through the W. P. A., the Army and the Navy, the Marine Corps, and these other agencies, in an effort to obtain labor to carry on his agricultural operations. That is something for us to think about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The official report shows there are 250,000 unemployed employables in Puerto Rico today; that of those 250,000 the W. P. A. is at this time employing 41,000, and this appropriation will permit the continued employment of that number. So, even subtracting the 41,000 provided for by the amount in this bill, there are still 209,000 unemployed employables in the island who are available for employment by any farmer who wants farm labor.

It was further shown that W. P. A. refuses to employ anyone who can get a job anywhere else. If any man is offered a job, and refuses to take it, they promptly fire him from W. P. A. employment. The W. P. A. officials took up the matter with the industries and asked them how many men of those on W. P. A. rolls they could use. They told them they could use 100—100 out of 41,000. So, I am puzzled by the gentleman's statement that the employment of these 41,000 is drawing labor from private industry, when there are 209,000 who cannot get any kind of a job at all and, in addition, W. P. A. offers the entire 41,000 on its rolls to local industry when needed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not going to dispute what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just said, but I call attention to the fact that he is now speaking about the official report which has been given to him. In other words, these figures he is giving are not his figures, as I understand him.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; they are not my figures. They are official figures compiled on the basis of a local census. I wondered if they agreed with the gentleman's figures. Did the gentleman get any figures down there which indicated that the official figures were incorrect or inaccurate? If so, will he let us have that evidence?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Our report, practically all of which was taken in the form of sworn testimony, will not squarely support the report which was given to our committee before we went down there and which undoubtedly has been given to the Committee on Appropriations. Conditions have radically changed with the improved shipping situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman say there is no unemployment on the islands? And what does he say to the statement that W. P. A. asked local industry to estimate how many men they could use, and they said they could use 100 men—100 out of 250,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not say there is no unemployment there. I would say there is unemployment there, and I will make the further statement that as long as we pour these millions of dollars into this island there will be more unemployment, because the Federal dollars which come in siphon people down from the hills into the cities and reduce them to a life in as nasty and degraded a slum area as you are likely to find anywhere, with tuberculosis, gonorrhea, and syphilis and all that goes along with it. They come down there

from the hills and squat and live as best they can.

And knowing they can get a few relief dollars, why, certainly, many refuse to stay up in the hills and work, and this drift that I refer to runs all through the operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, we can rely on the record. The record will show, and there are other members of the committee here who were down there with me and who are on the floor now, who can give you the facts about this situation. We went into the facts, and the record will show that men are taken away from sugar and coffee plantations for public-works projects. I went out into the country just to ascertain for myself, and I found that at a 1,500-foot elevation there were about 340 acres of land, with 28 coffee plantation houses on it. I talked to a man there and asked him why men were not working on it, and he said they are working down in the valley on a works project; working on public roads that you came over awhile ago. I saw them at work but I did not know what specific project they were working on or what farm they were from.

You can go down there now and study the sugarcane operation and you will find sugarcane is left in the field uncut, and at the end of next month, July 1943, that will be true, and it is left there because the Work Projects went in there and absorbed the sugarcane workers, took them away from the particular fields.

There is no question about that. I made it my business to go out and visit on some of the farms and plantations throughout the country to see them with my own eyes, so I do not have to take any official record.

Of course, we have got the testimony from the farmers; their testimony is in the record, and the record will speak for itself.

That does not mean to say that the farms will absorb all these people, but here is the fundamental point I am raising, which I fear we are about to overlook. Do we at this time, with reference to this \$7,000,000, wish to further a plan of putting more revenue into the Puerto Rican hands and thus encourage additional waste and graft and extravagance and experimentation, or do we at this time, by serving warning that we will leave the \$7,000,000 in the bill, but that, beginning in December next, we are going to insist that they use some of their own funds. In other words, we will leave the \$7,000,000 in the bill, but when the committee has completed its report and when we come back here next fall, we will have to revamp the whole program, or, because of the few remarks that we are making here today, give them a warning in questioning this proposal, that we are looking into a new policy with reference to Puerto Rico which we have never had in mind prior to today.

I am worried more about the domestic situation; there are others who can wor-

ry about international affairs, but I am for protecting the United States and its Territories, organized or unorganized, first, last, and all the time, and take care of the balance of the world thereafter if we feel able to do so.

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

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman—and I am asking purely for information. I have the highest regard for the gentleman. He has just returned from the island, and we want to get all the facts we can. I would like to ask him two questions. He mentioned graft just now. Does he charge the W. P. A. down there with graft?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I charge that in this whole operation, without any hesitation whatsoever, that in the administration of these amounts, the Congress, through the support that goes to Puerto Rico and to the insular government in Puerto Rico in connection with this whole problem, is a party to the graft that runs through the entire operation financed by Federal and insular funds for all activities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Just a second. May I ask if the gentleman will elaborate, in the extension of his remarks, and explain in what specific manner he says graft exists. That is a serious charge and should be itemized. We cannot lightly charge General Fleming's administration of graft without being able to prove it. It is the gentleman's public duty to tell what graft he found, if any.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; we will let the committee report cover that, along with the testimony presented.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman to enlarge on it? He surely has not made so grave an indictment without being able to prove it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let the official record and report speak for itself. I am willing to stand on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But as the gentleman knows it does not speak for itself. It does not charge graft, but the gentleman does. If the gentleman will not answer that question, may I ask this one: Is the gentleman in favor of the appropriation of the \$7,000,000 or does he oppose it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. At the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; at this time in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am in favor of it on this condition: That if this debate serves warning on Puerto Rico that from here on we are going to expect them to take funds from their own treasury; yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that he favors the appropriation of the \$7,000,000 as provided by the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If they are going to take warning from this that we are going to expect them to help support themselves as a part of their own domestic economy, I am willing to let it go through, but otherwise not.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is what I wanted to know—if the gentleman, after visiting the Island, is willing to support the \$7,000,000 until the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which he is a member, has presented its report on permanent legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am bringing this up for discussion at this time to get the House thinking on the whole subject.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman really believe in his own heart that any substantial good can be given to Puerto Rico with this money as long as the political philosophy of the present administration down there, meaning Tugwell's philosophy if you please, persists? In his own heart does he believe it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not going to make a political discussion out of this matter. What I am dealing with here is how far do we propose to subsidize the Puerto Rican treasury in addition to the great military expenditures we are now making, along with the enormous flow of income which is coming into the insular treasury by reason of these situations to which I have referred.

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD following the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Michigan, for whom I have the greatest respect. It has been my honor and pleasure to serve as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Insular Affairs which recently went to Puerto Rico to investigate conditions there and I want to take this opportunity to thank every member of that subcommittee for the splendid cooperation they gave in every manner. I think if there has ever been a committee that worked without any partisan feeling it has been this committee. We did not know whether we were Republicans or Democrats; we went down there and tried to do our duty as Members of this House to get all of the pertinent information as to what was going on there in order that we might come back and in due time make a report and give Congress the real facts so that this Congress might exercise its judgment as to what is the best legislation to pass with reference to Puerto Rico and its effect upon the United States as well as Puerto Rico. I wish I had a longer period of time in which to outline the situation.

With reference to the \$7,000,000 item which is before us today I think we ought to leave that in the bill as it is; I think we ought to pass that item, and I will tell you why: There has been some question

as to whether or not funds were improperly used or whether there was graft exercised in their use. I think the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who just spoke will agree with me that there was no evidence of any graft so far as the W. P. A. officials were concerned. I think sincerely that Members on both sides of this subcommittee had the feeling that of all the agencies, W. P. A., as represented by General Fleming, has done a good job there.

On the question as to the necessity for its continuance beyond this 5-month period I will in turn agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that I was against giving them \$50,000,-000 before we went down there, and upon returning I am still of the same opinion.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Are we not sticking our neck out to give them \$7,000,000 at this time when they have such a large island revenue, from \$75,000,000 to \$80,000,-000—a revenue higher per capita than that of any State in the United States?

Mr. BELL. On the surface that would appear to be so, but if one studies and analyzes the situation one will find that the revenues for the months to come have been allocated to certain plants and projects. W. P. A. down there is finishing up certain projects which are necessary to the war effort, some of them very necessary.

Mr. TABER. But they are more important in that they take help away from the farmers and take help from the private employer, destroying the economy of the island.

Mr. BELL. I am inclined to believe that the continuation of this program in its limited form for another 5 months is a matter of winding it up down there in an orderly manner and will not interfere with the economy of the island. I feel just as the gentleman does that we do not want to spend any money down there that is going to interfere with private industry. I am just as much opposed to that as the gentleman is, but I do feel that with respect to these projects which have been started we as a Congress ought to permit them to be finished in an orderly manner and that is what this \$7,000,000 appropriation is for, to conclude the thing in an orderly manner and to wind up an agency which has been doing that work down there.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that the Insular Legislature in Puerto Rico at its last session passed one of the stiffest tax bills in the history of the island?

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the food crisis is so real, so serious, that we of the Congress must act and act promptly. We face an inevitable food shortage

due mainly to the mishandling of our food program. There simply will not be enough food for our men in uniform, our allies, the people whom we may rescue from Nazi rule, and our own people at home.

It is too late to increase food production for this year. The administration has failed to heed the repeated warning of an impending food shortage. Before we entered this war representatives of agriculture appealed to the President to regard food as important as planes, ships, and guns, and to encourage maximum food production. Not only was nothing done to give us more food but the policies adopted restricted and discouraged production and brought about the present alarming situation. Forcing down prices by regulation discourages production and depresses the morale among producers. When the supply of any product is decreased by low-price ceilings, prices are forced up by the law of supply and demand, creating unlimited black markets.

The attempt to roll back butter prices under a subsidy has brought about the sale of so much butter to Government agencies that cold-storage warehouses are packed to overflowing, so the supply of butter for the public has been distinctly cut by the roll-back method.

Today, when there is a shortage on meat, four small packing plants in my congressional district are closed because they cannot operate under the O. P. A. price-ceiling regulation. Feeders cannot get corn for their cattle. Poultry raisers cannot get feed for their baby chicks. Proteins are difficult to procure. Bakeries are crying for corn sirup, corn products, and starch. Policies now being followed have brought about the slaughtering of milk cows that cannot be replaced in 3 years, and a milk famine is predicted in our larger cities this coming winter.

Our food supply must not be manipulated by politicians for the purpose of winning votes. Food production and distribution should be placed in the control of one competent individual whose sole purpose will be to give the American people more food at fair prices. He must know food production and distributing problems, and must be a practical man free from the restrictions and interference of New Deal theorists, and he must be blanketed with all-out authority to do the job. The manipulations of our impractical bureaucrats, who know nothing about our food problem, are making the situation worse. We need an immediate house cleaning to bring order out of chaos.

The people are looking to Congress to deal with this food problem vigorously and immediately. Food is a basic war weapon. The effective solution of the food problem will have an important bearing upon the outcome of the war and upon the health and morale of the people of this country. The hour is growing late, and we have no time to lose.

H. J. Haskell has written a book entitled "The New Deal in Old Rome." Facts are recorded in history back in the

year 301. Late in the third century, the anarchy was ended by an able soldier and administrator; Diocletian, with army backing, became the dictator, reorganized the government, and stabilized the currency on what he believed was a sound basis. Unfortunately, like some modern rulers facing a similar problem, he overvalued his new monetary unit. Prices promptly responded with a violent rise. Diocletian recognized the suffering that resulted, but naturally did not understand the cause. In 301, he issued his famous edict setting maximum prices and wages. The act had the death penalty for evasion. It read like modern orders.

The civil service had so expanded that a contemporary wrote, with disgusted exaggeration, that half the men in the nation were on the government pay roll. There were plenty of inspectors, but this early attempt at price fixing failed. It is recorded that businessmen closed their shops, that many articles of commerce disappeared, and that food riots resulted.

A few years later, we read the obituary of the act. For merest trifles blood was shed, and out of fear nothing was offered for sale, and the scarcity grew much worse until the law was repealed from mere necessity.

This, history records as of the year 301. It could be 1943.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in the debate on this bill on the question of subsidies and also about the probable amount of meat we have in the United States which is available for our civilian population, our armed forces, and for lend-lease. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in his lengthy and very interesting address indicates that we have sufficient meat on hand. Others who have spoken on the subject also indicate that we have plenty of meat. I wish to enter the debate from a different viewpoint and on behalf of the farmers who feed cattle, farmers who for half a century have been in the livestock-feeding business, farmers and producers who have furnished to us millions upon millions of pounds of beef and pork. I wish to differ from those who have spoken so often on the subject of supply. From what they have said, it would seem there is nothing to the meat problem except transportation and distribution. Of course, that has much to do with our farm problem. Let me give you the other side of the picture. Let me tell you the side of the farmer who feeds cattle and finishes them for the market. There is a tremendous expense for feed and care of these cattle before they are finished. The price these feeders get for this finished meat today is too low to allow them to stay in business. Under present conditions they cannot get even the cost of production. They are operating at a loss. The spread must be wider so far as finished beef is concerned. This subsidy and roll-back program is affecting these great producers to such an extent that I fear many of them are being forced to quit business.

Recently I called attention of this House to the case of one feeder in my district. This farmer has been in the feeding business for 25 years. He has always had around 1,000 head of cattle on feed in his yards. Today he probably has not one critter in the yards. He just cannot operate under present conditions. He just has to quit. On yesterday I presented to the House the resolution of 700 feeders and producers who met at Fremont, Nebr., indicating that they cannot operate nor can they continue in the feeding business any longer unless help comes to them at once. I presented to you a telegram from 97 feeders in Cedar County, one of the 24 counties in my district, who say they, too, fear a deep decrease in meat production unless some stabilized program is adopted at once. I have presented to you the reports from many other feeders in my district who have the same thing to tell you. They, too, are pleading for some immediate help. They do not fear any overproduction of meat. They have a different story to tell about meat supplies as compared to the stories told here about the tremendous stocks of available meat. These feeders are patriotic. They know that food is needed to win this war and they are anxious to produce it. They cannot do it under the roll-back and subsidy program. They want a stabilized program which will permit them to stay in business. Otherwise you are going to allow the destruction of a great meat-producing business upon which we must depend for badly needed food. These great producers who always take great chances in this business want to continue to furnish food.

I call your attention to the fact that the House Agriculture Committee has passed out a bill which will help the situation. It is known as the Fulmer bill. This legislation should pass before we recess here because it will help the farmers and producers of meat. It will help these feeders who are threatened with destruction. Also we will have on tomorrow the Wolcott amendment to H. R. 2869 which would eliminate this subsidy and roll-back program. I believe this measure, too, would help the producers of meat. I urge quick consideration of these measures because they represent the only pieces of legislation we now have and which will answer the demands of the producers who are so much concerned over the new price and food programs which have been inaugurated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all our name calling in connection with the discussion of world affairs I am wondering where our statesmen were when Mussolini was boiling the Ethiopians in oil and I wonder who furnished Mussolini the oil to burn the Ethiopians in? There was not too much protest from anybody about that procedure. One's hindsight is so much better than one's foresight.

In regard to this meat situation it does not do you or I or anyone else any particular good to get up here day after day

and continually repeat criticism of the O. P. A. without a constructive suggestion to offer. Most everyone is familiar with the facts and the causes of this meat shortage. The question is, Is there anything we can do about it? What are we going to do about it?

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Agricultural Committee, has a bill which has passed through that committee, a bill that in his opinion—and a large majority of the committee members think the same way—will help correct this situation as far as meat is concerned. I want to say that there are absolutely no politics in it. If anyone wants to make politics out of it, they will have to accept the responsibility. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] has lived up to his responsibility. He has the bill out of the committee and it is now up to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee can now assume their responsibility, and so can the other individuals and bodies whose approval is needed to translate this legislation into law.

I maintain there is no use to continually blame the O. P. A. and then do nothing to correct the situation in a legislative way. The Fulmer bill is an attempt to take the confusion out of food production and place the responsibility in the hands of one man and one food agency. The Fulmer bill is a constructive approach to the war food program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that if we continue this W. P. A. proposition down in Puerto Rico it means the absolute and complete destruction of all private employment in those islands. I have listened to statements by different members of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs who went down there. I am satisfied that those people in charge of the government of that island are out to wreck the economy of that island and unless we stand up here and limit the operations of the W. P. A. down there so that they cannot continue to break down private employment, it is gone and there is no hope for its recovery.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Speaking about the policy of government down there, let me read from this: American Economic Review, volume XXII, No. 1, supplement March 1932, papers and proceedings of the forty-fourth annual meeting of the American Economic Association. Beginning on page 75 there is an article under the heading, The principle of planning and the institute of laissez faire, by R. G. Tugwell, Columbia University. On page 89 he states:

The next series of changes will have to do with industry itself. It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. That is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis. It is literally meant.

Then on page 86, in the footnote, he states:

When industry is governed and government is industry, the dual conflict deepest in our modern institutions will be abated.

That was Dr. Tugwell's philosophy, apparently as stated by him at that time.

Mr. TABER. That is just the situation that he is trying to create in Puerto Rico. He is now spending \$2,000,000 of the money out of their own treasury to build a glass factory. The entire outfit is run without any efficiency or economy of business stability and I do not believe that I am going to neglect my duty here on the floor to offer an amendment to clear up that situation in order to try to make them do the things that they ought to do.

I have not the time to go into details. I have here in my hand an example of the way they perform. The Food Administration, as I understand it, sent down there from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 worth of food in the last year. How have they treated it? I have here in my hand the report indicating that the Food Administration has sent down there a great lot of red kidney beans and white beans that are now rationed by our Government, through the Office of Price Administration, and that they have allowed them to spoil rather than distribute them to the people. If there is trouble, it is the trouble of incompetent and improper administration, it is not the trouble of not having enough money. If we continue this W. P. A. in Puerto Rico, we are placing a curse upon the people of Puerto Rico from which it will take generations to recover. I hope the House will not be a party to this degenerate performance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and including an additional \$5,000 for employment of expert examiners, and actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of members of the Board of Legal Examiners serving as such while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, \$81,600: *Provided*, That the availability of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 shall be contingent upon the enactment into law of the bill (H. R. 1025) entitled "An act to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a Board of Legal Examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is an appropriation not authorized by law. There is absolutely no legislation authorizing this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding, Civil Service Commission: For an additional amount for printing and binding, Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, \$5,000: *Provided*, That the availability of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 shall be contingent upon the enactment into law of the bill (H. R. 1025) entitled "An act to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes to create a Board of Legal Examiners in the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point of order is conceded, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: To enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands", approved June 1, 1943, during the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending November 30, 1943, \$7,000,000, of which not to exceed \$350,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the items of expenditure specified in section 14 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943: *Provided*, That employees of the Work Projects Administration in active duty status on June 30, 1943, may, in the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator, be transferred to and paid from this appropriation without the necessity of further appointment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 7, line 11, after "June", insert "22."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 7, line 6, strike out "Puerto Rico." On page 7, in line 12, strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

On page 7, line 13, strike out "\$350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in favor of the amendment. However, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] advises me that he has an appointment shortly and he would like to precede me, so I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to precede me in speaking on this amendment, and I reserve my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New York in his remarks a little while ago seemed to have the feeling that if we pass this bill carrying the \$7,000,000 it might have

a tendency to set aside the traditional way of life in Puerto Rico and the capitalistic system and all that sort of thing.

I think every Member of the House who knows me knows there is no Member of the House who is more firm than I in his belief in our traditional form of government. I believe in the capitalistic system that our forefathers left to us. As far as I am given strength of mind and body, as long as I am a Member of this body I am going to fight and contend for those sacred things our forefathers gave us when they gave us the Constitution of the United States and our present form of government.

On the other hand, in regard to this particular item, I believe that in furtherance of an orderly manner of closing up the W. P. A. down there we ought to go ahead and pass this \$7,000,000 item. I have a feeling that it is the orderly way to do it. There are certain projects there which have to do with our national defense that ought to be finished up.

My distinguished colleague from Michigan said something about graft down there. I know he did not intend to imply there was any graft in the management of the W. P. A. down there.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. BELL. I knew that was the gentleman's opinion, but I merely wanted to clear it up for the body, because the W. P. A. down there, I think, has been handled in a fine manner.

As I said a moment ago, I believe that what we ought to do is to continue this limited program until they have an opportunity to wind it up. I think 5 months is a short time in which to do that. I think the President of the United States acted very wisely when by Executive order he ordered the closing up of W. P. A. all over the United States. I rejoice that he did it. I think he left the W. P. A. open in Puerto Rico because of the fact that he felt there was a special condition down there. It is one of our military outposts. There are certain things that ought to be done. So I am leaving it to you gentlemen to go ahead and pass this \$7,000,000 item.

I want to serve warning that when this item is passed, it is the last item I expect to vote for for W. P. A. down in Puerto Rico. I think that when this thing is closed up the W. P. A. should be closed up down there the same as it is here.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is clear now that this is the last item under W. P. A.?

Mr. BELL. I am speaking for myself. I am not speaking for anybody else.

Mr. CHURCH. I mean, the gentleman understands that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are the only places we are still attempting to vote W. P. A. money for?

Mr. BELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is acquainted with the graft and the theft, not under General Fleming in this particular case, no, but in the administration heretofore of W. P. A. Is not the gentleman familiar with that?

Mr. BELL. I do not care to get into a general discussion of W. P. A. in the United States, because that is a closed issue, but I will say that W. P. A. as operated under General Fleming I think has been operated honestly and carefully down there, because I have been down there and I have found no evidence to the contrary. I know General Fleming to be an able executive. I think he is thoroughly, beyond any question, an honorable man. I know his work down there is above reproach.

Mr. CHURCH. And does not the gentleman feel that it approaches reckless theft of the taxpayers' money to appropriate this \$7,000,000.

Mr. BELL. No; I would not say that at all. I do not agree with the gentleman on that.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot be a party to permitting an appropriation for the continuance of the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico. Here is the story. They have now in sight a tax revenue of \$75,000,000 to \$80,000,000 a year. That is more per capita than the State of New York, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Illinois, the State of Texas, or the State of Massachusetts or any other State in the United States. Why is it that with that enormous revenue they are unable to meet their own demands? The mismanagement down there of their affairs has been such, as the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CRAWFORD, has told you, that men who were supposed to be working on a farm left their jobs and went down into the W. P. A. employment in place after place and farm after farm. I say to you that unless you want to destroy completely the entire economic set-up of these islands, and of that island, it is absolutely necessary that we discontinue the W. P. A. in Puerto Rico. I leave funds in here for the operation of the Virgin Islands, perhaps leaving too much. There is nothing in the evidence to show how much it was for one and how much for the other.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why did the committee leave \$350,000 as administrative expense of the \$7,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Because the Public Works Administration asked for \$8,000,000 for the job. They asked for \$400,000 out of this for administrative expenses. The committee made a cut of \$1,000,000, and they cut the administrative expenses a like percentage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, it is 5 percent?

Mr. TABER. Five percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have not had access to the figures given to the Committee on Appropriations, but it seems to me that that is awfully high.

Mr. TABER. It is altogether too high. It is ridiculous, like the whole thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In view of what has been said on the floor, I certainly feel that should be reduced anywhere from \$100,000 to \$200,000, without hurting the program at all.

Mr. TABER. On the other hand I think this whole Puerto Rican W. P. A. proposition should be eliminated, and that is what I ask the House to do, to save six and a half million dollars.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in part when he refers to the present government that we have been having in Puerto Rico in the last 2 years under Dr. Tugwell. Really the Puerto Ricans have been suffering from a most tyrannical and rotten government under the direction of Dr. Tugwell. Under Governor Tugwell democracy is a shallow word. He has also been taking Puerto Rico as a guinea pig for his crackpot experiments, that are regimenting and ruining agriculture, industry, and commerce, and are a scare for private enterprise. I have been opposing and protesting against Dr. Tugwell for 2 long years, speaking on behalf of the majority of the Puerto Ricans, who do not want Dr. Tugwell there, and speaking on behalf of agriculture, commerce, industry, and labor in Puerto Rico who are opposing Governor Tugwell and requesting his removal.

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

Mr. PAGÁN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman really believe that there is any real hope for a successful program for Puerto Rico as long as Dr. Tugwell or his philosophy prevails in the government of Puerto Rico?

Mr. PAGÁN. No; I do not have any hope as long as Dr. Tugwell is Governor of Puerto Rico, and I hope that soon Puerto Rico will be rid of Tugwell. To put Tugwell out would be democratic and fair to the Puerto Rican people. They do not want him there.

Mr. CHURCH. I read awhile ago some of the philosophy of Dr. Tugwell. Here is some more of it, if you will pardon me. In the Battle for Democracy, by Rexford G. Tugwell, professor of economics, Columbia University, published in 1935 by the Columbia University Press, he stated on page 19:

This will perhaps explain what President Roosevelt meant when he spoke of this new system of relationship as governmental partnership with industry. The phrase is precise. The Government, however, is the senior and controlling partner.

These statements of Dr. Tugwell indicate his philosophy. Its effect is to destroy private industry and to destroy jobs for these people. He is now putting Government more and more in charge of industry.

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

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think the gentleman's attention should be called to the fact that Dr. Tugwell has absolutely

nothing to do with this proposition. This is a matter exclusively under the jurisdiction and administration of General Fleming.

Mr. TABER. But he has to do with the operation of the revenue.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I say this appropriation has nothing to do with the administration of Dr. Tugwell. So I oppose the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The authorization for this appropriation is already a law, and was approved unanimously a few days ago by the Senate and the House.

The present situation in Puerto Rico is very critical. A committee of Members of this House that recently went down there to investigate conditions can tell you how difficult are our economic problems. While here in the mainland there is labor shortage, in Puerto Rico more than one-half of our workers are unemployed. We have more than 3,000 workers unemployed. We have no war industries at all. Agriculture and industry are practically wrecked, mostly due to lack of transportation. The shipping shortage, due to the war situation, has been very acute. Shortage in shipping has been the cause for shutting down industries and for reduction in planting and harvesting our agricultural crops, producing great widespread unemployment.

The tax collections in Puerto Rico, mentioned before, are mostly for certain trust funds, which by law are tied for other purposes. The insular government of Puerto Rico has appropriated some amounts to help the unemployed through relief and public works, but it is not enough, because of lack of sufficient funds.

May I state also that a great part of the appropriation provided in the bill, as was stated by W. P. A. officials at the hearings, is to be devoted for works for malaria control and other health and sanitation purposes in districts close to the naval and military establishments in Puerto Rico, to protect the health of the naval and Army troops in Puerto Rico during the war.

I think that the people of Puerto Rico, under present circumstances, are entitled to this aid. In normal times, under other circumstances, I would not ask for such aid. The United States have certain moral responsibility with the people of Puerto Rico, with about 2,000,000 loyal American citizens, which they hardly can evade.

I hope that the amendment is rejected.

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

Mr. PAGÁN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURLEY. Is it true that the \$7,000,000 is earmarked for health and sanitary measures of Puerto Rico?

Mr. PAGÁN. It was so stated by the officials of the W. P. A. who testified at the hearings.

Mr. CURLEY. And in the gentleman's judgment it cannot be used for any other purpose.

Mr. PAGÁN. Yes.

Mr. CURLEY. And it is admitted by everyone that large sums of money are necessary for the protection and preservation of the health of the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. PAGÁN. And also for the health protection of the naval and military troops stationed now in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CURLEY. So that Dr. Tugwell would have nothing to do with the expenditure?

Mr. PAGÁN. Absolutely not. If Dr. Tugwell were to have anything to do with it I would be the first to oppose it.

Mr. CURLEY. So that irrespective of the views of Dr. Tugwell, the gentleman is in agreement with the committee that this appropriation is absolutely vital and necessary to the people of Puerto Rico?

Mr. PAGÁN. I agree with the gentleman, it is absolutely vital and necessary.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. Neither the Navy nor the War Department have asked for this appropriation of funds to be used to help any of their projects in Puerto Rico, under the W. P. A. or the P. W. A. Is that not right? They have adequate funds to carry out their own projects?

Mr. PAGÁN. I answer the gentleman that in the hearings before the Senate committee, when a similar bill was discussed, the officials of the W. P. A. testified that a great amount of this money was being spent on works for health and sanitation purposes, in districts close to the Army and Navy Establishments in Puerto Rico which were absolutely necessary to protect the health of the troops stationed in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CHURCH. I understand that the representatives of P. W. A., carrying out these W. P. A. projects, have represented that they can use some of it in the localities; yes. But the Navy and the War Departments have adequate funds to carry out every project that they have down there, and they do not want the W. P. A. leaf-raking around these projects. I am anxious to help Puerto Ricans help themselves.

Mr. PAGÁN. The Navy and War Departments do not oppose this appropriation, they favor it.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RABAUT. For the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois, 65 percent of the projects have been approved by the Army or the Navy. With all deference to his leaf-raking program, he is all off color on this. Sixty-five percent have been approved by the Army or the Navy as assisting in the war effort.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGÁN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to page 61 of the hearings, where Mr.

Field, testifying in behalf of this appropriation, said:

Then we have a malarial control project which the Army wants us to expand. Malaria has broken out in a virulent form and the Army is back of that project. Ten percent of the soldiers down there have malaria.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Puerto Rico has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at some limitation on time for debate on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the use of the committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think we should clarify the issues here a little.

I had the privilege of going to Puerto Rico with the committee. While I do not have time to go into the problems that exist there at this time, I wish to call attention to a few facts as I saw them.

In the first place, the Insular Affairs Committee of the House reported an authorization for \$8,000,000 to be expended by W. P. A. during the next 5 months. This was reported out unanimously and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is a member of that committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman voted against it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am not yielding. If there is any question about my statement, read the report of the committee. The gentleman is a member of that committee and we reported that bill from the Insular Affairs Committee of the House unanimously.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman voted against it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I decline to yield. I am a member of that committee. The bill went to the Senate. The Senate reported \$8,000,000 for this purpose, unanimously, on the theory that a committee was going down there to make a report on the conditions on the island, and then some decision would be made as to what should be done in the future with this island. Your committee has been down there. They appeared before you today. The chairman of the committee urges you to pass this appropriation of \$7,000,000, which is a cut of \$1,000,000 by the Committee on Appropriations. The ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], came before you and urged you to pass it. I went down there with the committee and I want to tell you people in this House that in my opinion there could be no greater piece of injustice or inhumanity against some of our citizens than the denial of this amount that is asked here at this time. It would

be outrageous. It would be inhuman. It would be unjust. These people have some rights. They are our citizens.

Here is what they are doing with the money. At the present time they are building roads, with practically all of this money. If that is cut off you would have some of the roads that are the most important roads on the island in such shape that they cannot be used, and there is no money to proceed with them.

The money that is spoken of here in the treasury of the insular government is almost entirely tied up in various funds—trust funds and otherwise. There is no money they can get for this particular use. Not only that, but I myself talked with a number of people on this question—men who are opposed to Mr. Tugwell. He is no problem here. I do not see why he should be dragged into this argument. Many of these laws were passed before he became Governor. It is an interesting thing that a great many of these measures that are called socialistic were passed by unanimous consent of the Legislature of Puerto Rico. The whole island wanted these measures. It is not a matter that concerns Tugwell. Tugwell only has veto power. In my opinion, while I do not have any great brief for Rex Tugwell, I think he is doing a fine job at the present time. I want to tell this House there has been some mention of graft and corruption and such things, but there is not one scintilla of evidence in all the evidence taken before this committee that indicates any graft or any corruption at all. That will be shown by your committee's report.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon the Member from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] stated in substance, if I understood her correctly, that she did not agree with any of the dunderheads on either side of the aisle.

Now, in view of the fact that a book was published last fall, around about election time, which gave a list of the dunderheads, so-called, I would be glad to have the Member put her list of the Members of Congress she considers dunderheads in to see how the two lists compare with each other. I have never regarded any of my colleagues on either side as either dumbheads, dunderheads, or dumbbells.

With reference to this matter of Puerto Rico: The President issued a statement yesterday in connection with the coal strike and down in the last paragraph in one of the papers I find this language:

As the Selective Service Act does not authorize the induction of men above 45 years into the armed services, I intend to request the Congress to raise the age limit for non-combatant military service to 65 years. I shall make that request of the Congress so that if at any time in the future there should be a threat of interruption of work in plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government—

Note, "owned by the Government"—the machinery will be available for prompt action.

Being ignorant of the establishments, plants, and mines which are owned by the Government, as distinguished from those which are operated, I am asking the chairman of the committee how many, if any, establishments owned by the Government we have in Puerto Rico or any other of the Territories covered by this bill or the appropriations in this bill.

Will the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee answer that question?

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many establishments, plants, or mines does the Government own that would receive a portion of the funds carried by this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain what he means by his inquiry? Does he mean Army and Navy Establishments?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the President said in this statement that he wants authority to draft all men up to 65 years of age, so that if at any time in the future there should be a threat of interruption of work in plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government, the machinery will be available for prompt action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if he will explain to me what if any reference his inquiry has to the appropriation of the \$7,000,000?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that this \$7,000,000 is to go to Puerto Rico or some of the different Territories, and my inquiry is, Does the statement of the President apply to any work that is being carried on in such Territories?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean Naval or Army Establishment? It has nothing at all to do with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; you do not understand my inquiry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It has nothing at all to do with it and I do not see the connection between the gentleman's inquiry and the item under discussion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The connection is that the President wants to put men in the Army and to use them in plants and establishments owned by the Government if the need arises.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The President made no statement about Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President refers to plants owned by the Government and he did not limit it to plants, establishments, or mines in the continental United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield, if the gentleman can answer the inquiry.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As an illustration, let us take the cement plant just outside of San Juan, which was financed through funds appropriated from the Federal Treasury approved by this House, through the so-called Puerto Rican Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which funds were used for the purpose of building the plant. Now I would ask the gentleman, with his legal knowledge, does he construe that to be a plant owned by the Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Personally, I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am trying to learn the answer to this for one thing: Does the Government own the rum plant in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Federal Government through its agency owns the rum plant; the Federal Government through its agency owns the cement plant, but I do not know whether the President meant plants thus owned through Government corporations would come under the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the question I am asking; that is what I would like to know specifically. Just what did the President mean; just what did he include when he said plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government. Did he mean that the Government considers itself the owner as distinguished from the operator of the mines? And did he mean that he expects the Government to own mines, plants, and establishments in the near future?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUDLOW. I should have hoped that every Member of the House might have had an opportunity to read the hearings on this matter before being called upon to vote. The situation in Puerto Rico is very bad indeed, and, while I know it is true that we have been very generous to Puerto Rico, the fact remains that we have been generous to people all around the world. We are giving food at the present time to an untold number of people in Africa and in other parts of the globe. These people down in Puerto Rico are our people; they are citizens of the United States, and they are under the American flag. The war has brought about some very serious economic repercussions in Puerto Rico; there is no doubt about that; it has multiplied their woes enormously.

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

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that instead of the war it is the Tugwell administration that has wrecked their economy?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think the Tugwell administration has had a good deal to do with it, yes; but I do not think we ought to dwell upon the Tugwell administration in seeking to appraise the economic situation in Puerto Rico; we should look at the humane features of this proposition and try to do something for our own citizens who are loyal members of the American Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. As to the Tugwell situation, he did not go into office until 1942 and this island was in a worse condition prior to that time than it has been since.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think Tugwell and Tugwellism have done considerable injury to the political system of Puerto Rico, but I cannot imagine he has had anything to do with bringing about these very serious economic conditions which we are trying to cope with here in this bill.

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

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The fact of the matter is that Puerto Rico's economy during the 45 years the island has been in our possession has never amounted to much due to the fact it has been subjected to our high tariff walls, our shipping monopoly, and whenever Puerto Rico attempted to develop an industry of its own, because of our shipping monopoly and our high tariff walls, we have gone down there and dumped goods to wipe out any industry in Puerto Rico.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I have not time to do anything but sketchily review the evidence here. If, however, you will read General Fleming's testimony he says the unemployment situation is very bad in Puerto Rico and the submarine menace has been bad, very bad, and the entire situation is very distressing.

The gentleman from Illinois raised the question as to whether the Army and the Navy is interested in any projects down there. I should like to call his attention to page 61 of the hearings where Mr. George H. Field, the Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Works Agency, testified. He said:

We have a malarial-control project which the Army wants us to expand.

He testifies further that they have more cases of malaria in Puerto Rico in a year than in the whole continental United States. He testifies further that in June 10 percent of all the soldiers down in Puerto Rico were afflicted with malaria. There are some things we can do and should do for humanity's sake to help the people of Puerto Rico. One thing we can do, and one thing we have been doing, is to keep 160,000 little children from suffering the pangs of hunger. Surely that is something worthwhile.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the only place that Governor Tugwell has in this argument is that of a "red herring" to be dragged across the trail. The argument here is: Are you interested in the feeding of 160,000 children? Or will you abandon them to hunger? Are you interested in seeing what you can do to prevent further tuberculosis? Or do you just want to walk out on your duty? This is the real argument. It is easy enough to drag a "red herring" around

here, but it is quite another thing to face the picture.

Fourteen thousand of these Americans down there are in the armed forces of our country today. Perhaps if they had had better food there would be more of them physically fit to serve in the armed forces. Look at the hearings, page 61, and find the answer to questions raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]:

Sixty-five percent of the people working on our projects are on projects certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as being important for their purposes; and that includes not only road work but other types of construction work.

There are unemployed 250,000 people who are asking for food—asking us for food. We live in a country that has recognized the conditions of the world. Our lend-lease program proves that. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would walk out on the very people—

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

Mr. RABAUT. Not now.

Mr. TABER. But the gentleman referred to me.

Mr. RABAUT. I will not yield until I have finished my statement.

If you want to follow the gentleman from New York you will walk out on some of our own under-the-American-flag citizens, while we talk about helping the people of the world. Two hundred and fifty thousand of those people are unemployed. Forty-one thousand only are on W. P. A. The difference is in excess of 209,000. These are the facts—not a Tugwell "red herring" drawn across the trail.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman was present, if I remember correctly, when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEEHEE] spoke.

Mr. RABAUT. I was; and I complimented him on his remarks.

Mr. TABER. And the gentleman from Mississippi indicated that there was no substantial unemployment there.

Mr. RABAUT. Did what?

Mr. TABER. Indicated that there was no substantial unemployment there.

Mr. RABAUT. As I remember his testimony he said there was unemployment. A person can take one or two sentences here and there and get a distorted view—but his general testimony before the committee was that this assistance should be given.

I quote from the testimony of my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEEHEE] from page 101 of the hearings on the bill:

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Insular Affairs was sent to Puerto Rico to make an investigation and report back their recommendations to the Congress for the future handling of the affairs of Puerto Rico.

The placing of a limitation of 5 months in this bill is a stopgap which would allow sufficient time for this subcommittee to make its investigation and report to the Congress.

It developed in our hearings that there is quite a large number of unemployed in Puerto Rico.

Moreover, the original amount was \$8,000,000, approved by the Senate, which this committee reduced to \$7,000,000.

It is a stopgap appropriation. It runs for 5 months and it amounts to \$1,400,000 a month. Two hundred and fifty thousand people are asking for food, and they are Americans.

What is this House thinking about? That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we have heard here this afternoon statements on this legislation that causes us to reminisce and reflect back over the last few years, because all of us have watched this relief program grow. We have again been told by inference that unless we make appropriations and do certain things blood would run in the gutters and the people would kick in the windows of the shops and that people would starve.

I can remember the experience back in my own State of Illinois. I can remember investigations which we made into relief conditions and at one particular place we found 1,250 families on relief and upon investigation we found that 431 of them had employment. We found that the percentage of fraud ran from 30 to 60 percent of all those who were receiving assistance, and this was true in every section we checked. We found that our State was becoming a mecca for those who wanted to obtain something for nothing. We found that as soon as we spread out this bounty there were those who came from all over the Nation to get it, and I know you will find the same condition to exist wherever public relief is passed out. It has happened in Puerto Rico, according to this testimony.

We have been told that the people from the hill country of Puerto Rico come down and take employment on W. P. A. because they can probably earn more than working upon the farms of their particular community. We are told that politics has no effect on its administration and I hope it does not, and we are told that Tugwell has nothing to do with it, and I wish to commend him if such is the case, because if that is true he is the first Governor in the history of the Nation that I know of who has not dabbled at some time or other in W. P. A. We have seen it work; we know what has happened. I am informed by a member of the committee, and if I am wrong I should like to be corrected, that there has been some \$16,000,000 appropriated by Puerto Rico for the relief of its indigent, yet they ask for this \$7,000,000.

To stop the influx of transients into my State I helped to enact into law a 3-year residence law which requires a residence of 3 years in order to obtain relief. We also made it mandatory for a man upon relief, if he was physically able, to work and earn the amount of his budget, and as soon as that went into effect the relief rolls went down very substantially.

I believe sincerely that if this appropriation is removed you will find those

who are now receiving the relief will return to the farms and places where they were formerly employed or where they earned their own livelihood by cultivating the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I desire to restrict my argument at this time to the question of need, and I use as my authority one whose integrity is beyond the realm of impeachment, one who is respected and accepted as an excellent administrator. I refer to Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, who is the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency. He said as far back as April 26 that "the unemployment crisis in Puerto Rico is more severe than it was in continental United States at the depth of the depression." He also said that "about half of the population is in great need." He stated further that "complete economic collapse has been prevented only by assistance from the Federal Government."

According to the chairman of another investigating committee, Senator CHAVEZ, "unemployment is increasing" and "local industries are practically at a standstill."

It has been estimated that there are unemployed in Puerto Rico, at various periods, between 225,000 and 325,000 people, affecting 165,000 families. These are facts and no amount of hocus-pocus can conceal them. Yet we are urged to eliminate this \$7,000,000 appropriation, a mere pittance for the relief of a good and honest people who are the victims of the worst evils of colonialism.

Let me point out to you, gentlemen, that the Latin-American people of South and Central America have a strong feeling of kinship toward the people on the island of Puerto Rico who are also Latin Americans. There are 100,000,000 Latin Americans who are watching the United States, following closely the manner in which we treat the people of Puerto Rico, the people who live on what we call the Gibraltar of the Caribbean, which guards the entrance to the Western Hemisphere. Despite this vital factor in this war you seek to deny the people of Puerto Rico \$7,000,000 to relieve their unemployment in a slight degree, and you do so by heaping insults upon them, and by misinformation, and misrepresentation of the facts.

Now let me for a moment deal with the question of ownership, the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan. He wanted to know about ownership in Puerto Rico. Let me give you some figures. Fifty percent of the sugar land is absentee-owned by four big United States corporations. I will give you their names: The Fajardo Sugar Co., the South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., the Eastern Puerto Rico Associates, and the Centrale Aguirre Co. Another 26 percent is also in the hands of absentee owners. The American centrales control 41 mills. The sugar industry comprises 40 percent of farm acreage, 56 percent of the value of all farm lands and buildings, and 60 percent of the exports. It em-

ploys 50 percent of the agricultural workers. Is the present plight of Puerto Rico's agriculture the fault of the people of Puerto Rico?

Why is there unemployment in Puerto Rico? Because first of all we have never permitted Puerto Rico to develop an industry of its own. In Puerto Rico, had they ever attempted to develop any kind of an industry, it would soon have been destroyed by those who now exploit the people of Puerto Rico.

For the past 45 years Puerto Rico, under the complete control of the United States, has been prevented from developing its own industry. High tariff walls have excluded the island from other world markets. This fact and the coast-wise-shipping laws which forced Puerto Rico to do its commerce under ships flying the American flag at exorbitant rates, have made the island almost wholly dependent on the United States for its food and essential supplies and for the marketing of its cash products. Puerto Rico has been our colonial possession from which we have drained a rich abundance of raw material but have not permitted to develop an island industry which would guarantee the well-being of her people. Under such a system of colonial exploitation Puerto Rico has not and cannot ever hope to develop a sound national economy which will guarantee the Puerto Rican people employment, good health, and decent standards of living. That is why the problem of immediate political independence and self-determination for Puerto Rico is a matter of such basic importance. There can be no hope of effective industrialization of Puerto Rico without Puerto Rican independence.

Let the investigators also tell you that Puerto Rico has a one-crop economy, sugar, a diabetic economy. Because of this large ownership of land concentrated in the four corporations I have just mentioned it has been impossible for the Government and the people of Puerto Rico to take farm land and use it for a subsistence-crop program, use it to raise a few things with which to feed their families.

I have often wondered whose ideas have been voiced when I have heard arguments against Puerto Rico similar to those expressed on the floor of the House today. I have wondered if these arguments have not been the ideas of the sugar trust which has little if any regard for the well-being of the Puerto Rican people.

I am not suggesting the destruction of the sugar industry. I am suggesting the simple formula of diversified agriculture, a subsistence crop program, use of marginal and other unused land, to develop an adequate food supply for the Puerto Rican people. The sugar trust with its monopoly of land has prevented this rational approach to the problem.

Instead for Puerto Rico and her people it has been sugar, low wages, and exploitation. Then you stand up here and base your argument against appropriating \$7,000,000 for the relief of these people on the ground that these people are diseased, they are lazy, they want to get away from the farms to seek W. P. A.

wages. It is nonsense, sheer nonsense, and you use it to alibi a system of colonialism which shames the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the Commissioner from Puerto Rico if it is not a fact that the insular government has appropriated some \$16,000,000 for relief during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. PAGÁN. I do not think that is the correct figure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the gentleman think it is?

Mr. PAGÁN. They have appropriated all possible amounts to help the unemployment there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know whether or not they are preparing to spend any of those amounts they have appropriated, or have they spent any of them?

Mr. PAGÁN. They have spent some. Mr. CRAWFORD. How much?

Mr. PAGÁN. I cannot tell the gentleman the exact amount, but I know they have spent nearly \$3,000,000; but that is not a sufficient amount to take care of 300,000 families.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that, but what I want to get into the record, if the gentleman will give us the figures, is how much they appropriated. I think the gentleman will find it is exactly \$16,000,000.

Second, how much of the \$16,000,000 have they spent, when do they expect to spend it, and are they going to hold it up to 1944 and use our Federal Treasury funds in the meantime? I suggest that the gentleman look into that for his own protection, if for no other reason.

Now may I ask the Commissioner this. I think the Commissioner knows what I am talking about. Does the gentleman want the record to show that this \$7,000,000 carried in this bill is to be spent for sanitary and health purposes? If I understood correctly, the gentleman from Massachusetts asked the gentleman that question. Does he want the record to show that?

Mr. PAGÁN. A great portion of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does the gentleman mean by "a great portion"? We want to keep the record straight.

Mr. PAGÁN. The portion stated by the officials of the W. P. A. in the hearings. They stated that 65 percent of this fund was to be spent for works for malaria control, on sanitation, and on other health purposes, especially in districts close to the Navy and Army bases established in Puerto Rico.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he wants the record to show that 65 percent of this \$7,000,000 is to be used for health and sanitation purposes.

Mr. PAGÁN. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We will watch and see how it is spent, then, because that is not my understanding at all. I think the gentleman from Michigan, a mem-

ber of the committee, stated that 65 percent of the projects had been approved by the military authorities. Is that not correct?

Mr. RABAUT. I corrected by statement when I took the floor. I said that 65 percent of the people working on the projects are on projects certified by either the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That certainly does not say it is for health and sanitary purposes. That is the point I am getting at. In other words, if you would build a big military road from San Juan to Mayaguez—I am not objecting to the road, now I am trying to get our thinking straight on this, because you are not going to settle this problem this afternoon. So I say that if the \$7,000,000 is largely spent for military roads then it will not go for health and sanitary purposes. If we had a list of the projects which have been approved we would know roughly for what the money is to be used, but without the list, we are largely guessing about the matter.

You are not going to stop this program with \$7,000,000. You are going to have this problem for the next 25 to 50 years. I stand on that statement, because we have done some very extraordinary things down there, that will perhaps have to be undone. For instance, take the question of people starving to death. Here is Haiti, for instance, under our supervision for some 15 or 20 years. We still dominate the picture almost 100 percent. Do you know what the cash income of the Haitians was? About \$4 a year, just \$4 a year. Is there any starvation there? Not at all.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. You will find the Haitian works, he produces food, gets along. Take the December 12, 1942, issue of the *Foreign Commerce Weekly*. I was reading it this morning. See what they have to say about how 95 percent of the Haitians are getting along and how well they are and how they take care of themselves, although I think the last boat to land in Haiti was some months ago. In a country in the Tropics, you can generally feed yourselves if you want to do it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On what?

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the things that nature provides, just as we do in the temperate and arctic zones. Did not the Eskimos get along before the Public Works Administration began to operate?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On what?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Bananas, breadfruit, mangoes, sugarcane, tropical nuts, various root foods which grow in abundance, plants, and many other highly important foods to say nothing about rice and fish, plus other items obtained with cash income. There is a shortage of proteins, of course. The gentleman is making fun of sugar.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Do you eat sugarcane?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That question indicates how coddled the gentleman is. If he understood the Tropics he would know how valuable the sugar content of

the cane is to the native and how much he uses it. Sugarcane will give about \$300 in dollar income from an acre of good cane. Do you know what these so-called substitute food products, which the gentleman from New York would have grown, probably as much as \$15 per acre—more likely less. And then what would be the buying power of the people? Apparently the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] would do away with the sugar industry, and have everybody now engaged by that industry starve to death on the same basis he claims some of the other people who are not engaged in and by the sugar industry are starving. I ask the gentleman just why he thinks God Almighty placed sugarcane in the Tropics and sugar beets in the colder zones?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this item came to the Committee on Appropriations at the end of a long process of executive and legislative collaboration.

The House Committee on Insular Affairs, which exercises jurisdiction over the legislation involved, after some considerable deliberation, passed a resolution on May 24, 1943, as follows:

Resolved by the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, That pending a study of conditions in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, recently authorized by the House, and in view of emergent conditions there;

It is the sense of the committee that the Federal Works Administrator should be authorized to continue a work-relief program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for a period of several months from July 1, 1943, and, in accordance with the purposes of the Emergency Relief Act, fiscal year 1943. In the opinion of the committee, this emergency authorization should not exceed 5 months, nor the funds \$8,000,000. The chairman is authorized to communicate this resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

This resolution was passed unanimously, and was subscribed to by all members both majority and minority, of the Committee on Insular Affairs. They then held hearings and eventually formulated a bill which was brought into the House as House Joint Resolution 128, authorizing an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The joint resolution was referred to the Union Calendar, and passed the House May 27, 1943.

I quote briefly from the report, House Report No. 506:

Economic conditions in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are critical. This has resulted in widespread unemployment. While in the United States there is a shortage of manpower and a great demand for workers, conditions in the islands of the Caribbean, as a result of the lack of shipping to bring in raw materials for manufacture and to ship out finished products and agricultural commodities, have produced the opposite result.

The Senate committee found that the work program provided by the Work Projects Administration in Puerto Rico has prevented widespread suffering and general collapse of

economy. It is the plan of the President, with whom the committee is in agreement, to close up the Work Projects Administration throughout the United States and the insular possessions by June 30 next. The Work Projects Administration is now employing on the islands of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands about 41,000 people on a large number of projects. Of these, 40,000 are employed in Puerto Rico. The cost for this employment is at the rate of \$1,600,000 a month.

The committee is unanimous in the view that some arrangement must be made to prevent the discharge of this great group of people on June 30. The committee does not propose the continuation of the Work Projects Administration as such, but in lieu thereof, recommend to the House the passage of House Joint Resolution No. 128 which would authorize the Federal Works Administrator to provide work for employment of needy persons on useful public projects for a period not to exceed 5 months from July 1 next, according to the provisions and purposes of the Emergency Relief Act for the fiscal year 1943 insofar as they are applicable to such employment.

This legislation is admittedly a stop-gap arrangement pending the time when the committee can bring to the House its considered judgment after making actual observations of the conditions on the islands and after completing the studies of the various proposals that have been made to alleviate them.

This House joint resolution was not only reported by the committee unanimously, but it passed the House unanimously, was unanimously approved by the Senate committee and unanimously agreed to in the Senate. The item then went to the Budget, and was transmitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the House and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. At no stage of that long process is there any record of criticism or objection.

My friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], a member of the committee which considered the legislation, occupies a rather anomalous position. He agreed to this recommendation by his committee. He approved the preliminary resolution. He voted for the bill. In company with other members of the Committee on Insular Affairs he accompanied the delegation to the islands and personally participated in the inspection and viewed the situation at first hand. And with all this familiarity with the proposition and an intimate personal knowledge of conditions as he found them on the islands, when I inquired of him at the close of his speech just now as to whether he favors the appropriation of the \$7,000,000—although in cooperation with my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who offered this amendment, he has tried in every way to throw cold water on the proposition—he says we ought to appropriate the full \$7,000,000. That is the gentleman's position. That is his final conclusion. And that is the opinion of every member of the official delegation which visited the islands and has just returned within the last week. They saw the unemployed. They saw men at work who otherwise would have been without employment. They inspected the public works in process of construction. They saw them feeding 160,000

hungry children and having just returned from that enlightening experience, they recommend, without exception, that the money carried by the bill be appropriated to take care of the situation until permanent legislation can be enacted.

This bipartisan delegation from the Committee on Insular Affairs, after a minute inspection of the islands, were unable to find anything to criticize in General Fleming's administration. No one questions his integrity and ability and the success of his work as W. P. A. administrator in the islands. When I inquired of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] just now if there was any implication of inefficiency or maladministration, whether there was any evidence of graft in connection with the work, he replied unequivocally, if somewhat reluctantly, that there was not. He gave the W. P. A. a clean bill of health. He did not submit a single objection to or criticism of the manner in which this money is being expended or the integrity with which it is being administered.

Mr. Chairman, no higher tribute could be paid to General Fleming and his staff, and no more convincing justification could be submitted for the approval of this appropriation and the rejection of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demand by Mr. TABER) there were—
a yes 36, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.
The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to strike out the last word under the head of "Department of Commerce." I ask unanimous consent to return to that part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but we have agreed to finish this bill promptly this afternoon, and I shall have to object to returning.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, provision is made in this bill for some funds for the Civil Aeronautics Authority of the Department of Commerce. I desire to discuss a matter in that connection in which I believe a large number of the Members of the House and Senate are interested. Since 1935 the W. P. A. has engaged in an extensive program of airport construction throughout the United States. The construction activities of W. P. A. have now terminated. When the order for termination was given engineers of the C. A. A., together with those of W. P. A., conducted joint surveys of the projects still in operation. This survey disclosed that 28 airports in the country remained in a state of partial completion due to the withdrawal of W. P. A. funds.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the subject under discussion by the gentleman does not relate to the provision of the bill which we are now considering.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed out of order.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, 267 airport projects were approved by the Civil Aeronautics Authority to be completed under the W. P. A. formula by contribution of W. P. A. funds to be met by local municipal funds to complete those ports. Of those 267 airport projects so approved, when the W. P. A. ceased functioning, there were 28 ports located in various States where local communities had expended, in connection with W. P. A., a total sum in excess of \$8,400,000.

Herewith is a complete list of these airports:

California: Merced.
Colorado: Pueblo.
Connecticut: Danbury.
Georgia: Atlanta.
Idaho: Idaho Falls.
Indiana: Bloomington.
Iowa: Iowa City, Des Moines.
Kansas: Pittsburg.
Maine: Dexter, Eastport.
Michigan: Menominee.
Minnesota: Eveleth, Hibbing, International Falls.
New Mexico: Eaton.
North Carolina: Wilson, Burlington, Rockingham.
North Dakota: Valley City.
Texas: Henderson.
West Virginia: Clarksburg, Wheeling.
Wisconsin: Eau Claire, Siren, Oshkosh.
Nebraska: Fremont, Beatrice.

Many of these communities have borrowed money through bond issues and have raised money and bought the land to make the sponsor's contribution for the completion of these airports. They did so with the distinct understanding that the Federal Government would maintain its proportionate share under the W. P. A. formula to enable those ports to be completed. Now we find, with the folding up of W. P. A., these 28

airports, some of them from 50 to 90 percent completed, upon which the sum of \$8,400,000 has been spent by the local and Federal Government; 3 of them are located in my State. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY], who sought to take me off the floor and prevent me from bringing this matter to the Congress, that the people of Wisconsin and the people of all the States I have mentioned are extremely interested in seeing the Congress take action to complete these ports. Now, I say that unless we are able to direct the Federal Government to expend the money necessary to meet its obligation, those ports are going to disintegrate and become useless, and each day that they remain in their present state the \$8,400,000 investment we have already made in those ports will be depreciated.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to ask the gentleman a question. I am as interested in airports as anybody in this House, but how can we distinguish with regard to the airport program? With the cessation of W. P. A., we stopped the school lunches, we stopped building schools, we stopped building hospitals, and we stopped building roads. Everything else fell in the same category as airports.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I think the attitude of Congress has been reflected in other legislation which clearly shows that the Congress intends to have the Federal Government keep faith with the municipalities so that projects that were started under W. P. A. and were partially completed, and which were started with the distinct understanding with the local communities that they would be completed, should be completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am somewhat familiar with the situation that the gentleman describes. There is one of those airports at Bloomington, Ind. I am in complete agreement with the contention of the able gentleman from Wisconsin that those half-finished and rapidly deteriorating airport projects should be completed. That is just common sense. I would like to offer this as a contribution to the gentleman's discussion: I understand that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has prepared a proposed estimate and submitted it to the Bureau of the Budget for an appropriation of \$8,000,000 to complete those 28 airports.

Mr. KEEFE. I was just coming to that.

Mr. LUDLOW. I understand the Bureau of the Budget is to present the matter to the joint Army and Navy Board and get its opinion as to the military

necessity of those airports, and those that are approved as being essential in the military interests will be recommended for appropriation by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentlemen there are two sources from which funds are available for the building of airports. One is the fund that we appropriated to the Department of Commerce, which is approximately \$200,000,000. Those funds are subject to the jurisdiction of the Army and the Navy Board. There must be a finding of the Army and the Navy in order to secure money from that fund to complete the airport projects, that those projects are essential and necessary in the interest of national defense.

Now, it so happens that these 28 airports have not received the approval of the Army and Navy that they are of military necessity, and yet the municipalities that are involved went on the assumption, being misled by the Federal Government through the W. P. A. and through governmental agencies, that if they would go ahead and bond themselves and procure land, go ahead and meet the sponsor's contribution, that these airports would be constructed.

It seems to me that it is utterly and completely breaking faith on the part of the Government of the United States if we do not take steps here in this Congress to see that funds are provided to complete these ports under the program which was originally started by the W. P. A.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Supplementing what the gentleman says, I took this matter up today with Mr. Wayne Coy, the Acting Director of the Budget, and he stated these 28 projects will be resubmitted to the Board to determine their essentiality in the military interest and those which are approved will be favorably considered by the Budget in the hope that in the next deficiency bill funds may be approved to carry the program out.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that at the time the airport program was started, the question was asked as to whether or not strictly military necessity was of paramount importance, and these municipalities were led to spend their money in the purchase and building of these airports at a time when it was necessarily considered that they must be of military necessity in order that the Federal Government would make a contribution to complete them.

Now we are faced with a situation where the Army and Navy declines specifically to approve these ports as a military necessity. The Bureau of the Budget will not approve a request of the Civil Aeronautics Authority which is now pending before them, without Army and Navy approval, and these communities will be sitting there "holding the bag," with airfields on their hands. The Government must keep faith with the municipalities, when it asked them to go ahead and spend their money on these projects.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 2 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I went into this matter with my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] in connection with an airport in New Mexico, and in our particular case the airport was started with the understanding it would have military necessity, and it was channelled through the regular sources and Colonel Harlow said that he thought that it should be done, and I am glad the gentleman is bringing the matter up.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that we had a meeting in my office this morning. Many Congressmen from these various States are interested in these projects, and there was a unanimity of agreement among the Members present that we should make every effort possible to place an amendment in this deficiency bill if the rules would permit it in order to secure immediate approval of the estimate that has been submitted by the Civil Aeronautics Authority to the Bureau of the Budget. This is a matter that should demand the immediate attention of the House, and I am at this time calling it to your attention and expect to call it to the attention of the other body in order that we may get this appropriation through and get some action on it before this House recesses. Unless we do, the matter will go over again, and perhaps to the next year. We must protect and finish these airports we have started.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the matter under discussion should be of interest to every Member of this House who took an interest in the original construction of these airports.

W. P. A. began with an original program of approximately 1,019 of these airport sites. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the De-

partments of State and Commerce is very sympathetic to what is involved in this particular item of debate. We could not include it in the regular bill for Commerce due to lack of our Budget request. Now, let me give you a brief explanation of this program because eventually it is going to have something to do with an over-all program involving about 3,500 airports in every State in the Union and every congressional district when hostilities cease. When the President of the United States sent a letter to Major General Fleming liquidating W. P. A. he had this to say:

State or local projects should be closed out by completing useful units of such projects or by arranging for the sponsors to carry on the work.

The President wanted to complete these useful projects. Certainly airports 50 to 90 percent completed, with over 8 millions invested, could be considered useful units. Now, what is the picture? When W. P. A. liquidated it had completed 103 out of 267 airports. Of the rest the Army and Navy took over 71 and is now completing them, or we think they will complete them. A resurvey was made of the other airports. There were 93. The Army and the Navy and the C. A. A. Board made a resurvey and picked 65 for completion because of military necessity, and the money for their completion will come to you in a few days in the form of a conference report reappropriating \$99,000,000 earmarked for these W. P. A. projects. That left 28 which are from 50 to 90 percent completed and which projects we are now discussing. The United States Treasury is interested in these 28 uncompleted airports because over \$8,400,000 of Federal money, State money, and county money is invested in them. Every day those airports lie idle a great loss of invested capital is incurred through wind erosion, and so forth. We are losing a large Federal, State, and municipal investment. It is only a matter of economy that the work be finished. It will take \$8,000,000 to complete them. The Civilian Aviation Administration, knowing of this great investment, knowing the value of these airports to national defense, would like to have them completed. So the C. A. A. went to the Budget. They told the Budget they needed \$8,000,000 to complete these airports because the airports were needed. The President has said to complete useful units or make arrangements with the sponsors to complete them. The C. A. A. has carried out its part by the request to the Budget.

We met this morning. Many of us have been working on this matter a long time. We decided to take the floor to inform Congress of the probable loss of this big investment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, has a break-down of what it will cost to complete each one of these airports. Those of you interested should get those figures. You will be surprised at the amount of money that your State, your city, and your Government has invested in airports 50 to 90 percent completed.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. There is one airport near the city of Vesta, Nebr., where a W. P. A. project was constructed, an airport covering 130 acres where they were training 50 flyers for the Government. W. P. A. said we ought to enlarge it. They did so by taking in areas surrounding the field with the result that the new one is not completed and the old one cannot be used.

Mr. STEFAN. That is right and it will cost \$450,000 to complete it. There is one airport in my district, Fremont, which will cost about \$25,000 to complete. It is 90 percent complete yet it has been abandoned representing a great outlay of city and Government funds. I want that investment saved and this valuable and badly needed airport completed.

Because of parliamentary procedure we are stymied, we cannot offer an amendment to include this important item. We may get help in the Senate.

We are pleading with the Budget Bureau to allow and approve immediately this C. A. A. request for \$8,000,000 to complete and save this investment in order that we may include it in this bill when it gets over to the Senate. We want these airports authorized before we go home or before we recess.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said and to point out that the airport I mentioned at Raton, N. Mex., is 91 percent completed.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. It will only cost \$75,000 to complete that airport. The gentleman has worked hard for its completion.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. May I say on the gentleman's behalf that there is not a man in the House who is more diligent and who has taken more interest in this matter than he has. There are three of these airports that the people of my State have spent thousands and thousands, yes, millions of dollars, as I understand it, to build or, rather, they have given land that is worth that. These are magnificent, prosperous towns near the great Army activities of my State. Yet they will leave this out, and they cannot be completed.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has helped and worked hard for aviation generally.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says. I do not know whether there are any of these in my State or not. Nevertheless, I feel that there is a great future for aviation, and I think it would be a permanent investment for the country. Un-

less there would be some Member object or raise a point of order, the amendment could be offered. From what I can judge, it is the unanimous sentiment of the House, if no point of order is raised.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we could pass it if no point of order were raised.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no doubt about the amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Our committee wants to proceed in an orderly manner. I am sure a point of order would be raised. I want to thank the gentleman, however, for his contribution. We want to save this investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for 3 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, we all should, if we all do not, feel grateful to both the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. STEFAN] for calling this important matter to the attention of the House. I feel that the Government does have a moral obligation to carry out a solemn contract and if we fail to complete these airports that have already been started and many of which are nearly completed, we would not only be guilty of a breach of faith but we would suffer a severe economic loss. I never did believe much in W. P. A. but when one undertakes even a bad thing he should see it through. "Blessed is he who sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not."

I happen to have an airport down at Joplin, Mo., that is practically complete. All that it lacks is \$14,000 to \$16,000 worth of lighting facilities. The people in that community have cooperated with the Federal Government and both have spent over \$500,000 for building that airport, which is located in one of the third largest defense areas in the United States. The field is complete, the hangar built, the runways constructed, and yet we cannot use it.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. No; I do not want the gentleman to embarrass me. I do want to tell the gentleman that this Joplin airport is between Fort Leonard Wood and Camp Crowder, in Missouri. It is just across the line from the Jawhawk ordnance plant and from the shell-loading plant over in Kansas. It is about halfway between Kansas City and Fort Joe Robinson, at Little Rock, and Camp Chaffee at Fort Smith, in Arkansas. It is about halfway between St. Louis and Oklahoma City, in one of the most strategic areas in the United States. We have lead and zinc mines and several powder plants in this area. This airport could be easily extended. Yet, because the W. P. B. or the Army or the Navy or some other agency overlapping C. A. A. has been negligent, envious, or jealous, we are denied these \$14,000 worth of lighting equipment in order to utilize that field that is already complete. What a waste of public funds. Yet I know the acute shortage of critical materials.

Recently a bomber that cost \$350,000 crashed near that field, killing all the crew and, of course, the bomber was lost.

too. It is all right for the Congress to appropriate funds to complete these fields, but unless we can jar some sense into the heads of some administrative agencies down at the other end of the Avenue in order to get the equipment to utilize these airports, the money will have been spent in vain.

Mr. Chairman, it is shocking to know that we already have lost more men in air service training than we have lost in combat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for 2 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the last speaker that there was no contractual obligation on the part of W. P. A. in its relation to the States. In this, my answer to him, I desire to quote my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has always referred to this Federal assistance as a hand-out.

Under the W. P. A. the Federal Government was to pay about 75 percent of the cost. I want to be very clear about the matter. There was a requirement in W. P. A. to complete Federal projects, and if the completion of an airport is requested now as necessary to the war effort by either the Army or the Navy, it will be completed. However, other projects not necessary to the war effort upon which great contributions have come from the Federal Government may be completed by their sponsors. As far as these airports are concerned, I am as strong for the construction of airports as anyone present, and I wish at this time to commend in a special manner the devotion in this regard of my personal friend and colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for the airport program.

But it certainly comes as a surprise to hear W. P. A. praised in this House; it certainly comes as a great surprise to now hear that W. P. A. really has done some good in so many parts of the country; that W. P. A. has been accountable for some airports; that W. P. A. was accountable for schools, libraries, courthouses, roads, lunches for children, and a thousand other things. Formerly we heard much talk about boondoggling and everything else, but today, at last, W. P. A. comes into its own and is praised on the floor of Congress. I am happy that this day has come, for at last recognition is made of the generous gifts of the Federal Government to the States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 302. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 26, after line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 303. Appropriations contained in this act may be used to reimburse the emergency fund of the President for advances made therefrom to meet obligations for purposes for which the funds are provided in this act and for which purposes such appropriations are contained herein."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a precautionary amendment offered by direction of the committee. We trust it will not be necessary. We hope and expect this bill will be passed in ample time to antedate the close of the fiscal year, but in the event through some misfortune it should be delayed beyond the first of the fiscal year, this will make it possible for reimbursement to be made of funds advanced to take care of the items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 303. This act may be cited as the "Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 26, line 7, strike out "303" and insert "304."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in his remarks of yesterday, appearing on page 6343 of the RECORD, made the statement that certain contracts had been entered into by the Office of War Information in violation of law. Also that it was incorporated by a group of people most of whom are on the preferred list of the Dies committee.

The original contract with Short Wave Research was entered into by the Office of Coordinator of Information, headed by Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan. General Donovan is one of the most eminent men in the Government service today. He has a long record of public service. He served with credit and distinction in the first World War. He was the nominee of his party for Governor of New York against Governor Lehman.

While he needs no defense, I am glad to be able to certify that this contract was not in violation of law and that he did not recruit for carrying out the contract men from the preferred list of the Dies committee. I think it is only due to General Donovan that this statement be made.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just want to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that I stated that those who incorporated the Short Wave Research, Inc., were a group of people who were on the preferred list of the Dies committee. I did not say that those whom they recruited

were on that list. I made no comment of that kind.

I still say that the contract was illegal. It is perfectly clear, I think, that it is illegal. It is now under investigation by the Comptroller General.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It could hardly be under investigation when it was discontinued some time ago.

By way of historical review, Mr. Chairman, I shall read the following statement:

The Office of War Information, Overseas Branch, inherited on its establishment in June 1942 a contract which had been entered into on April 25, 1942, between Short Wave Research, Inc., a private corporation, and the Foreign Information Service of the Office of Coordinator of Information, headed by Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan. After the Office of War Information was given the foreign information service formerly in the Office of the Coordinator of Information, the Office of War Information renegotiated this contract with Short Wave Research in July 1942, and that contract was continued until terminated by the Office of War Information on March 7, 1943. During the period of the contracts with Short Wave Research by the Office of the Coordinator of Information and the Office of War Information, beginning in April 1942 and ending in March 1943, \$545,009.79 was paid to Short Wave Research, Inc., for foreign-language services required in overseas propaganda. This sum was entirely from authorized and vouchered funds.

The arrangement was entered into originally for reasons of economy, of which the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission were cognizant. At that time, the Foreign Information Service of the Office of Coordinator of Information was preparing programs in many languages, but did not broadcast in any single language sufficient hours each day to warrant hiring full-time linguistic personnel. Short Wave Research, Inc., maintained a pool of available personnel with linguistic or literary skills needed in overseas propaganda. Under the contract, the Foreign Information Service could call for such services as it needed, for given hours each day or week, and payment for these services was made to Short Wave Research, Inc. All payments were for writing, translating, or radio broadcasting services actually rendered.

When the Office of War Information submitted its first budget to Congress in September 1942, a sum was included for these services and the item was clearly set forth and explained in the book of justification.

By January 1943, programming by the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information had increased in volume to such an extent that it became preferable for the Office of War Information to place all linguistic and literary personnel directly on its pay roll. This change was completed and therefore the contract was terminated by the Office of War Information on March 7, 1943.

Payments made under contracts with Short Wave Research

Payments made by the Office of Coordinator of Information, April to June 1942, before transfer of the foreign information service to the Office of War Information.....	\$226,855
Payments made by the Office of War Information from July to October 1942.....	178,120
Payments made by the Office of War Information from November 1942 to March 1943.....	140,033

There was a saving here. Originally, instead of using personnel whose entire time could not be employed, they used the

pool supported by this service to give the service only when service was needed. At other times there was no charge upon the Government. All payments were for writing, translating, or radio broadcasting services actually rendered. When the service was built up to a basis of continuous employment, the contract was discontinued.

If there had been such maladministration, such malfeasance, and misuse of funds as are indicated by the gentleman, it would have been brought out at that time, and certainly opportunity was offered for criticism at that time.

So there is no basis on which an investigation could be predicated. I am sure if any investigation is being made, General Donovan can more than maintain the right he had to make the original contract. And, of course, O. W. I. had a similar right.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The statement that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just read is incorrect in several respects. In the first place, Mr. Davis became the head of the O. W. I. some time before we went away from here in the early summer of 1942. For almost a year he has operated under this contract with the Short Wave Research, Inc., and this set-up was designed to hire people for the Government without their having to go through the Civil Service Commission or be classified by the Civil Service Commission. The O. W. I. was given opportunity to enter into contracts without reference to the provisions of section 3709 of the code, but that applies only to supplies and materials. It does not apply to personal services, because the statute was designed to keep people on the Federal pay roll so that they could be checked upon, and the Civil Service Commission could properly classify them. I do not feel that any statement that I have made in criticism of O. W. I. in this connection is in the least out of the way, or in the least incorrect, and I think that I will stand right square upon what I said. I did not say that the majority of the employees were upon the preferred list of the Dies committee. I said the incorporators were on that list. The gentleman seeks to make General Donovan the goat. The man I criticized was Elmer Davis, and the criticism was well founded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, originally this work was under the Coordinator of Information, General Donovan, and he, in this capacity, negotiated the contract, and the fact that the contract was not illegal is shown by the fact that expenditures under it have regularly passed through the General Accounting Office and been properly vouchered and approved. Later the Office of War Information was created, and this work was transferred, that is,

the Foreign Information Service was transferred from the Office of the Coordinator to the O. W. I. under Mr. Davis, and the O. W. I. renegotiated a contract with Short Wave Research in July 1942, and in March 1943 discontinued this contract.

The record cannot be construed as a reflection on General Donovan, who has had a distinguished public career, and who has represented and is representing both his country and his party in a most praiseworthy manner. The evidence is that his accounts were voucherized by the proper authority and O. W. I. continued a contract and followed a practice inaugurated by the Coordinator's office.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3030) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN INDUSTRY

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2536), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BARDEN, Mr. HART, Mr. LESINSKI, Mr. DONDERO, and Mr. CHENOWETH.

EXCESS PROFITS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN PRODUCTION BONUS PAYMENTS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2888), relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, this involves the question of excess profits on the production of zinc in the lead and zinc mining areas of Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas. Last year we attempted to correct an apparent inconsistency involved in the payment of bonuses for the work of low-grade zinc deposits, and then charged the producer excess profits. By oversight the matter of the working of so-called tailing piles was overlooked and the anomalous condition still prevails as far as that is concerned.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and there is no objection from the Members on the minority side.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have examined this bill thoroughly. It is a meritorious bill and ought to be passed in the interest of the prosecution of the war.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 735 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Nontaxable bonus income: The term 'nontaxable bonus income' means the amount of the income derived from bonus payments made by any agency of the United States Government on account of the production in excess of a specified quota of:

"(1) A mineral product or timber, the exhaustion of which gives rise to an allowance for depletion under section 23 (m), but such amount shall not exceed the net income (computed with the allowance for depletion) attributable to the output in excess of such quota; or

"(2) A mineral product extracted or recovered from mine tailings by a corporation which owns no economic interest in the mineral property from which the ore containing such tailings was mined: *Provided*, That the exhaustion of such mineral product would give rise to an allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) if such corporation had an economic interest in such mineral property, but such amount shall not exceed the net income attributable to the output in excess of such quota."

Sec. 2. Section 711 (a) (1) (I) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(I) Nontaxable income of certain industries: In the case of a producer of minerals, or a producer of logs or lumber from a timber block, as defined in section 735, there shall

be excluded nontaxable income from exempt excess output of mines and timber blocks and nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735. In respect of nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735 (c), a corporation described in section 735 (c) (2) shall be deemed a producer of minerals for the purposes of this subparagraph."

Sec. 3. Section 711 (a) (2) (K) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(K) Nontaxable income of certain industries: In the case of a producer of minerals, or a producer of logs or lumber from a timber block, as defined in section 735, there shall be excluded nontaxable income from exempt excess output of mines and timber blocks and nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735. In respect of nontaxable bonus income provided in section 735 (c), a corporation described in section 735 (c) (2) shall be deemed a producer of minerals for the purposes of this subparagraph."

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "mined", strike out "Provided, That the exhaustion of such mineral product would give rise to an allowance for depletion under section 23 (m) if such corporation had an economic interest in such mineral property."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the amendment merely strikes out some surplusage that was overlooked.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole and to include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, if I may, of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, if he can tell us when the bill S. 35 is likely to be reported from his committee? It involves a question of silver which the War Production Board and others who are interested in the war effort think should be passed quite speedily.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It has been referred to a subcommittee. I do not know just when they will be ready to report. I will check up and give the gen-

tleman that information in the next day or so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would do that, because I understand it is a question of days before there will be no silver for use in the war effort.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is an emergency as far as silver currency is concerned, is it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No; it is silver that is used in the war effort. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] understands the urgency of it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has spoken to me about it and it has been referred to a subcommittee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill originated in another branch of the Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] called it to my attention frequently.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He may have a bill of like nature, but the one I am referring to was passed in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON. All bills relating to that subject, of course, will go before the subcommittee, and I will try to inform the gentleman in a day or two just when it will be reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill is S. 35, introduced by Senator GREEN, and it has passed the Senate.

It is a bill that is connected up with the elimination of the Celler amendment in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, and there seems to be no objection to it. I know that if it is possible to get the bill considered before we recess there is no objection to the committee giving it early consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman will agree with me that it has been represented as being quite urgent for the war effort and should be taken up very quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, there is no question about that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter I have written to the President.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I have just received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to

include an editorial from the Washington Post.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee this afternoon and to include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, entitled "What Our People Want of the Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FROM PEARL HARBOR TO TOMORROW

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I realize only too well that none of us can spare one-tenth of the time he needs to read one-hundredth of the wonderful printed material which flows across our desks in a continuous flood tide.

However, once in a while I do get a chance to read some item or booklet with care and thought and when I discover a good one I want to share it with others; especially you, my colleagues, whom I know face my own problem of sorting and selecting what to read. I am happy to recommend without reservation a booklet I have just read entitled, "From Pearl Harbor to Tomorrow." It is a most wonderful day-by-day account of the first 15 months of our war. Not only is the whole publication of great interest to all of us who saw the hand of destiny at work in the dark days before the war but the booklet is well indexed, and is, therefore, invaluable for reference purposes.

James Bell is the author of this work and one of his readers who was very much impressed with the book brought me two copies and asked that I place them where they would be accessible to other Members of Congress. This I am happy to do and you will find a copy in each of the cloak rooms.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to

extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper editorial.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 40 minutes.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House of Representatives in considering an appropriation bill deprived the Office of War Information of the funds necessary to conduct its Domestic Branch. This action if concurred in by the Senate, which is presently considering the bill, will result in the complete elimination of this agency without the provision of any substitute. Indeed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] who introduced the amendment to eliminate this appropriation stated that there is no necessity for the work now being performed by this office and that the war effort would proceed more expeditiously if no similar office existed.

I do not wish to talk of the spirit of pique and legislative resentment in which the House took this action. We know that Friday was a field day for the critics and enemies of the administration. I will not even say that some of this resentment is not understandable and that a small portion of it is not justifiable but I do however think that we should calmly and in a proper deliberative mood consider now the results of the action we have taken and whether or not we have performed a service or a disservice to our country.

The following day Elmer Davis, the Director of the Office of War Information, announced that should the House provision be finally enacted into law he would have no alternative save to resign. This morning the Washington Post condemned the action of the House and pointed out the impossibility of servicing the American public with the proper news and information about the war and about the domestic front unless some office existed which could collate and assemble such information from the various agencies of the Government and also from the news sources on our battlefronts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman is doing this afternoon. In my judgment, if Mr. Elmer Davis should discontinue the work he has been doing for this Government in connection with the Office of War Information it would be a serious loss to our war effort.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman feels that way because I believe Mr. Davis is doing a very valuable work,

work we cannot afford to dispense with at the present time.

I will discuss in some detail the valuable and necessary service now being rendered by the Office of War Information.

I might state at the outset that much of this information was obtained from the Office of War Information itself and that any Member is free to challenge its accuracy.

The controlling principle of O. W. I. on the domestic front is this: "This is a people's war, and to win it they should know as much about it as they can. We will tell the people the truth and nothing but the truth. Only information of value to the enemy will be withheld."

If the domestic branch of the Nation's war information organization is abolished, will the people of this country have a clear and accurate picture of our war activities, policies, aims, successes, and failures? Will they remain, as they are now, the best-informed people in the world?

PRESS

Before O. W. I. was established a year ago, the public had lost confidence in the accuracy of military news. Newspapers were carrying the charge that the Navy was withholding news of the complete destruction of our Pacific Fleet. Another charge was that bad news was withheld until good news could be balanced with it. The people at war, ill-informed, were deeply shaken.

The O. W. I. has fought within all councils of Government for the prompt, complete, and accurate reporting of all military news. Only information valuable to the enemy is withheld. Today the American people know they are accurately informed as speedily as possible.

A year ago the press of the country was bitterly attacking the Government for conflicting statements by various Federal officials on rubber, oil, production, prices, manpower, and so on. Conflicting statements led to Nation-wide public confusion. Newspapers in all sections charged that no one could be sure that he had obtained the truth.

Today not all, but most, conflicting statements have disappeared, due to the coordinating work of O. W. I. The public knows where we stand on the battle fronts, in production, in conservation, in financing, in price control, and in all other major war undertakings.

A year ago newspaper correspondents had to work with 33 separate Federal agencies to obtain war news. Today 54 correspondents get most of their stuff from the O. W. I. central news desk.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am in accord with the gentleman's views. Right now is no time to dispense with the domestic branch of O. W. I. It is the only organization that has a well coordinated, well planned campaign to educate the people on the dangers of inflation. That campaign is to start soon, yet Congress will be in the position of not only failing to levy taxes to siphon off sufficient excess purchasing power to prevent inflation, but also to

have crippled the O. P. A., the only agency that is charged with the duty of keeping down prices. We must not dispose of the only agency which is trying to carry on a campaign to prevent inflation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. So it is especially bad at this particular time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his observation because I know this organization is going to be quite valuable also in our domestic front, although I spoke of the dissemination of foreign news. I agree with the gentleman that inflation is probably a greater danger at present than it has been at any time since we have been in the war.

RADIO

The radio industry—networks, affiliated stations, and independent stations—are devoting about \$100,000,000 in radio time to war information. The industry's desire is to help keep people accurately informed and to stress those campaigns—such as bond sales, salvage, food conservation, and so forth—which will help promote the war on the home front.

The industry depends upon O. W. I. to bring the facts together in proportion and perspective. Without O. W. I., the industry would have to work separately with 33 Federal agencies, each of which would be interested in only 1 phase of the war, and each of which would contend with the industry that its program deserved first attention on the air. The result would be chaotic. The truth is that a \$900,000 annual cost by O. W. I. enables the radio industry to do an effective \$100,000,000 war job.

ADVERTISING

The advertising industry has converted its output to war, also. About \$100,000,000 in newspaper and magazine space carries vitally helpful information on black markets, food conservation, point rationing, and so on. The advertising council obtains its basic data from O. W. I. If O. W. I. were discontinued, 33 separate departments would attempt to work directly with the advertising industry; their competitive demands would most likely cause the industry to give up in disgust.

MOTION PICTURES

The motion-picture industry is making, at its own cost, 26 special war pictures a year for use in the bulk of American movie houses. O. W. I. makes 26 also. Hence, there is 1 picture a week, on an important war topic, in the movie theaters each week. The industry favors the present cooperative arrangement. It knows that O. W. I., having sifted the needs of all agencies, is supplying it with basic facts on those war problems which can best be tackled by motion pictures. If there were no domestic branch of O. W. I., the industry would be besieged separately by W. P. B., O. P. A., O. D. T., Treasury, War Department, Navy Department, Agriculture, and other agencies. The industry would have to pick and choose, with no assurance that it was making its maximum contribution to public understanding.

POSTERS

The retail stores of the country placed their display windows at the disposal of O. W. I. One poster each week deals with a current war campaign, such as security of information, Navy recruitment, black markets, food conservation, bond sales, and so forth.

MAGAZINES, BOOKS, AND FREE LANCE WRITERS

O. W. I. does not write articles for magazines and books. But editors, publishers, and writers are constantly asking "What problems need to be explained?" O. W. I. keeps them informed and they in turn, at their own expense, do the job.

THE FIELD

Each Federal war agency has field offices. Many cities have 4 or 5 such offices and a few have as many as 15. At these field locations, 1 O. W. I. office does the information job for all. If each did its own, the cost would more than double.

ENEMY PROPAGANDA

Every American citizen may obtain enemy propaganda by radio or by reading Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo dispatches in his newspaper. O. W. I. is the only agency in America that is regularly exposing the lies and fallacies of what the enemy is saying to us.

SAVING THE GOVERNMENT MONEY

The Domestic Branch of O. W. I. costs less than \$9,000,000 a year. But its services enable the free communication media of America—press, radio, advertising, motion pictures, magazines—to do an effective job and this private effort, on war subjects alone, costs several hundred million dollars a year.

If O. W. I. is abolished, the information costs of every Federal war agency will rise. Indeed, the Federal cost will easily double, and the result, to the American people and to our free communication media, will not be half as good as it is now.

Why is it then in the face of the importance of this Office in the conduct of the war that its operation should have aroused so much resentment among the Members of the House that they would vote to discontinue its appropriation?

Several distinct criticisms have been leveled at the conduct of this Office and I will speak of each of them briefly. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] stated in a moving address that this Office had stirred up racial feeling in the South and that in consequence it was a detriment to the war effort in that section of the country. Having an appreciation of the delicate nature of this question, particularly at the present time when we read of the hideous occurrences recently in Detroit, I am constrained to sympathize with the gentleman's position. Certainly at this time no action should be taken, no word should be spoken which would alien Americans against each other on racial issues and I would not countenance any such activity. I sincerely believe, however, that there has been no intentional attempt to cause racial disunity on the part of the responsible heads of this organization. I believe that if any Member holds a different opinion and thinks that the Office

of War Information is fermenting racial discontent, Mr. Davis would give his complaints sympathetic consideration and eliminate any action which could be reasonably criticized as having this effect in time of war. I wish to comment at this point what the Director of this office himself has to say about the racial question and its connection with the operation of his Office.

Some Members of Congress have suggested that the Office of War Information intruded into racial relationships by the publication of a pamphlet, *Negroes in the War*.

This pamphlet was written specifically to point out the stake that 13,000,000 American Negroes have in the war, and to help counteract Japanese propaganda designed to foment racial discord in this country.

Obviously the responsibilities of O. W. I. to convey information about the war to the people of this country include the responsibility of providing information of particular interest to minority groups. The Negro minority is the largest racial minority in the country and has a special interest in the part that the Negroes are playing in the war effort. The purpose of the pamphlet was to indicate the advances made by the Negro people under American democracy in contrast to what would be in store for them in event our enemies should win; to point out the contributions being made by Negro citizens in professional, industrial, and military fields, and in general to foster among Negroes a feeling that they, as well as white Americans, are fighting this war. There was nothing inflammatory in the pamphlet. It was written by a well-known Negro writer and edited with extreme care by competent members of the O. W. I. staff who are thoroughly familiar with the Negro problem.

Negroes in the War is largely photographic, giving the pictures of Negro leaders and showing what contributions they were making to wartime America. The pamphlet was distributed largely to Negro religious, social, and fraternal organizations.

The most prevalent criticism, however, is that frequently heard from the Republican Members of the House. They accuse the Office of War Information of playing Democratic politics and specifically of promoting the fourth term of President Roosevelt.

If their criticisms be well taken and if this office is using its prestige and favored position to play partisan politics, I would of course agree with these gentlemen that such conduct is highly reprehensible and should be stopped immediately. I am a Democrat and a fairly consistent supporter of the administration. I am not so partisan, however, that I would deny to the Republican Members the right to protect their legitimate political interests nor do I think that a governmental office, particularly in wartime, should promote disunity by engaging in partisan politics.

Again, however, I would suggest that this charge also is entirely unfounded and largely prompted by the too tender

political sensibilities of the members of the Republican Party. There was one booklet issued by O. W. I. which portrayed and somewhat idealized the life and accomplishments of the President. This book was, however, not circulated in this country and no one charged that it was. It was sent to our foreign front for propaganda purposes, not among our own people, but among our allies and our enemies. I think that this booklet and its circulation can be defended. Whether we like it or not, the President symbolizes America to most foreign countries and I might say that his personal popularity among our allies and sympathizers does much to promote the popularity of our cause. I will agree, however, with Mr. Davis who himself has stated that in an effort to lean over backward to avoid the slightest semblance of politics that there should be no future dissemination of similar literature. Mr. Davis has this to say about political activity in his organization:

The Office of War Information has neither the inclination, the talent, nor the experience to engage in political propaganda.

The Director, moreover, has instructed the staff to take every precaution against issuing material which might in any way be construed as having a political intent. In a staff order binding on all personnel the Director stated:

It is the duty of all staff members to continue so to conduct themselves that there shall never be any basis for such criticisms, in the judgment of fair and intelligent observers. Office of War Information can no more be concerned with politics than can the Army or Navy. Our sole function is to contribute to the winning of the war.

The Director of the Domestic Branch and many members of the staff are Republican. No consideration whatever is or has been given to personal political affiliations, however, beyond the regular check to determine possible Communist or Fascist connections.

By and large the personnel of O. W. I. Domestic Branch are professional people—newspapermen, script writers, photographers, artists, motion-picture technicians, and advertising men. They are not political partisans. They are concerned only with how they can present the facts.

The information programs conducted by O. W. I. in general involve no political issues whatever—the why and how of food rationing, fuel rationing, airplane production, and similar matters quite outside the field of political controversy.

In a recent speech in Boston Mr. Davis criticized the perspective of some of the Washington correspondents. He has been subjected to attack both on the floor and in the press for his remarks. I have often thought myself that many news writers and commentators fail to keep before the people the picture of the great accomplishments which this country has performed in its conduct of the war and that they have confined their observations largely to the inevitable disagreements among the various branches of the Government and between the two major parties and also among those in administrative offices,

many of whom are nonpolitical and are drawn from business life. Whether or not my opinion is correct is beside the point. This is a matter of extreme unimportance and not even the most severe critic of Elmer Davis would state that a veteran newsman like himself had any thought whatever either in his remarks in Boston or at any other time to in any way shackle the free press of America.

Finally, I wish to speak of an address made on the floor of the House last Thursday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKIL], the burden of which was that the Office of War Information was playing Communist politics largely because it has not adopted as the policy of its office the contentions of the Polish Government in exile as to the various matters which it has in dispute with the Soviet Government.

This last attack has caused me some concern because the gentleman has always been an outstanding liberal and a supporter of the President, in addition to being a personal friend of my own. In the course of his address the gentleman has, undoubtedly in good faith, but unjustly, attacked the character and patriotism of several of the staff of this office. He moreover has adopted a position concerning our foreign policy and our relations with Russia which I consider unfortunate and one which would, if given any public support, endanger our friendly relations with that country at the time of our common battle with the enemy.

The gentleman's strictures upon the personnel of the Office of War Information do not extend to Mr. Elmer Davis, the Director, except insofar as he states that Mr. Davis has been a failure as an Administrator. I share the gentleman's praise of the high accomplishments of Mr. Davis as a correspondent and news analyst. I know that he has taken his present position with the sole motive of rendering service to his country and at a considerable financial sacrifice. I disagree with the gentleman, however, in his statement that Mr. Davis has managed his office badly and also with his statement that he has surrounded himself by incompetents and Communist sympathizers. I am personally acquainted with only one member of the staff of this office who has been criticized by the gentleman, but my acquaintance with him and my knowledge of the falsity of the accusations against him give me good reason to doubt the accuracy of his remarks about the others.

He has seen fit to attack the character and attainments of Alan Cranston, who heads the Foreign Language Division of the Domestic Branch of this office. Mr. Cranston is an experienced newsman, having been for years a foreign correspondent in Italy and London for the International News Service. I can testify from my acquaintance with him that he is capable and patriotic and also that he personally detests any trend toward communism in this country. Instead of playing down the contribution to the war rendered by the exiled governments and the people in their occupied countries, the group headed by

Mr. Cranston has continuously emphasized the sufferings and the bravery of these people who have done so much to help us with the war. I have several exhibits which I will be glad to show the gentleman, showing news releases to the foreign language newspapers in this country which emphasize the value of what is being done by the governments and people of occupied Europe. As to the insinuation of any connection on the part of Mr. Cranston with the so-called Tresca affair, which incidentally was an unexplained homicide down in New York, I shall not comment except to say that any mention of his name relative to this occurrence is absurd.

Mr. Gordon, who is criticized as ignorant of the duties of his position, as inexperienced and as communistic-minded, and whom I do not know, is, I am told, a journalist of 8 years' experience, a college graduate, a fine American, and a linguist who is conversant with several languages.

As to Mr. Hudes, whom the gentleman states was a Communist, I was told myself by Mr. Davis that he had no knowledge of any communistic connections on the part of this man nor any reason to believe him so disposed. If the gentleman is of the opinion that Mr. Hudes is guilty of subversive activities, I would suggest that he refer his name to the Kerr committee.

I am concerned also with the gentleman's complaint that the Office of War Information has not promulgated propaganda criticizing the Russian Government in the so-called Katyn massacre and in the Ehrlich and Alter case. I am convinced, and I am sure that the House will agree with me, that if the Office of War Information or the Department of State had taken the position suggested by the gentleman it would have been a serious affront to our ally, the Soviet Government, which might have been of sufficient gravity to have caused the severance of our relations with them. These are matters of such extreme delicacy that I do not think that any high Government official can risk becoming involved in them. Every responsible American writer considers the Katyn massacre story as unadulterated Nazi propaganda. As to the Ehrlich and Alter case, none of us knows all the facts, and, more than this, it so intimately involves the sovereignty of the Russian Nation that to me at least its discussion upon the floor of the United States Congress seems improper and dangerous.

The gentleman is passionately interested in a free Poland and I can sympathize with his desires. With my great friendship with those of Polish antecedents, any peace settlement which would not insure the ancient and Christian nation of Poland its proper recognition would be to me a tragic failure, but I do not propose for this reason to make public statements unfriendly to the Russian Nation on matters which should be discussed, if at all, through our proper diplomatic channels. We need friendship with Russia to beat Germany, we need friendship with Russia to beat Japan, and we need friendship with Russia to maintain a world peace.

Let it not be thought in my making these statements that I in any way condone communism at home. American Communists are in my opinion disloyal to this country in which they live, because their ultimate allegiance is not to America but to Russia and the Third International. I think they are potentially dangerous because although at present the party line demands that they cooperate with our war effort, they will surely sabotage our interests if they change the party line. My feelings in this matter and my sympathy with the future of Poland will not permit me, however, to endanger our friendship with Russia which I think we must maintain for the safety of our Nation and of the world.

So, therefore, I do not condemn the Office of War Information for its position as to foreign affairs but rather I heartily commend it for its devotion to the national interest.

I sincerely trust that whatever matters the gentlemen of the House might sincerely have in disagreement with this important Government office, they will attempt to adjust them amicably and that if we get an opportunity in the House to modify our action taken last Friday that we should reconsider the vote which we have cast to destroy a valuable public function without providing any substitute for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WASTE IN GOVERNMENT OPERATION

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently spent 10 days in my district in Georgia in daily contact and association with my constituents who form a part, and to me a very important part, of the populace of this Commonwealth known and loved by us as the United States of America. I have always been convinced that the essence of a representative form of government was a close association of a representative with his people and a first-hand knowledge of their problems, their hardships, their emotions, and reactions to the various national issues. I am more convinced than ever that any Representative in Congress to give the best representation to his people should at least have regular periodical association with his people.

I want to say to this body, and through this medium, to every taxpayer of this Government, that I saw and learned facts first-hand that were appalling, amazing, and distressing while I was in my district.

I am bringing these facts to this floor with the hope that the people who toil to furnish the money to run this Government may be awakened sufficiently that they will correct the disgraceful and shameful waste that is being committed by those in operation of the Government. I have often remarked, and I believe, that 40 percent of every dollar that is appropriated to the various departments here in Washington for their operation is wasted. This, of course, I must admit is an opinion based upon my observation since I have been in Congress, but I be-

lieve sincerely after conservative reflection that if an efficiency expert were to investigate the operation of the various departments of government that his findings would sustain my opinion above expressed. However, this is a question that at least could be considered debatable.

On the contrary, I found while on my trip away from Washington that the War Department in entering on great tracts of land and clearing same for air bases, in disregard to every intelligent impulse, and as I consider as an insult to every taxpayer of the United States, cut down hundreds upon hundreds of acres of sawmill and pulpwood timber and hired men to cut it, pile it and burn it, in the face of a great need through the country and in the war effort of sawmill timber and pulpwood, and further in the face of the highest tax assessments that have ever been levied against the people of this country. I have no way of computing accurately the actual value in timber destroyed willfully by fire, but on one air base it would certainly run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. I cannot see how any man can destroy tangible property in the face of the hardships that the citizens of this country are having by necessity to go through at this time. Just why the War Department would commit and have committed these fiendish acts of destruction in the face of a \$71,000,000,000 appropriation is inexplicable. This, of course, is a small item as compared to what has been destroyed throughout the United States by similar conduct by this Department. My colleagues from the four corners of this country have told me of similar instances. I have further been told by reliable parties that they do not hesitate to push chimneys down to large buildings of good lumber and fire them when farmers who are trying to produce for the war effort are standing by trying to purchase such lumber for badly needed repairs on their farms. I have further learned from reliable sources of this same Department piling up lumber that is left over from construction work in amounts sufficient to build several large dwellings and burning it when farmers who actually need it are asking for it; and from similar sources I have learned of near whole kegs of nails being thrown away in the face of farmers being denied sufficient nails to operate their farms.

Another fact that is rather significant is that not willfully, but as a direct result of carelessness, the Department has burned up toward \$100,000 worth of timber in Clinch County, Ga., belonging to three or four individuals in that county. I have been endeavoring over a period of several months to get the War Department to do something about fire protection for the property adjoining a bombing-practice range, and have been given the usual line of promises without any action until thousands upon thousands of acres of timber land have burned to ruin, destroying the life accumulation of the individual citizens, the direct result of gross negligence, for the payment of which damage the Government is unquestionably bound by every moral law.

I was humiliated and disgusted over other acts being committed by this Government that are unthinkable in the face of the manpower shortage existing today. I heard of many similar instances, but especially one where a turpentine operator and farmer who was cutting badly needed lumber with a small sawmill, and very properly was working a son about 15 years of age whose school was in vacation. One of these wage and hour field representatives, or whatever he may be designated, appeared on the scene and became very much alarmed over this young man performing this work, and not knowing he was a son of the operator, propounded to him many silly questions. The man who was delaying the work of these people was of draft age and by all means should be in the service of his country fighting for the freedom Americans have learned to love instead of putting about trying to take from the American citizens the privilege to work and earn an honest living. In other words, they are continually putting about the premises and agitating the employees of sawmills, turpentine processors, and other citizens who are trying to make an honest living and furnish means to others to make an honest living, and in every instance entering where there is peace and harmony and general satisfaction to go away leaving discord, dissatisfaction, and a frustrated and unproductive business.

If there has ever been a time in the life of our Nation when the taxpayers of this Nation should wake up and rout from its pay rolls parasites and demand a complete stamping out of disgraceful and criminal waste of their property and money it has now been reached. I represent a people who expect to work for a living, who always have worked for their living, and who accept as a privilege the right to work for a living, and who love their flag and the Nation it represents and are free and willing taxpayers, but a people who were born and reared in an atmosphere of honesty and sincerity, and who expect from their Government the same degree of consideration, honesty in purpose, and action that they are willing to give their Government.

I realize that there is no more waste in my district than in any other district of the United States, but I am calling upon the War Department and the Secretary of War to see that this criminal waste is stopped, and I am calling on the American people who are now being taxed to the bone and who may expect to be taxed a great deal heavier if this waste is not stopped, to demand that it be stopped.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. We are all going to have a chance to get out and see what is going on in the country in the next few weeks if we adjourn around July 3. I think the gentleman has made quite a fine statement here and we should all take it to heart.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman. It helped me to go down there

and see the fruits of our labor, to see what fruit the tree is bringing forth.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I wonder if the gentleman's inquiry regarding the waste of lumber has extended to the purchase of unnecessary quantities of lumber and timber by the War Department for the construction of large camp projects. I have been told by men in my State, who are familiar with the situation, that in some instances timber is lying idle now as a result of purchases of huge quantities that were not needed. I wonder if the gentleman can throw any light on that question.

Mr. GIBSON. I cannot. I was down there for a special purpose. I heard a great deal about such waste but I cannot verify it. What I am bringing to your attention are these things which I saw with my own eyes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PLUMLEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. FITZPATRICK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 25, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Friday, June 25, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands in executive session at 10 a. m. Friday, June 25, 1943, for the purpose of considering S. 364, H. R. 647, H. R. 2801, and various other bills. At 10:45 a. m. the committee will resume open hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1. Hon. Norman Littell will be the witness.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct fur-

ther hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

517. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

518. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the sixth bimonthly report dated June 11, 1943, on the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation from April 10 to June 11, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization; without amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3018. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; with amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2837. A bill to provide for central responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2401) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emma Hall, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: H. R. 3041. A bill to suspend the immigration of aliens into the United States during the war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3042. A bill to amend section 105 (b) of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the purpose of increasing the Government's contribution to the family allowance of servicemen having wives and children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3044. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3045 (by request). A bill to promote the welfare of persons discharged for disability from the military and naval forces during World War No. 2 by establishment in the Treasury of the emergency loan fund, Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution to provide priorities with respect to farm machinery and equipment to farmers in areas affected by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to suspend limitations on production in areas affected by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution appealing to every citizen to support our gallant airmen, soldiers, and sailors with racial cooperation at home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COURTYN:

H. R. 3046. A bill for the relief of Hershell Parrish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 3047. A bill granting a pension to Irene M. Estes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3048. A bill granting an increase of pension to Josephine Morris Rowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 3049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joe J. Svejkovsky; 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:

1735. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of Mary Albanese, requesting the passage of legislation against the return of the Japanese to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1736. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of 125 citizens of Zanesville, Ohio, urging support 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.

1737. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from F. E. Giltner, president, Massac-

County Farm Bureau; one from Ernie Harper, of Belknap, Ill.; and also one from William Maedeker, of Rosebud, Ill., earnestly opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1738. Also, communication from the Farm Bureau of Richland County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and roll-back on food prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1739. Also, communications from Fred Kotter and C. P. Fletcher, of Karnak; Allen Rottmann, Walter E. Dyer, Charles L. Adkins, Carl Baccus, and Fritz Kruger, of Metropolis; and S. A. Lynn, of Brookport, all representative farmers of Massac County, Ill., opposing the proposed subsidy and price roll-back on foods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, in a world filled with the clamor of those whose trust is in violence and with the boasting of those who reckon not with the ultimate supremacy of forces unseen and eternal, we come seeking fortitude and stability as we rest our souls in those final and vital things stronger than the noise of the world. Confront us, we beseech Thee, with a vision of Thy majesty that we may be stripped of pride and made humble and penitent.

Save us from being victims of the apparent and the transient. Give us the steady confidence that behind the unchartered riot of today there hides a power whose invisible energy is the real master of the field. May we keep that faith even when the obtrusive circumstances of the hour shriek against that creed. And so in dark and dangerous days may we still be able to utter our glad and grateful confidence:

Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident. The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 24, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Burton
Andrews	Brewster	Butler
Ball	Bridges	Byrd
Bankhead	Brooks	Capper
Bilbo	Buck	Caraway

Chavez	McCarran	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Shipstead
Connally	McFarland	Smith
Davis	McKellar	Stewart
Downey	McNary	Taft
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Mead	Thomas, Utah
George	Millikin	Tobey
Gerry	Moore	Truman
Green	Murdock	Tunnell
Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Gurney	Nye	Vandenberg
Hatch	O'Daniel	Van Nuys
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Waugren
Hill	Pepper	Walsh
Holman	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wherry
Kilgore	Revercomb	White
La Follette	Reynolds	Wiley
Langer	Robertson	Willis
Lodge	Russell	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is absent, having been directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, as a subcommittee of one, to visit the hospital ship which recently reached New York from Africa.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR WAR DEPARTMENT—IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS (S. Doc. No. 76)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, for the War Department, for the improvement of existing river and harbor works, to remain available until expended, amounting to \$7,095,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE FOR FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 77)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$12,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT IN A SPECIAL CASE (S. Doc. No. 78)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to