

against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2615. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Morrison and Noah Oil Operators, of Albion, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 3203 providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2616. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Neva Piland and others of Foll and Ozark Counties, Mo., 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.

2617. Also, petition of T. W. Endicott and others of Hbcomo and Howell Counties, Mo., 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.

2618. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others of Howell County, Mo., 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.

2619. Also, petition of Mrs. G. J. Ragain and others of Marionville and Lawrence Counties, Mo., 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.

2620. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Mrs. F. Brooks and others favoring passage of House bill 2082, 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.

2621. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Leah Sterling, of Eagle Rock, Calif., and others, approving House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2622. Also, petition of Rev. E. Dow Hoffman and others, favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., relative to care of returning disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2624. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of J. A. Fisher and 21 other citizens of Weston and Buckhannon, W. Va., favoring enactment of House bill 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities

of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2625. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. G. T. Dickinson and 49 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. Also, petition signed by J. C. Gearhart and 25 other citizens of Willamina, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2627. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. T. M. Gladden and 65 members of the First Methodist Church of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2628. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Garden City, Kans., favoring the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2629. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of H. J. Dickherber and 30 other citizens of St. Charles County, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2630. Also, petition of Morris Care, of Silex, Mo., and 43 other citizens of the ninth district, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2631. Also, petition of C. E. Schuchman, American Legion Post, No. 323, and 14 citizens of Wentzville, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2632. Also, petition of Joe H. Sachs, of Flinthill, Mo., and 28 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2633. Also, petition of Becker's Service Station, Flinthill, Mo., and 41 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2634. Also, petition of Theo. Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 23 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2635. Also, petition of Victor Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 69 other citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2636. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Sunnyside, Thorp, College Place, and Outlook, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill 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.

2637. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, committee on radio, American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Select Committee on Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

2638. Also, petition of the Cumberland United Baptist Association, Portland, Maine, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to liquor advertising in newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2639. Also, petition of the city of Waukegan, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Lake Michigan when it is at a mean level which is deemed higher than the safe conduct of interstate commerce and navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

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

Almighty and everliving God, all things wax old as doth a garment; but Thou art the same. Thy years shall not fail. Change and decay in all around we see, but Thy mercy endureth forever.

Give us the untroubled calm which illumines a faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world. May we see and know Thy word as the power of a growing seed hidden in the cleft of the rock, which presently it will split to pieces. In the light of Thy presence may we know that we live only as we love; that we are strong only as we are pure; that we succeed only as we are just and merciful and good. In this tumultuous day when the highways for Thy conquering truth are being paved even by the wrath of man, we pray not that Thou shouldst help us carry out our plans, but that we may be the willing channels for Thy redemptive purpose for all mankind. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

#### LAND IN UTAH TO BE RESERVED FOR ADDITION TO GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT, COMMISSION, ETC.

Letters from the Postmaster General, the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, and the Chairman and Administrator of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, the Office of Strategic Services, and the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

## BOXCAR SHORTAGE IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, telegrams and letters received by me from citizens and corporations of North Dakota dealing with the boxcar shortage, which is seriously interfering with the war effort.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGNITE, N. DAK., September 17, 1934.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Present railway order on boxcars discriminates against co-op elevators. This order has not been used since 1923. No reason for digging it up now. I ask only a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business. Please carry this protest to the Office of Defense Transportation and see that A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 is rescinded.

RALPH NOTMAN,  
St. Anthony & Dakota Elevator Co.

GOLDENVALLEY, N. DAK.,  
September 17, 1943.

HON. SENATOR LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.:

The grain-car situation remains critical. Those few cars available are equally distributed between the elevators regardless of volume handled. This is an unfair practice, and some of our members' patrons are forced to haul their grain to the line elevator. We would appreciate very much if you could do something to correct this unfair practice.

FARMERS GRAIN CO.

WHITMAN, N. DAK., September 10, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you do all possible to relieve grain-car shortage. Our crop only half threshed. Need cars badly.

WHITMAN CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

ROCKLAKE, N. DAK., September 11, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Car situation is terrible. Anything you can do to get more cars to move this crop should be done at once.

CROCUS FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR.

EDMORE, N. DAK., September 10, 1943.  
Senator LANGER:

I urge release on boxcars for grain.  
FARMERS SHIPPING & SUPPLY CO.,  
G. P. DAVIDSON, Assistant Manager.

ANETA, N. DAK., September 10, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Thirty percent of grain threshed. Elevators and farm granaries filled to capacity. Grain will have to be left in open if empty cars not furnished.

FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION.

KLOTEN, N. DAK., September 10, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We are not getting enough cars up here. Situation very bad. Have same corrected.

KLOTEN FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

MICHIGAN, N. DAK., September 10, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:  
Boxcar situation very critical. Something has to be done or situation will become disastrous.

MICHIGAN FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

ROCKLAKE, N. DAK., September 10, 1943.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Urgent cars be provided for grain. Threshing only starting this area and elevator filled. Only four cars received last 10 days. Three per day needed for normal shipment.

A. O. SOLBERG,  
ROCKLAKE FARMERS UNION  
ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION.

NOONAN, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

Urge fair distribution of cars on basis of volume of business. Have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded.

FARMERS CO-OP. ELEVATOR CO.,  
A. M. PAULSON, Secretary.

BERLIN, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 discriminators to large volume grain elevators should be rescinded. Order has not been used since 1923. Why use it now? We are depending on you to enter protest with Office of Defense Transportation. We want only a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business.

BERLIN FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,  
GEORGE McNALLY, Manager.

PARSHALL, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

We urge you to get railroad to rescind A. R. A. Circular C. S. C. No. 10, which discriminates against our cooperative elevator and have cars allocated on basis of historic volume. Our association has a membership of about 350 members.

PARSHALL FARMERS UNION  
CO-OP. ELEVATOR CO.

KRAMER, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence to rescind A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10. It discriminates greatly on our normal volume of business. In the past we have used four cars to our competitors' one. Please protest this discrimination to O. D. T.

KRAMER EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.  
E. F. TROTTER, Manager.

TAYLOR, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

We want fair distribution of grain cars on a basis of historic volume of business. Have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded.

FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.,  
R. INGOLD.

TOLNA, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate Office Building:

Have received only five cars for grain shipment in past 6 weeks. Must have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded at once. Protest O. D. T. unfair to Co-op elevators.

TOLNA FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.,  
F. T. PATTERSON.

SOUTHHEART, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building:

Boxcar distribution for grain. We want fair distribution of cars on basis of historic volume of business for all elevators.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE ELEVATOR CO.

ADRIAN, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
HON. SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Because of the present system of boxcar distribution by the railroads, we are filled to

capacity on grain and have had only three cars so far this month, while to the west of us our line-house competitors on the Midland Continental Railroad are getting all the Northern Pacific cars they want. Even though the Midland doesn't own any cars of their own, we who are on the Northern Pacific suffer. Our Co-op elevator stands to go under from this year's discrimination, because our customers are forced to go where they can get rid of their grain, namely, the Midland Continental Railroad. In previous years the distribution of cars depended on the volume of business done by an elevator. Now we are all equal, every one, and farmers are forced to do business and haul their grain to elevators, even against their wishes, in order to get rid of their grain. Under the present set-up of car distribution we stand to lose customers, and no doubt will wind up in the "red." We would like to have you use your honorable and good offices to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded, and protest to the Office of Defense Transportation to have the distribution of cars put on the basis of past volume of business. Thank you.

ADRIAN EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.,  
E. R. LUEDTKE, Manager.

POWERS LAKE, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

Car situation is extremely serious here. Thousands of bushels of grain are piled on the ground because our elevator is blocked. Appreciate your effort for relieving this critical situation.

LUNDS VALLEY FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

KILLDEER, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Enter protest with Office of Defense Transportation against A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10. Have same rescinded. Letter follows:

KILLDEER EQUITY ELEVATOR CO.

MEDINA, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We protest against the boxcar discrimination against the cooperative elevator. Railroads refuse to give cars on basis of past volume of business. We want nothing unfair but we ask for our share of boxcars according to the volume of business we have had in the past years.

MEDINA FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.,  
FRED KLEIN, President.

RAY, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Present railroad boxcar order discriminates against cooperative elevator companies. This is an old order last used in 1923, which does not apply to us today. All we ask is a fair distribution of cars on a basis of historic volume of business. We are asking you to protest to the Office of Defense Transportation on this unfair car distribution and that you do everything in your power to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded. Under present order a company with one house which did not operate last year is able to obtain same number of cars as we do when we have three elevators and handled over 700,000 bushels of grain last year. We vigorously protest against this kind of dictatorial ruling and are depending on you to do all in your power to abolish this order.

RAY FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

CLIFFORD, N. DAK., September 14, 1943.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You have already received information in regard to the boxcar situation our cooperative elevators find themselves up against. It seems queer that when our elevator is chuck full and Cargill is not full that Cargill should get two empties to every one ours gets. The situation is becoming desperate.

We need action and now. Put all you've got behind this and help us out.

Sincerely,

CONRAD I. RYGG.

WILLOW CITY, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Present railroad order on boxcars discriminates against cooperative elevators and this order has not been in use since 1923 and no reason for digging it up now. We want nothing more than a fair distribution of cars on basis of historic volume of business. Urging you to contact Senator WHEELER to have A. R. A. Order C. S. C. No. 10 rescinded.

WILLOW CITY FARMERS ELEVATOR Co.

EPPING, N. DAK., September 16, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.:

We feel it very unfair that present ruling of the American Railway Association, allocating empty freight cars for shipment of grain equally to all elevators regardless of volume of business. We, as a board of directors of a cooperative elevator, respectfully ask your wholehearted aid in having this order rescinded to the former method of allocation according to volume of business.

AUDRY YOUNG.  
MAURICE ARCAND.  
JORGEN HAUG.  
JOE THEIGE.  
ALVIN ANDERSON.

BOTTINEAU, N. DAK., September 16, 1943.  
Senator LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Honorable Senator, would appreciate you doing everything possible to have railroads rescind order on allocation of boxcars. We are unable to handle patrons' grain as long as this order is in effect. Thank you.

CARBURY FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR Co.

FARMERS ELEVATOR OF HAZEN,  
Hazen, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are no doubt aware of the seriousness of the boxcar shortage in this area. While we realize that not much can be done to increase the total number of cars we can get here, I am writing you to acquaint you with certain factors that are resulting in inequitable distribution of the cars we do receive in this community.

One line elevator company operating here and in nearby towns has apparently convinced the Northern Pacific Railway that a fair distribution of cars would be based strictly on the number of elevators—if eight cars were available here, two should be assigned to each of the four local elevators. This would not appear too unreasonable if it were not that this line company has two elevator buildings here, one in operation and one used for storage. Even so these two buildings have a total storage capacity of only 80,000 bushels as compared to the 160,000-bushel capacity of our one elevator including annexes.

If storage capacity is not a satisfactory basis for car assignments, perhaps volume of business for the past few years might be considered. Our volume every year has been at least double that of the line house elevator.

For these reasons we believe that assignment of cars on a one-for-one basis is decidedly unfair to us. It has already resulted in great loss of business to us since grain can be now taken only when it can be shipped out. The line house with a previous volume of less than one-fourth the local business in the past is now being handed exactly one-half the local grain by virtue of the arrangement.

We are asking your immediate consideration of this problem and we urge action that will restore to us the right to do our just share of grain buying.

Respectfully yours,

FARMERS ELEVATOR OF HAZEN,  
GOTTLÖB FROESCHLE, Manager.

BEULAH, N. DAK., September 16, 1943.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

As a cooperative elevator with over 150 producer stockholders, we hereby appeal to you to do all in your power to have the railroads discontinue their present basis of distributing box cars under a ruling known as C. C. S. No. 10 first issued in 1923, but not having been used until this year. Under this rule all cooperative elevators are discriminated against because they have in past years handled the bulk of the grain at local stations but their stockholders are now being forced to deliver their grain to rival elevators. We ask for distribution of cars on basis of volume handled and not elevators owned.

BEULAH FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR Co.,  
ERNEST R. HAFNER, Secretary.

BEULAH, N. DAK., September 17, 1943.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Mercer County Farmers Union appeals to you to do your utmost in regard to the unfair distribution of grain cars by the railroads under ruling known as CCS-10 first issued in 1923 and not used until present time. Stockholders of cooperative elevator are being forced to deliver their grain to competitive elevators. We ask for distribution of cars on basis of volume handled and not according to the number of elevators.

MERCER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,  
MAURICE PETERSON, President.

FINGAL, N. DAK., September 15, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our farmers' elevator at Kathryn, N. Dak., is having a hard time this fall because we do not get enough freight cars.

We have been informed that an old law is followed in the distributing of cars to elevators whereby the elevators all get an equal number of cars regardless of volume handled in the past, and regardless also, I presume, of the size of trade territory and number of patrons involved.

Whatever may have been the purpose back of this law when it was passed 20 years ago, (and has been disregarded in later years) it works out to the disadvantage of our company, and I presume that this is largely true of every cooperative elevator in the Northwest.

The Farmers Mutual Elevator is the only elevator at Kathryn. We have a large trade territory and a great number of stockholders and patrons.

This fall we are losing a lot of grain because we are not in position to take it all, as at times we are filled to the brim and have to wait for cars—sometimes several days. Some of our competitors who formerly did not handle a very large volume of grain must this year be sitting pretty. Ordinarily we would not begrudge them this business if it was obtained through free competition, but giving them as many cars as we get makes it a sort of a "forced feed" affair.

Yours very truly,

KATHRYN FARMERS MUTUAL ELEVATOR Co.,  
A. C. NELSON, President.

FARMERS SHIPPING & SUPPLY Co.,  
Edmore, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.  
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I, as a voter and a friend of the farmers, urge you as our Senator to help enforce a law to the effect that all railroad box cars be distributed according to historic business.

The ruling that the American Railway Association has dug up from their ancient files, known as Circular C. C. S. No. 10, is crippling our business. This order discriminates against us; it diverts our business to a rival, a detriment to our cooperative. You, Mr. LANGER, as our Senator, I would like you to get in touch with Senator WHEELER, who I believe is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ask him to investigate this procedure at once.

You as our Senator, Mr. LANGER, I would like to have you ask the O. D. T. to act. Joseph Eastman, who is chairman of the O. D. T. I believe, is a fair man and one who will act promptly when the facts are given to him.

The time to kill this order is now—not next year—and I will be writing to you and wiring you until we have accomplished our aim.

Yours truly,

G. H. DAVIDSON.

BURNSTAD FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR Co.,  
Burnstad, N. Dak., September 14, 1943.  
HON. Senator LANGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are up against a very serious problem in North Dakota this year. We have a large wheat crop and it seems as though the railroads are discriminating against the cooperative elevators in the northwest territory.

It would seem to me that the railroads should distribute grain cars according to the amount of grain that was handled by each elevator the past year. I have here before me a record of grain that was handled by all the elevators in Logan County the past year.

I will cite you one example at Lehr, N. Dak. They have three elevators and they are privately owned. They handled 257,000 bushels of grain the past year, and we handled 209,000 bushels, and we have only one elevator. Our elevator is owned by the farmers in our territory. These elevators at Lehr, N. Dak., had five grain cars on September 13, 1943, and we only had one car on September 14, 1943. I would think, considering the amount of bushels that we handled in comparison with those elevators at Lehr, N. Dak., we would be entitled to four cars to their five.

Very truly yours,

BURNSTAD FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR Co.,  
By PETER GRESS, Manager.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 426).

By Mr. WALSH (for Mr. Davis), from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 714. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the United States ship *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; without amendment (Rept. No. 427).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 428);

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; with amendments (Rept. No. 429); and

H. R. 305. A bill for the relief of Howard Morgan; without amendment (Rept. No. 430).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 862. A bill for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works; without amendment (Rept. No. 431); and

S. 1309. A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 432).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 950. A bill for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 433).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; without amendment (Rept. No. 434); and

H. R. 304. A bill for the relief of J. E. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 435).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 436).

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 30, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 881) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

## BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1407. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution providing for the retirement of Harry Colder, an employee in the Senate restaurant; to the Committee on Rules.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on September 14, at the request of the Navy

Department, I introduced a bill (S. 1353) to further amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to allowances for travel by automobile; to permit of allowances for transportation in excess of minimum first-class accommodations; and for other purposes. I find that the bill deals with all civilian employees in all departments of the Government, and, in my opinion, it is therefore not a matter for the Naval Affairs Committee to handle. I therefore ask that the Naval Affairs Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which I understand deals with civilian employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

## DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## NAVY DAY

Mr. WALSH. I ask consent to submit a concurrent resolution asking the President to designate October 27 of each year as Navy Day.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was received and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the Navy League of the United States traditionally designates October 27 as Navy Day; and

Whereas October 27 is the birthday of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, who was a staunch advocate of an adequate Navy; and

Whereas Navy Day is observed on this date because it marks the birthday of President Theodore Roosevelt; and

Whereas the Navy Department officially recognizes October 27 as Navy Day and the Navy League's sponsorship thereof: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That October 27 of each year is hereby recognized by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America as Navy Day, and that the President of the United States is requested, as Commander in Chief, to order naval units throughout the United States to assist civic bodies in appropriate observance to such extent as he may deem advisable, to issue a proclamation each year declaring October 27 to be Navy Day, and in such proclamations to invite the Governors of the various States to issue Navy Day proclamations: *Provided,* That in the event October 27 falls on Sunday, the following Monday shall be recognized as Navy Day.

## LINCOLN COUNTY, TENN., OVER THE TOP IN WAR BOND PURCHASES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have received a telegram of some importance from R. A. Largen, chairman, Lincoln County (Tenn.) War Bond Sales Committee, which I desire to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., September 30, 1943.

Senator TOM STEWART,  
Washington, D. C.:

Lincoln County, Tenn., with a population of 27,000 people, with September bond quota of \$888,000, with several districts unheard from, we have gone over the top with a total sale of \$1,083,621, which is an average of \$40 for every man, woman, and child in Lincoln County. We just wired you to let you know we are with you.

R. A. LARGEN,  
Chairman, Lincoln County  
War Bond Sales.

## INDEPENDENT BANKING—AN AMERICAN INSTITUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world likes plain-spoken, straightforward language.

Recently an American from Spokane, Wash., Eric A. Johnston by name, talked straight from the shoulder to the Association of British Chambers of Commerce.

He bluntly told his audience the differences between our two countries, and then he told of the resemblances and how we could cooperate after the war for a good world purpose.

It is about one of the differences he stressed—centralization of all power in the Federal Government—that I am now concerned.

Johnston calls attention to the fact that in Britain the financial system is practically a unit, the great banks having branches all over Britain, whereas in this country our banks are independent banks, National and State.

Recently Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in an address in Cincinnati before the bank-supervising authorities of 48 States, spoke of a "unified banking system" coupled with "well-regulated branch banking limited to trade areas."

All this means that apparently, in Mr. Eccles' judgment, we should become British-minded in our banking methods, or that our State and Federal banking supervisions are no longer functioning effectively together, and that our system of dual banking must be eliminated, with State authority supplanted by a strongly centralized authority.

It cannot be denied that a single centrally controlled national banking system would wipe out one more aspect of our traditional democratic economy. In every totalitarian country one of the first steps was the taking over of the banking and financial institutions. The control of money and credit has always been a prerequisite for a strong centralized government.

We base our Government on duality—a federation of autonomous States. Here the people are sovereign. They have given to the State governments the powers they possess. They can retake those powers. The Federal Constitution provides that all power not specifically delegated to the Central Government shall be reserved to the States.

I call attention to Marriner Eccles' statement because I do not believe that the National Government should have exclusive power in the banking field.

In other words, the States should not be deprived of their right to charter and supervise banks which are designed to look after local needs.

Marriner Eccles' idea is just another indication of the thinking of some people who believe that by centralizing more power in Washington, a better job can be done in the hinterland.

There is no better example of the fallacy of such thinking than in banking itself. The independent country banker has been one of the great stalwart forces of our country. He has been father confessor in connection with all the financial troubles of the community. To him have gone the troubled in spirit and in mind, and they have received aid and assistance. By and large, he has been faithful to his trust.

In most instances, he has grown up in the community. He knows every man, woman, and child of the community. He is in touch with the heartthrobs of the town and the village. He is interested in the economic, social, and moral growth of the town because it is his town. He is more than a money lender. He is a community builder. He is interested in church, school, and community life. He is interested in the old folks and the men and women in business, and he is interested in the youngsters who are going to school. This is his home town. Without all these ties and knowledge, without the sympathy and understanding which flow therefrom, he could not render the service he does.

Now it is proposed that his bank should simply be a branch institution, not a local home-bred institution, and, of course, the banker would be considered to be out of date, so a manager would come from some distant city. That is what Eccles was talking about.

I stress this matter at this time because in the opinion of the average American, centralization in government has gone too far. I believe that the next nominee for President on the Republican ticket will "ring the gong" if he emphatically tells the American people that, when the war is over, he will pledge himself to demobilize department after department to the extent of at least 50 percent, and in many instances more, and get rid entirely of useless agencies in government.

The people's experience with the O. P. A. and other agencies of government has been such that when the war is over they want to get rid of government interference, which after all is simply the result of centralization in government of matters which should be handled locally.

Our banking system in America is entirely different from the British system. We want to keep it different. We question all centralized dominance in government.

#### PRESIDENT VERSUS PRESS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Versus Press," published in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from Ohio is going to discuss the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Very well.

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	Gurney	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hatch	Reed
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Green	Overton	
Guffey	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent because of illness.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted an amendment intended to be offered as a substitute for the pending bill. I wish at this time to explain the intention of the proposed substitute amendment. We have been dealing with three questions. We have been dealing with deferment of registrants under the selective-service system, first, for industrial occupations; second, for dependency; third, for health. Those subjects are all dealt with in paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was last amended on June 23, 1942. It seems to me that if we are going to deal with the subject comprehensively it should be done by a redrafting of that particular section. I have attempted to do so, and to rewrite that section in accordance with the various principles which I think have been developed in the discussion here. Some parts of the amendment, which Senators will find on their desks, are simply rewritten from the existing section and are the same; the first part, for instance:

(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act, in the land and naval forces of the United States, of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

Under that section there have been deferred approximately 1,500,000 men, and it has been thought that those deferments are too numerous. I have added only one proviso to that section. In conferring with various members of the Senate we have repeatedly discussed the problem of industrial exemption; the question of whether the authorities have gone too far in that respect; the question of feather-bedding of labor; the question of employers being allowed to hoard labor which should be in the Army. Some of the Members of the Senate with whom I have discussed the question feel that industrial exemption should be entirely abolished, at least with respect to men under 25 years of age, or even under 30 years of age. On the other hand, I have discussed the question with other Members of the Senate who think that would be going too far; that there are men who, even though they are under 25 and unmarried, are more essential in industrial occupations than in the Army, particularly in the airplane plants. Therefore I was unwilling to go so far as to say that we should absolutely cut off those exemptions with a broadax. Amendments of that kind will be offered, however, and I think the Congress should consider them.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Upon the point being discussed by the Senator from Ohio, it will be noted that the deferments of registrants under 30 years of age will begin after January 1, 1944. I should like to inquire why the deferments should not begin immediately upon passage of the pending measure. It seems to me that if deferments are to be made, they should be effective as soon as possible. It would be unfair to men with dependents to take some of them until January 1 and then start deferring them. Why delay the deferments until January 1, 1944?

Mr. TAFT. This is the only restriction I have been able to convince myself should be made on the deferment of men for essential industrial occupations:

*Provided, however,* That if the registrant is under 30 years of age on October 1, 1943, he shall not be deferred under the authority given by this first sentence of paragraph (1) after January 1, 1944, unless such deferment is approved by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered—

That is the present law—

by the local selective-service board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working, and by the Director of Selective Service.

That would mean that while the local board where the individual is registered would have final say with respect to deferment, in addition to that local board's deferment he would have to get the local board in the place where he is working to say that he should be deferred, and he would have to have the deferment approved by the Director of Selective Service in Washington.

With respect to the delay in deferments until after January 1, 1944, concerning which question has been raised, I do not object to making the provision apply sooner, but a review by the Director of Selective Service of approximately from 500,000 to 600,000 individual cases will be necessary with respect to the men under 30 years of age. It seemed to me that that was such a gigantic job that probably it could not be done before January 1. However, I think we could speed it up somewhat by providing that no further deferments should be granted at this time without the approval of the Director of Selective Service.

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

Mr. TAFT. I should prefer, if the Senator from West Virginia does not mind, to finish my explanation of these subjects. I will be very glad to yield later on.

One of the reasons for providing that deferment also must be made by the local board where the registrant is working was suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. He pointed out that in many cases men are deferred by their home boards; then they go to a big city and become employed by, let us say, the Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Co., and they send back certificates stating that they are employed by the Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Co. They may be employed at sweeping out the floor, or they may be performing wholly unessential

work, and the local boards in the towns from which they come are wholly unable to determine the essentiality of that work.

The language of the amendment provides that a registrant must also obtain the approval of the local selective service board having jurisdiction over the locality where the registrant is working, the local board which can judge of the essentiality of the work, which can ascertain if the registrant is performing essential work, which can call before it officers of the plant and ascertain whether the registrant is really performing essential work. That board shall pass on the question of deferment.

Finally it has seemed to me that the Director of Selective Service should assume all responsibility for this job. We are asking him now to determine that there shall not be too many men deferred for industrial employment. It would place the Director of Selective Service also over all the Government officials. He could determine whether a man deferred in the Department of the Interior was essential.

I do not see how we can prevent the delegation of some discretion to somebody. The trouble today is that we are delegating discretion to thousands of individual boards scattered throughout the United States, many of them without the facts upon which to base their opinions, guided by very general and rather ambiguous rules as to who should be deferred and who should not be deferred. I believe we should place the responsibility on the Director of Selective Service, so if 500,000 men under 30 years of age are deferred, they are deferred only because he says they should be deferred. That first part of the amendment deals with the question of industrial deferment. I feel that it will force back into the service a considerable number of men who are now deferred for industrial occupation. I think the Senate should debate whether we should go further; whether we should say that no man under 25 years of age shall be deferred. I am afraid we would find a great many essential men who should be deferred. I do not think we should deal with the question with a broadax.

The second part of the provision deals with the question of dependents. It would do two things. First, it would put the whole matter on a national basis, on the basis of a national pool.

It is provided that notwithstanding the section of the Selective Service Act which requires State quotas and local quotas, hereafter no person shall be taken until the class which is prior to him is substantially exhausted throughout the entire Nation. It seems to me that perhaps that is the most essential thing we can do; because, although the system was all right in the beginning, today every State has made approximately the same sacrifice; but there has been so much migration—men have wandered away from the agricultural States, for instance, to the industrial States—that the result has been that many more married men are called in

the States from which the single men have migrated. It seems to me we have reached the point where we should have a national pool. That is what the amendment provides.

The categories which would be set up are categories only of men who have dependents.

The first category is that of those who have collateral dependents.

The second category is that of those who have a wife but no children.

The third category would be made up of married men with pre-Pearl Harbor children, men who are under 25 years of age on the 1st of October 1943.

Category 4 would be made up of those men between the ages of 25 and 30.

Category 5 would be made up of those men over 30 and up to 38 years of age.

Category 6 would be made up of those whose induction into the service would cause extreme hardship or privation to the wife, child, or parent with whom the man maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home. Those words are the words now used by the Selective Service System in determining who shall be considered to come within the category of extreme hardship and privation cases.

It is then provided that no man shall be taken in category 1—that is, the category of men who have collateral dependents—until substantially all the single men throughout the Nation are taken; that no man shall be taken in category 2—that is, the group of men with wives but no children—until substantially all the men with collateral dependents have been taken. That is substantially the rule of the Selective Service, except the amendment would put the matter on a national basis instead of on a State basis.

Second, the amendment provides that no man with children—in other words, no father—shall be drafted until all single men who have been deferred are taken, throughout the Nation; that no man over 25 years of age shall be taken until all men under 25 years of age are taken; that no man over 30 years of age shall be taken until all those under 30 are taken.

Finally, we have the extreme hardship cases. In a few minutes I shall speak about the reason for making the age distinction; but at this point I desire to pass on for a moment to the reason for making the physical-disqualification deferments. We have heard much criticism of the Army and Navy standards. I believe that criticism is largely justified. On the other hand, I do not see how Congress can undertake to prescribe the standards, and I do not see how we ourselves can do anything to change the result. However, we can indicate to the services and to the President that we think the question should be given the most serious consideration.

So the amendment would insert in existing law a provision that—

In order to enable the President to perform his duties under the sentence of paragraph (1)—

Incidentally, the Army and the Navy are not now given the power; but under

the Selective Service Act the power is given to the President of the United States. He could have determined those standards; he could have delegated the task to General Hershey. Personally, I myself think he should have delegated it to General Hershey. However, instead he delegated it to the Army and the Navy.

It is provided that—

In order to enable the President to perform his duties under this sentence of paragraph (1), and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President shall forthwith appoint a commission of five qualified physicians of whom at least one shall be an Army officer and one a Navy officer, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established.

Mr. President, it seemed to me that was about as far as we should go in indicating our belief that there are many men who have been put in category 4-F who should be returned and used by the Army and the Navy. Three million four hundred thousand men have been classified in 4-F, and it seems reasonable to believe that a considerable number of them may be taken.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have attempted to deal constructively with each of the three deferment questions. My feeling is very strong that there should be an age differential as between younger married men with children and older married men with children. At the request of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. CLARK) and some other Senators, I have provided for an additional category to include men under the age of 25. My original plan was simply to provide for separate categories for men under 30 years of age and those over 30 years of age. It seems to me perfectly clear that what we want to do is to get the best men for the Army. That is our whole job. This is drafting. We are not considering the general manpower question. The Selective Service Act is not qualified to deal with the general manpower question. If we are to deal with it, we should do so comprehensively, in comprehensive legislation for that purpose.

However, so far as the Army is concerned, it would seem to me that the men under 30 make more desirable soldiers than those over 30, particularly because we have already obtained most of the officers needed for the war. Today, we are dealing, practically, with privates. The chances of a man being promoted to be an officer before there is substantial fighting are rather remote. Today, we have plenty of older men available to be officers, if that is what we want; but now we are dealing substantially with privates.

Last week General Marshall testified relative to the matter of the younger

men. He was asked the following question by the senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. BRIDGES):

General, in view of the experience of the Army with younger men, the success of the younger men as contrasted with older men, do you think it would be practical to limit the father draft, we will say, from fathers between 18 and 30 rather than going up from 30 to 38 and thus get into an age class that has not been too successful?

General Marshall replied:

Well, I will say the younger soldiers are better for us to handle. Just what effect it would have in the manpower problem if you eliminated fathers over 30, I do not know. But we find it a simpler matter and quicker business to train and prepare the younger men.

So, Mr. President, if we are looking for what the Army wants, it does not want fathers over 30. It wants fathers under 30. Incidentally, there are over 550,000 under 30, so we can see there never would be need to draft fathers over 30.

There are a number of reasons why I feel differently about fathers under 30 and fathers over 30. First, I think fathers under 30 are very loath to stay at home. I think most of them feel that a certain discredit is cast upon them if they stay at home.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did not understand how many fathers the Senator said were under 30 years of age.

Mr. TAFT. There are approximately 2,000,000, but the Selective Service estimate that out of that group they would get approximately 550,000, and that is considerably more than they say they need for the present.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, I think fathers under 30 are probably rather more anxious to go than not. I do not think we shall find from them any great objection to being drafted. Certainly, Mr. President, all the protesting letters I have had seem to be with reference to fathers over 30, men who have reached a substantial position in life. After all, the men under 30 have not made very great progress, as a rule—with very rare exceptions—in their business or profession or whatever they are doing; so they would not be sacrificing so much as would those who have attained higher positions. Furthermore, they have not achieved positions in which they are so important to the business or profession they are serving. The men over 30 have reached such positions.

In other words, I do not believe we would be upsetting industry any, as a rule, by taking men under 30, rather than those over 30, because if they are essential to industry they will be deferred, anyway; and we are talking now about the fathers who are in the less-essential industries. Today I think practically everyone is essential. There are very few places where a man can be taken out without the necessity of filling his place. There is hardly a civilian activity left which cannot be said to be essential for the civilian population. It is true that many of the fathers we will

take will be in businesses, but it is unlikely that the taking of those under 30 will seriously disturb the operation of the civilian machine.

Furthermore, as a rule, the taking of younger fathers will not involve as much financial hardship, because the older fathers have usually built up a considerably greater expense. Many more of them have bought houses of their own and have to maintain those houses. Generally they are likely to have more children. They are likely to have assumed a great deal more expense than the men under 30.

It is said that the wives of the men under 30 are more likely to have very young children and cannot work, but we have made very liberal provision for the treatment of wives with very young children. We are providing day nurseries for children. We are providing care for the wives during the period of confinement.

Most of the younger wives have families. Their fathers and mothers are still maintaining homes to which they can return. That is true in most cases. One of my sons, who is a pre-Pearl Harbor father, has been in the Navy for nearly 2 years. His wife is living with her mother and father. I know of many cases in which young wives are able to return to families in which the parents are still living.

Furthermore, so far as children are concerned, the problem of delinquency, which is one of the most serious problems, relates almost entirely to the children of fathers over 30. There are few fathers under 30 with children old enough to get into the delinquent class. They can be dealt with by day nurseries and various social organizations which have been set up. If there is extreme hardship, the fathers are deferred, anyway, in category 6. That question would be determined by the local boards. So I feel very strongly that there is a marked line of distinction between fathers under 30 and fathers over 30.

I take it that the chief argument against a measure of this kind is the War Manpower Commission. To a large extent, the so-called draft of fathers is not intended to be a draft of fathers. It is intended to force fathers out of so-called nonessential occupations into essential occupations. Frankly, I think it is a very indirect way of doing it. If we are to have a labor draft, we had better set up a labor draft. Personally I am opposed to it. Personally, I do not think that the business of trying to determine what is essential and what is not essential is one which can be successfully done by the War Manpower Commission. I think of two cases of which I know personally. I know of a colored janitor of an apartment house in Georgetown, who is 36 years of age. He operates the whole apartment house, which has 50 or more Government workers living in it. He is a very competent janitor.

If he is taken away, someone else will have to be found to carry on his job. It is an essential job. I cannot see the point of forcing him to go to work in the Navy Yard making guns, something at which he would be no good and about

which he knows nothing, and putting in his place, to operate the apartment house, someone who probably would not be any good at it.

I have a partner in a law firm which is doing a very large amount of business in connection with naval ordnance. I believe he has three or four children. He is 36 years old. Someone must do that work. The work must be done by some competent person. Knowing his general physical make-up, I feel very strongly that he would be a very poor man to have in any of the so-called essential industries into which he might be forced. I do not think he would be any good as a machinist in an airplane factory. Yet that is the kind of thing which the War Manpower Commission is trying to force by using this indirect power on fathers over 30 and under 38. Incidentally, it does not deal very largely with the problem, because the problem relates to men over 30. Under the law it cannot get any hold on men over 38, who represent more than half the men with whom it is necessary to deal. I do not think it is an effective way to deal with the manpower problem.

I believe that we should deal specifically with the problem of taking men into the Army. I do not claim that my amendment would absolutely prevent the draft of fathers. I do think that it would substantially postpone such draft. If such a measure were passed by both Houses, I think the Selective Service agency would be very loath to go into the question of drafting fathers. In effect, we set out two other methods.

If it is desired to change the date from January 1, 1944, to an earlier date, I think that could be done; but so far as the general problem is concerned, I feel confident that the passage of this measure would accomplish as much as we can hope to accomplish in a legislative way. It is difficult for me to see how we can take away from the administrative authorities the final discretion to pass on the principles which we have set up as a proper basis for the deferment of registrants.

Mr. President, earlier I objected to interruptions. I am now glad to try to answer any questions as to the problems which I have discussed.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As the able Senator from Ohio knows, the provisions of his amendment have been discussed with a number of other Senators, including myself. A difference arose as to a part of the amendment, in particular, as to the authority for deferments of men under 30 years of age. Because of that difference, there was submitted today an amendment in the nature of a substitute, changing only a few lines in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the printing of the substitute submitted by me today, lines be drawn through the language of the Taft amendment proposed to be deleted, and that the language proposed to be substituted be printed over it, so

that Senators may more easily see the difference between the two proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. He provides in his amendment that men under 30 shall not be deferred unless such deferment is approved by the local selective-service board where the registrant is registered, and also by the local selective-service board where he is working, as well as by the Director of Selective Service. Has he not left us just where we are today? The deferments which are granted today are granted by the selective-service boards under the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I have left the situation where it is today. I do not claim that my amendment is a substantial revision of the principle, but I do say that today the local selective-service board has the absolute right to defer any man, and many of them are deferring men. The local selective-service board where the registrant is registered does not always know the situation. It may think that some war plant is doing a very necessary war work. It may not realize that in the whole picture it is not really so essential. The Director of Selective Service can do practically nothing about it when a man is deferred. There is provision for an appeal, but appeal is seldom taken, and the power is seldom used. If the deferment had to be approved in Washington, I believe there would be a substantial difference in the number of deferments. Furthermore, the responsibility would be placed on the Director of Selective Service, and he would have to meet the problem. I have found the Director of Selective Service generally very favorable to the deferment of fathers. So far as his own acts are concerned, I feel that he would prefer not to draft any fathers. I went to him soon after this question arose and discussed the whole subject with him. He was the one who set up this dependency deferment based on family relationship. In general, I have found him loath to resort to the drafting of fathers. He has been forced into it by the fact that many men are deferred. He has very little to say about whether or not they should be deferred. He makes general regulations. I think he should have made more definite regulations, but I believe that his general approach to the problem does not permit him to make definite regulations. However, in my amendment we absolutely put the question up to him. I believe that if the proposed legislation is enacted he will favor, so far as possible, the checking of deferments. I think he is opposed to deferments rather than otherwise. I also believe that if the responsibility is placed squarely upon him, he cannot say that he has to follow the decision of the local board. Congress has expressed a very definite policy up to this time to the effect that the decision of the local board shall be

final. That is the congressional policy, and he can rightfully claim that he is not responsible for the deferments. What the proposed act does is to say that he shall be responsible, and I believe the amendment, if adopted, would accomplish some substantial results. It may not go so far as the Senator would like to go, because I fear to go that far.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I say that I do not agree with the Senator that the language which he is suggesting could relieve the situation at all? At the present time the Director of Selective Service has over-all control of the selection and deferment of men. Rules for deferment are made in the selective service department under his direction, and to this very day we have a situation which is calling for correction. If the authority to say who is to be deferred under 30 years of age is placed in the local boards and the Director of Selective Service, I see no hope whatsoever for correction of the present situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator the alternative? The alternative seems to me to be the possible wrecking of such industries as those engaged in airplane production. Nothing is so important today as the production of airplanes by this Government. Yet, if we should take every single man under 30 from the west coast airplane plants, for example, I should not want to assume the responsibility for the resultant checking of the production of airplanes. That is what would occur if we were to follow such a course without giving someone discretion to say what men should be taken. Take the copper mines; we have to have copper as well as airplanes. I do not want to assume the responsibility of saying, "That is all very well, but so many of your men must come out of the mines or out of the airplane factories and go into the Army tomorrow." I do not want to assume the responsibility for such procedure.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Unless Congress is willing to take the responsibility of saying that so many men must go, whoever they are, there will be no relief from the hoarding of labor which we have had described to us day after day and month after month.

I do not wish to debate this question until the proposed substitute has been printed and made available to Members of the Senate for examination. However, I say that unless Congress is willing to face the situation squarely instead of leaving in the hands of draft boards the responsibility for determining the exemptions with respect to men under 30 years of age, we shall allow the situation to continue as it is today, with no opportunity for relief.

I wish respectfully to invite attention to the very able argument which has just been advanced by the Senator from Ohio to the effect that men under 30 years of



age have not progressed so far in life and have not become as settled in their occupations as men over 30 years of age, and that whenever men are called from the plants they should be called from among those under 30 years of age to serve in the military forces. That same argument applies to the taking of men below 30 years of age without dependents as it applies to those with dependents. If the decision on this point of deferment for occupation is left entirely to the draft boards, as it is at present, we cannot hope for any relief in the situation. We must be definite in saying who cannot be deferred. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is not definite. The substitute I shall offer is definite.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree that we cannot hope for any relief. I think that substantial relief is provided in my amendment. Personally, I hesitate to go further than the amendment provides. If the Senate wishes to go further it can vote to do so. It is a very simple matter to amend the amendment in the nature of a substitute, or adopt the Senator's proposed substitute in order to make a broadax cancelation of exemption of certain groups which we might wish to designate.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that I had been on my feet earlier awaiting the opportunity to speak with reference to this particular point. I should like to press it with this thought in mind:

On page 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, in lines 4 to 12, inclusive, we find a proviso. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Ohio that all three agencies mentioned in lines 8 to 12, exclusive, must concur before an applicant may be deferred?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. That would apply after January 1, 1944. I feel that it would take some time to set up the system, and that it would probably require some personnel to recheck about 600,000 cases. However, all agencies must concur. If a man desires to be exempted from military service he must "sell" his board at home, as well as the board nearest to where he is working, which may examine into the conditions of the plant where he is employed, and determine whether he is really an essential worker in the particular plant. The board at home usually cannot do so. Third, the exemption must be approved in Washington or by some agent of the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. DANAHER. Let us assume that a board in Maine, for example, says that Joe Doe is now earning \$150 a week in an airplane plant in Connecticut, which is a great deal more money than he used to earn in a month in Maine. Let us assume further that he is sending \$140 of his pay to his home and living on the

remaining \$10 of his salary, and some are living on just about that amount.

Mr. TAFT. From what the Senator is saying, it must be cheaper to live in Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. It is, the way some of them are living. The local board says, "We are going to grant that man deferment, because certainly he is an essential worker." The board in Connecticut says, "This man never saw a grinder, a polisher, or a planer; he does not know a mill machine from a broom handle, and he never worked in a factory in his life until a month or 6 weeks ago, and we know that he is not an essential worker." Under those circumstances does the Senator from Ohio mean to say that by the proposed amendment he would impose on the respective boards the administrative burden of adjusting and reconciling the matters involved in the man's application for deferment?

Mr. TAFT. No; if any board should veto the application, the man would not be deferred, or if the selective service vetoed his application he would not be deferred. In other words, if he wished to be deferred he would have to obtain the consent of all the agencies involved before he could be deferred. If any board says, "No," he is through. That is the intention of the language.

Mr. DANAHER. If the call in any given month is for 25,000 men, is it the purpose of the Senator that the Selective Service may go wherever the 25,000 men can be found and take them into the Army?

Mr. TAFT. At the bottom of page 3 the Senator will see the following language:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, induction into the armed services shall be upon a Nation-wide basis.

The intention of the clause which I have just read is that section 4 (b) is not to be repealed. It would remain. The quotas would remain. But if the quota of men in category I is exhausted a board cannot be called upon for any more men, in spite of the general provisions of the act, until all the other boards in the country have exhausted their quota of men in category I.

Mr. DANAHER. Taking that explanation of it, does not the Senator see that the administrative burdens will be so vast that a man may properly say, "You have no right to induct me into the armed services of the United States until proof is established that Colorado, Ohio, or Indiana cannot meet these requirements?"

Mr. TAFT. I do not think any court would stop on that ground. If the Selective Service Bureau can say that substantially all the men in that group have been taken I do not see how there is any chance of holding up deferment. The amendment does not say "all." It says "substantially all."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There is so much that is fundamentally reasonable and

logical about the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio that I should hesitate to be thought to reject it. I should like to know, though, whether or not he has given any consideration to accomplishing this general result on a State basis rather than on a Nation-wide basis.

Mr. TAFT. I have found in talking to Senators that one of the things they are apparently most set on is the establishment of the quotas on a Nation-wide basis. I think the system ought to be on a Nation-wide basis today. I do not know that it should have been in the beginning, but today I think it will be found that in one State, for instance, it will be necessary to take a great number of married men, while in another State there are single men left. That situation has gradually developed by the migration of labor and by many other circumstances. I believe that the draft ought to be on a Nation-wide basis, and I may say that, so far as I can discover—and I have tried to talk with as many Senators as possible—that is the view of most of the Senators. I have not been particularly trying to present my own views on this question but I have been trying to get the consensus of the views of the Senate in order that we might approach this whole problem from a constructive standpoint without interfering with the men whom General Marshall says he needs.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In connection with what the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has said, it seems to me that the objection raised by the Senator from West Virginia is very largely cured by the provisions of the substitute of the Senator from Ohio, first, that there shall be established a national pool; and, second, that not only the local board of the place of residence of the man claiming deferment but the local board where the man is proposing to work shall also be required to grant deferment.

This situation has come to my attention many times; I have called attention to it on 2 or 3 previous occasions; am very familiar with it, and it seems to me that it constitutes one of the greatest loopholes in the Selective Service. For instance, in the St. Louis metropolitan area there are some 590 industrial concerns engaged in war work for whom the deferment of employees engaged in essential work is entirely proper. But we have the situation of people coming into St. Louis from rural Missouri, southern Illinois, Arkansas, Tennessee, and, in some cases, from away down in Mississippi, who get a certificate, say, from the Curtiss-Wright Co.—I am simply using that as an example—that they are in the employment of the Curtiss-Wright Co., and they send it back to the local board and get a deferment, when, as a matter of fact, they may be engaged in mowing lawns, sweeping floors, or as timekeepers, or some other work entirely

unessential. The local board might say they were not doing essential work and might be replaced by old men or boys or women. It seems to me that the provisions of the substitute would cure that sort of a situation. I am informed and believe that the number may run into many thousands who might properly be inducted into the armed forces.

I think the best feature of the substitute is the provision for a national pool. It may have been entirely proper originally that the Government set up the theory of a local pool, but I think that time has passed and the local pool theory has exhausted its usefulness. I think everybody is agreed that if married men have to be taken, if it is necessary to have married men for the successful prosecution of the war, they simply have to be taken, and if it is necessary to take men from 50 to 60, they also ought to be taken; there can be no controversy about that. The only question is as to whether the quota of men who ought to be in 1-A has been exhausted; and it seems to me the men in 1-A ought to be exhausted before married men with children are taken. But the provision of the substitute of the Senator from Ohio creating a national pool and the provision requiring a check-up by the board at the place where the man is employed will go very far to straighten out the situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am in hearty accord with the statement of the Senator from Missouri that selection of men for the service should be from the Nation at large for the Selective Service Act is national in its scope. Furthermore, I am in thorough accord with the view expressed that there should not be exemption from the service of men who are needed. The question involved is on the taking men from civil life and placing them into the armed services in an orderly manner and in a way best suited to the welfare of the country.

But I do not agree with the position that having two selective service boards pass upon deferments is going to relieve the situation that exists today. Most of the deferments granted by selective service boards are upon the request of the employer. If one board will grant it on request of the employer, why will not the other board likewise grant it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is a great deal of difference between a board in Arkansas, Tennessee, or Mississippi taking a blanket certificate of an employer and a board in St. Louis that can go to the plant and see what a man is doing.

In that connection, I want to say another loophole I have discovered in the administration of the Selective Service Act, if the Senator from Ohio will permit me—I do not want to make a speech in his time, but am rather thinking out loud—grows out of the lack of personnel and the lack of machinery for checking these things. For instance, as I said a moment ago, in St. Louis five-hundred-

and-ninety-some plants are located, and from those plants perhaps 30 percent of industrial deferments in the State of Missouri arise. Such deferments have to be passed on, and, so far as any check from the Selective Service itself is concerned, the requirements of the various companies as to what they should have in the way of deferments is in the hands of one officer. He happens to be an excellent officer; he used to serve in the same outfit where I served, and I know him very well; but one officer comes down from State headquarters on Tuesday and stays in St. Louis until Friday, and then goes back to State headquarters; he has one stenographer, and it is absolutely impossible for him to make an adequate check of the requirements of all those industrial plants. Congress has never been niggardly to the Selective Service in giving it money and machinery to carry out equitably and fairly the provisions of the act.

Mr. TAFT. The trouble is not so much that. The Congress has said that the Selective Service may appeal from the decision of the local boards but that the local boards shall be really the determining factor.

The effect of this amendment is to put the responsibility on the Selective Service. We have got to give them the money they have said they need in order to check these things. Every case has got to be checked—there cannot be a "spot" check—and the requirement is on the Selective Service Director himself that every case must be checked, and he is going to be able to do so the better if he has more personnel.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me see if I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Ohio. Take the case from St. Louis which the Senator from Missouri speaks about. Undoubtedly there must be many men under 30 years of age in the plants of St. Louis who reside and work there and who would be affected by only one draft board under the plan of the Senator from Ohio. In such cases there would be no change from the present law. In fact, I do not think there is any practical change even in those cases where two Selective Service boards pass upon whom may be deferred for industry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia, if the Senator from Ohio will permit me, that in that particular instance there has been organized a body formed of all the draft boards in the St. Louis metropolitan area, which includes a considerable territory outside the confines of the city of St. Louis. The board meets once a week, agree so far as they can as to uniform methods of taking men, and they have been very assiduous in their check of the essentiality of the men they have deferred. I have attended meetings of that organization. I attended one at which I suppose 300 members of draft boards were present, and they all stated instances that came to their notice of men who were working in an essential industry but not engaged

in doing essential work, over whom they had absolutely no jurisdiction and no right, I think, to make any check or to change their deferment status.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say that my whole point is that more men are needed, and that it would be better to take from the plants and the mills men under 30 who have no dependents, who are physically and mentally qualified, than it would be to take men with dependents and families. That is the whole point that is involved.

I oppose the plan of the Senator of Ohio, because I want the Selective Service officials to be required to first take men under 30 who have no dependents before taking men with dependents into the Service. And to that end I will introduce a substitute for the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is wrong in saying that the local boards pass upon the cases. I read from the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs:

Senator WHEELER. Now, Mr. Baruch, I was in one of these plants in California where the president of an aircraft factory told me that the average man in that plant was 24 years old. Now what happened? When the draft came on these young men who were about to be taken into the Army, these single men, flooded into those factories. They were attracted by high wages, and they were attracted by the fact that it would enable them to evade the draft. I know that from many things.

The general word went out to all the young men in this country, when the draft law was passed, that if they went into essential industry, they would not be taken into the armed forces. That was the general word which went out all over the country. I stated at the hearing:

Whereas the married man with a family stayed home and stayed on his job.

He was not to be taken, but the young unmarried man was to be taken. I read further from my inquiry of Mr. Baruch at the hearing:

It has been called to my attention, and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado has also had it called to his attention, that married fathers couldn't get jobs because of the fact—

Mr. BARUCH (interposing). There was no general deferment in the aircraft factories until recently.

Senator WHEELER. You say there was not any deferment until recently?

Mr. BARUCH. Not until recently, because that was the chief thing manufacturers were objecting to. If they do get deferment, they are supposed to move as fast as they can—

Senator WHEELER (interposing). I think you are wrong about that, Mr. Baruch, and I would like to ask Colonel Keesling. How long has it been that single men in aircraft factories have been deferred?

Colonel KEESLING. Right from the start, provided they were irreplaceable.

Mr. BARUCH. Provided they were irreplaceable.

Senator WHEELER. Yes, exactly; but every one of these boys, every one of these men, when he goes into that plant gets an order from his boss saying that he is irreplaceable.

Mr. BARUCH. That is a lot of nonsense, because the local board ought to see that he is replaced. He gets his deferment from his local board; he can't get it from anybody else.

Senator WHEELER. But the practice has been, Mr. Baruch, that if the manufacturer and the mine operator go to the local board and say that these men are essential—

I know of innumerable cases in Montana where young men have gone to Los Angeles and other places on the Pacific coast. They are told by their local boards, "If you want to be deferred, the thing to do is to get into a war industry." They return with letters from their boss or someone else saying that they are working for a war plant, and they are deferred. That is exactly the situation, and my position is supported by Colonel Keesling, who has said that has happened from the beginning.

Mr. TAFT. There is no doubt that, under the law, the local boards have deferred men who were supposed to be essential. I have no doubt that a very large number of local boards have been very stiff, and that the Senator himself, if he were on a board, would have granted the deferments the boards granted. On the other hand, there are many others which are careless, and there are others which should be checked and controlled much more than they are today; and that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. The point I make, however, is that the local boards were told from Washington to defer the men if they went into war industries; and they were deferred. It was not the local boards which wanted to defer many of these men. They were told, and the word went out all over the country, that if a young man went into a war industry, he should be deferred. The result has been as I have stated, for instance, in the factory to which I referred, the largest airplane factory in the city of Los Angeles, which I visited.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is wrong, because I have had protest after protest from industrial employers that men who they thought were essential have been drafted anyway. I do not believe there has been any general rule that anyone who went into an essential industry should be deferred.

Mr. WHEELER. The word went out.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know where it went out, but it did not reach most of Ohio, because in Ohio man after man has been drafted from essential industry. I think reliance is placed on the boards. Some boards are stiff and some are not. I think we can stiffen up the system, but at least I am not prepared to abolish it.

Mr. WHEELER. Colonel Keesling said, "Right from the start, provided they were irreplaceable," and the decision was with the employers as to whether the men were irreplaceable. If they said the men were irreplaceable, the boards had nothing to do except to accept them.

Mr. TAFT. I have but one final word to say. The amendment I have offered presents three or four points, and I think there will be agreement in the Senate on most of them. The only point of controversy will be over industrial deferments, and I think that will be worked out and an agreement reached. If so, I am very hopeful this approach to the problem may be taken by the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he would put the matter off until January 1. If the present policy is to be carried out, between now and January 1, 446,000 fathers will be drafted. General Marshall has said that as of January 1 he hopes not to have to take any more men, but my information is that the Selective Service thinks that if something is not done to change the situation, if the standards are not lowered, every father who is physically fit will be taken either into the Army or the Navy.

#### INVESTIGATION OF WAR MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 183), as follows:

*Resolved*, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the entire war manpower problem, to consider all reports thereon and information with respect thereto, and to assemble and submit to the Senate in compact form all pertinent data and information in order that the Senate may have a composite picture of the manpower problem, and be in a position without undue delay to devise and pass necessary legislation to meet this problem, thereby removing existing confusion and improving the effectiveness of our war effort. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, in considering the pending bill, which provides for exempting from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 certain married men who have children, we are confronted with the testimony of General Marshall, Admiral King, General Hershey, and other

prominent members of the armed services, as well as the testimony of other men, notable among whom is Mr. Bernard Baruch, who urges that we either support General Marshall's request or remove him from his present position.

I have great confidence in General Marshall and Admiral King. If I were in the service I should be proud to serve under either of them and should certainly carry out their commands and orders implicitly. I know the duties of a soldier—I have been one—but as a Member of the United States Senate I have a duty not only to the generals and the admirals and all the men and women in our armed services, but to all the people of the United States, including approximately 125,000,000 not in uniform.

It is the duty of the heads of the armed services to wage war, and because of the global nature of this war, the distances, and the difficulties of transportation of men, material, and supplies, and the fierceness of our enemies, from the very outset the heads of the Army and Navy have made extravagant requests for every kind of materials and supplies. As a result, we are overproduced in many things. We are overbuilt and overexpanded in many facilities for producing munitions in this country. Countless instances have been disclosed where the armed services needlessly hoarded strategic materials which up to this time have not been used, and quite likely never will be used.

Now comes the request for additional men for the armed services. The controversy hinges around whether or not we should immediately, and without further investigation or survey, allow the drafting of men who have fixed responsibilities incurred by marriage and the birth of children before December 8, 1941. I do not criticize General Marshall for his demand for every available physically and mentally fit man to wage war under his command. As a soldier, he frankly admits that his duties are those of a soldier, and when asked whether he would recommend the drafting of married men, his reply, in substance, was that whether married men were drafted or not was a problem for another branch of the Government, namely, the Manpower Commission; and, of course, the Manpower Commission will decide, under their present attitude and intention, to take the married men, because General Marshall says he needs a given number of men.

I believe, and I have always believed, that it is the duty of every man in the country, once his Nation has been attacked by a foreign foe, to defend his country in every possible way, even to the extent of laying down his life in battle. That is not only my personal view—it is the view of my family which has a record of 100-percent voluntary service for active front-line duty.

However, because this war is so vast, carried on at such great distances on so many fronts, there will come a time when we must decide as free people the amounts of money, materials, or men we will supply in the best interests of our country to bring about ultimate victory

and the best results that can be obtained thereby. When it was stated by General Marshall during his testimony that every person in Russia is in the war, we commend that as being admirable. Few events in all history command more genuine admiration than the heroic fight waged by the Russian armies and people against the formidable military machine of Adolf Hitler. But we might, with good grace, I believe, remember that Russia was an ally of Germany at one stage of this war, and every man in Russia is fighting now because Germany has attacked and invaded Russia. I am sure that if an enemy were invading and occupying part of our country and threatening our very existence, every man, woman, and child in America would be fighting—even with pitchforks, if necessary.

I can readily see that if we were invaded, we might, to a large extent, all be brought under the control and commands of military necessities and leaders. That time, thank God, has not yet arrived, and I believe, therefore, it is the solemn duty of the Congress of the United States to perform its constitutional functions of raising and maintaining an Army in the name of the people; and that includes the determination of who shall serve at any present moment in the Army.

Everyone will agree that fathers have a great responsibility the moment their children are born. That responsibility is that of a father in peacetime as well as in war, and the home provided by that father is the backbone of the civilization we are defending at the present moment.

I agree that fathers have more to defend than those who have no such parental responsibility, but the thing for us to consider what will be the effect on the morale and morals of this Nation at the present time of breaking up 446,000 additional homes where there are fixed expenses and definite obligations which cannot be met under any stretch of the imagination on the salary of a private soldier and the allotments the Congress has thus far seen fit to provide.

Certainly, all our people cannot be transformed or converted into an armed force; some must be left at home to maintain the production lines and support the elements of our governmental and civil functions.

Remembering that General Marshall demands a given number of men, I call to the Senate's attention the survey made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, after careful study, recommends at once the reduction of the employees in the vast bureaucratic Government by 300,000 persons. I call to the attention of the Senate the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] of the flagrant hoarding of labor in industrial plants throughout the country. I call attention also to the reports which have come to each of us, in various forms, of the lack of efficient employment of the millions of men already in the armed services within the confines of the United

States. I believe it is the responsibility of Congress now to conduct an exhaustive and complete survey of the bureaus, industrial plants, and of the men in the armed services in the camps of the country at the present time, to determine within the next 3 months whether there are not available an adequate number of men who do not have the additional responsibilities of supporting wives and families.

General Marshall testified that there are some 700,000 fathers serving in the Army now. Admiral King testified that there are approximately 170,000 fathers in the Navy. We have now close to 1,000,000 fathers serving in our armed services. God bless them.

If the time ever comes when an intelligent and efficient defense of this country cannot be maintained and victory cannot be assured without the drafting of the remainder of the fathers, no one could reasonably object to that being done. But upon the showing thus far made, I believe it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to make a complete survey of the manpower problem before we break up 446,000 additional American homes.

The statement that the Congress should blindly follow the advice of our military leaders on any matter which so vitally affects both the home front as well as the military front, has no more weight, in my judgment, than the statement that the courts of our country should cease to function and let the military leaders determine the justice that is to be meted out to our citizens. We should consider expert military and naval advice, of course. We should weigh it and then perform our responsibility of determining for ourselves whether the demands for men for active military service cannot be adequately filled from the available men not having wives and children to support.

I realize that we cannot measure liberty in terms of dollars—and those who face their death in front-line service to defend those of us who remain safely at home can never be adequately compensated in money—but prudent men must determine how much our Government is going to pay for the military service of any individual soldier. The supply of officers is already adequately met, in fact, many of the services are reducing the number they have already started to train. Consequently, there is little need for these fathers to become officers, and at this late hour there is much less chance for them to advance in the early stages of their service to the position of a commissioned officer. Therefore, they will be required to accept \$50 a month as a private soldier's pay, and a man with a wife and three children by making his \$22 a month allotment for his wife and children will receive from the Government \$82.

We are already besieged by labor which, while making the highest wages ever known in history, is demanding that we appropriate vast sums of money to roll back by subsidies the cost of its living. If at its high wages labor com-

plains, how, then, can we expect a man's wife and three children to maintain even a semblance of decent living conditions on \$82 a month.

Already both Houses of Congress have passed a bill providing for over \$18,000,000 in additional appropriation for the minimum care of the pregnant wives of the men who are now in the service. There will be an immediate demand, and in my judgment a justifiable demand, for greatly increased allotments for the wives and children and other dependents of servicemen; and on the basis of cost per man alone, we have a responsibility to determine just how much we should pay for the services of any one man in the ranks of the Army of America.

I understand that our devoted friend and most desirable neighbor to the north—Canada—has not yet drafted married men for overseas service. I understand that only one of the South American countries even contemplates raising an army for overseas service. I understand that Australia limits, in the main, the services of her men to the immediate area of their own land.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have been generous beyond all imagination to all of these countries in our lease-lend program, plus the fact that we have millions of our men now overseas defending all of these countries, as well as our own, I believe that it is now, at long last, time for us, as the representatives of our people, to resurvey the entire manpower question of this country, as it relates to the efficient prosecution of the war. Then, as Congress—not as military men, but as the representatives of all the people of America—we should lay down the definite and positive rules for the future selection of the manpower of this country for the military services, and thus end the unconscionable confusion which is being imposed upon our people.

I yield to no man in my willingness to lay my own life upon the altar of our country's defense. I do not pretend to be a military strategist or expert. I do not pretend to tell General Marshall what size Army can be most profitably utilized. But I do say that we, as Congress, in representing all the people, have a positive and definite responsibility to see that when we scrape the bottom of the barrel to get the available men for military service we send the best men for that purpose, and at the same time safeguard the homes of America. While I respect the advice of our military leaders, they are not infallible. They requested that in the Selective Service Act we provide for the drafting of men between 38 and 44 years of age. Later they found that was a mistake. They took such men for limited service, but, after 2 years of training and service, many of them are being discharged.

I could speak for an hour upon the blunders thus far committed in the prosecution of this war, but in the main they have caused only the depletion and loss of money, materials, and jobs. But if we blunder now, we shall certainly disrupt almost one-half a million homes, and that will have its lasting effect upon the

future generations of America. Such a blunder I do not believe we can afford.

It is apparent that as we go forward with the war our military and naval leaders will demand the maximum of available men, and military men in charge of our Selective Service will continue to issue the orders. Industrial plants, headed by men seeking to meet their schedules, and anxious for further contracts, will keep men, even to the extent of hoarding them. The vast bureaus of our Government will continue to keep as many men as they possibly can. There will be increased demands for labor to make up for the constant depletion of the groups engaged in our food production. Never in history has there been such a strain and drain upon the material and human resources of America; never in history has the Congress, elected to represent all our people, had such a tremendous responsibility as that it has now. We should immediately create a committee to coordinate the splendid and outstanding work and discoveries of other committees, and to recommend, after careful study, definite over-all rules for the utilization now of the manpower of our country within the ages set by our present Selective Service Act. If we do not do that, we shall soon find that we shall have failed to such an extent that we shall be confronted by new and unprecedented demands for the control of the entire population of America. That, too, will undoubtedly be recommended by the solemn testimony of military and naval leaders as being absolutely necessary. Congress has a desperate responsibility to perform now concerning the conduct of our over-all war effort.

After sending \$15,000,000,000 worth of war materials, munitions, and superior weapons of every type to every battle front, followed by millions of our fighting men, I think the time finally has come for us to determine how far we should go in breaking up an additional one-half million American homes, to dispatch men with troubled minds to the far corners of the earth, leaving at home inadequately provided for families.

Mr. President, I ask that my resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs as the proper committee handling the manpower question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that matter was presented to me today. I think the Committee on Interstate Commerce would have equal jurisdiction. While it is true that the Committee on Military Affairs has treated this subject largely, yet the matter of manpower has now become more or less of a national, interstate, and State problem.

The only purpose in having the resolution referred to one of the regular committees is to have such committee consider whether the resolution should thereupon be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for the purpose

of having it provide the funds for the committee to be appointed by the Vice President. So no question of jurisdiction is involved there, insofar as concerns the matter of dealing with the problem of manpower. The question of jurisdiction applies only to the matter of the reference of the resolution to one of the standing committees, which, in turn, would have the duty, if it saw fit to report the resolution favorably, of referring it to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, when the resolution reached the floor a while ago I requested that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and also so specified in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois requested that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee; and, by vote of the Senate, the appropriate committee has been designated as the Committee on Military Affairs. Does the Senator from Oregon make a motion?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Chair does not understand my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator's position; but there is nothing before the Senate unless the Senator makes a motion.

Mr. McNARY. My point is that it is not necessary to do so; I am not bound by the attitude of the Senator from Illinois. I am speaking for myself. I specified, in my own right, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator so specify in the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. It is in my own handwriting. I asked that the Vice President appoint a special committee. All that the regular committee to which the resolution might be referred would do would be to refer it to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It is for that reason that I requested the specific assignment. I shall not be insistent as to that, but I know whereof I speak. That is why I asked that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to be referred from it to another committee. If that is done, the resolution will subsequently be referred to the special committee to be appointed by the Vice President, under the resolution of the able junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has not yet been recognized.

Mr. WHEELER. I thought I had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I desire to say that I find myself in disagreement with the able minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I think the Chair is correct in his reference of the resolution to the Committee on Military

Affairs. That committee has had jurisdiction over resolutions and proposed legislation dealing with manpower. The committee has had many hearings on the subject of manpower. As the Chair has reminded the Senate, some months ago, during the present session of Congress, in January or February, the question arose as to whether the Committee on Military Affairs should handle certain matters with reference to manpower, or whether the Committee on Education and Labor should have jurisdiction over such manpower matters. In the previous Congress the Committee on Education and Labor had held very extensive hearings on the manpower problem. In spite of the fact that the Committee on Education and Labor had held such hearings, extensive though they were, the Senate, by vote, decided that the question should be referred, not to the Committee on Education and Labor, but to the Committee on Military Affairs. All matters dealing with manpower have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It seems to me that the Chair is absolutely correct in sending this resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my very able and distinguished friend from Alabama misunderstands the philosophy involved. The resolution does not pretend to ask any standing committee of the Senate to make the investigation. Authority is conferred upon the President of the Senate to appoint a special committee for that purpose. So his argument is wholly without foundation. The only question involved is whether the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for authorization of an expenditure of \$2,500. That is all that is involved. The question has nothing to do with jurisdiction. It has nothing to do with the study which the Military Affairs Committee has heretofore made. If the resolution provided that some standing committee of the Senate should make the investigation, properly it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs; but that is not what we are discussing. The investigation, if it is made at all, will be made by a special committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the resolution has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who submitted the resolution asked that it be referred to the appropriate committee, and the Chair has ruled that the appropriate committee is the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, it is within the discretion of the Chair to make the appropriate reference. The question is not very important; but I was trying to make the distinction between a matter referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and then referred, and a matter referred to a special committee having jurisdiction. How-

ever, the Chair does not understand, so I will not proceed further.

The resolution (S. Res. 183) was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, first of all let me say that the only reason for introducing my resolution at the outset was the fact that in February of last year, when the question arose with reference to drafting fathers, I introduced a bill to prevent the drafting of fathers. After that time I frankly stated that what I wanted was to have an investigation by the various departments of the Government of the question of deferring the fathers of the country until such time as the various departments themselves, realizing what the situation was, could investigate the manpower problem and take draft dodgers and slackers out of industry and out of the Government bureaus and put them into the Army, where they belong. Nothing was done about it.

The other day the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]—I am sorry he is not now present—made the statement that I was wrong in my views before Pearl Harbor, and that I am wrong now.

Mr. President, I am willing to let history determine whether I was wrong before Pearl Harbor, when I said that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war. Mr. Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job." I am willing to let history say whether I was wrong in saying that they would first say, "Give us the tools," and then would say, "Give us the men." Now it seems that they not only want the boys, but they want the fathers.

The other day I received a letter from a prominent industrial leader, the president of a railroad. He said, "They not only want the fathers, but they will probably want the mothers as well."

I am willing to let history determine whether I was right in the statements which I made. I am willing to let his-

tory decide whether I was right when I said that we should defer the fathers of this country because so many men in industry have been deferred. They are deferred for two reasons. Fortunately, some labor unions are opposed to the deferment of young unmarried men in industry and the induction of the fathers of the country; but some labor organizations have worked hand-in-glove with industrial leaders in hoarding labor, because the more men who are on the payroll the more dues will go into the treasuries of the labor organizations. I am glad to see that some of the labor unions are beginning to realize what it means to the labor unions themselves if they pursue the policy of hoarding labor, particularly young single men, when boys are dying on the battlefields all over the world.

What will the boys who come back, some of whom will be wounded or dying, say when they see young men whose average age is 24 being hoarded in one of the largest airplane factories in this country, where they went for the specific purpose of avoiding the draft? What will those boys say when they see other young men hiding in the Government service and in industry? What will they say to the industrialists who are hoarding labor? What will they say to some of the labor leaders who are standing by and permitting it to be done?

Let me call attention to General Hershey's appeal last night. General Hershey is finally saying exactly what I have said on the floor of the Senate. It is an admission that I was right. I read from an article in the New York Times of October 1. The headline is, "Hershey appeals in deferment cut. Fears breakdown of public morale unless employers release single men."

I have stood on the floor of the Senate and said that when we draft fathers and let single men hide behind draft deferments in industry and in the Government service, we break down the morale of the people of the United States and the war effort as nothing else under the sun could do. Why is it that I am receiving letters from members of draft boards from one end of the country to the other, saying that they are resigning from the draft boards? Why is it that they are saying that they are going to quit entirely? Some of them are saying that they defy the Government to take them. It is because of the fact that they know that in their particular communities, from one end of the country to the other, the morale of the people is breaking down when they see what is going on right under their noses.

I read from the New York Times article of October 1:

With the father draft on its way, a breakdown in public morale is likely unless employers stop asking for occupational deferments for single men merely because it is convenient for them to do so, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey declared yesterday. His warning was addressed to 2,000 personnel executives at the closing session of a 3-day conference on manpower stabilization conducted in the Hotel Pennsylvania by the American Management Association.

Taking management to task for flagrant abuses in asking for occupational deferments for single men, General Hershey called upon employers to make superhuman efforts to see that no deferment is requested for any man capable of rendering military service unless the job must be done and can be done by no other available person.

If General Hershey had taken that position, if the War Manpower Commission had taken that position, and if the district draft boards of the country had taken that position at the outset, and said to the local draft boards, in effect, "You cannot defer these single men," and if they had made a check-up on the various industries from one end of the country to the other, we would not be in the position we are in today, and fathers would not today, October 1, 1943, be inducted into the armed services.

Members of the Senate of the United States have said to me, "Well, it has already been done, and what can you do about it? We have to draft fathers." They have said, "We do not want to assume responsibility in connection with this matter." They do not want to take the responsibility for it. Well, whose responsibility is it? When Senators speak of not assuming responsibility, I admit that the responsibility rests with the various executive departments of the Government from the President down. If the President has serving under him incompetent men who have not done their duty, he, not the Congress of the United States, is responsible for keeping them in office. So the responsibility for the break-down in the manpower situation in the United States today rests squarely upon the shoulders of the President of the United States, and it cannot be placed anywhere else.

Allow me to invite the attention of the Senate to the colloquy which took place in one of the hearings at which Mr. Baruch testified. When Mr. Baruch was on the witness stand I called his attention particularly to a letter which I received from the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, in Flint, Mich. I called his attention to the statement in the letter:

We, the undersigned, a committee elected by the membership of Chevrolet Local No. 659, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, to investigate the rumors prevalent in the Flint Chevrolet plants that management has appointed mere boys (who are the sons of Chevrolet superintendents and other high officials) foremen, for the sole purpose of enabling them to evade being inducted into the armed services.

Some time ago Major General Hershey stated publicly that the only thing that would drive the draft dodgers out of the plant was social indignation.

Mr. Baruch said:

Do you mean to say that Hershey admits he is interested in the matter and that he can't do anything about it?

The discussion continued:

Senator WHEELER. I am just reading what they say.

Mr. BARUCH. Of course, that is absurd.

Mr. Baruch later said:

Well, I don't know what Mr. Hershey has actually said and what someone thinks he

has said, but if Mr. Hershey admits that he can't do anything about it, the thing to do is to get somebody who can. I can't imagine Hershey saying any such thing and I am sure he is anxious to look into all such complaints.

Mr. President, the truth is that these complaints are coming from one end of the country to the other, and Gen. Hershey himself, in his speech last night, called upon employees—

To make superhuman efforts to see that no deferment is requested for any man capable of rendering military service "unless the job must be done and can be done by no other available person."

I read further from a newspaper account of his speech:

"It is realized that there are many reasons for the presence of young men in industry," he said. "It is understood that many of them have acquired a very considerable amount of 'know how' during the time they have been in the plants. Regardless of these facts, however, a great many of our people believe the time has come when these young single men should be in the service and that industry should find others to do this work or get more work out of those already in the plants."

I agree that industry should get more work out of the men, and I assert that in my judgment no labor organization in the country can justifiably contend that it should have such rigid rules with reference to employment that fathers will be forced to be inducted into the armed forces.

The newspaper article from which I have just read continues to quote General Hershey, as follows:

"There were those in industry who combined in pressure groups to descend upon Washington and who attempted to frighten us into amending our regulations," he continued. "They presented briefs which set out in no modest manner the importance of their activities and the essentiality of their men. We tried to be reasonable, but all too often when we consulted our local boards we found that those boards knew many facts which were not included in these briefs and which did not substantiate their contentions. "There were others who for months believed that their prominence was so well established that any stationery bearing their name would be sufficient to give a registrant permanent exemptions."

Mr. President, General Hershey had it in his power to make rules so that draft dodgers would not be permitted to remain in various industries, if he had wanted to do so.

I invite attention to the fact that simultaneously with the statement of General Hershey the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in its convention held in New York on September 30, 1943, adopted a resolution decrying—

the hoarding of youth labor by the large war plants in the country, and their failures in innumerable instances to attempt to replace physically fit young men of military age with older men beyond military age.

The newspaper article, with reference to the resolution, stated:

The resolution asserted that 85 percent of the work in war plants can be done by inexperienced workers, and continued: "Every

available, physically fit, youthful, unmarried man who is without special skill, as well as those who were unmarried at the time of the enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1940, should be removed from the war plants and inducted into the armed services."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I am in complete sympathy with his objective and what he seeks to accomplish. I assert that the Senator from Montana has rendered a great public service in arousing the thought of the people of the country on this most important question. Later I expect to take the floor in my own right to discuss the subject now under debate.

I am one of the group which has been working with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] in preparation of an amendment which will bear upon the matters to which the Senator from Montana is addressing himself.

Begging the Senator's pardon for interrupting him, I invite attention to a letter addressed to me from Wichita, Kans., dated September 16, 1943, in which my friend, the writer, states as follows:

I would suggest that a thorough investigation be made of these so-called essential single men in the defense plants.

It may interest the Senator to know that Wichita is one of four or five largest centers of aircraft manufacture in the country, and is the largest center of such manufacture in the whole central West.

My friend continues as follows:

From my own observation in the Wichita airplane plants, and I have worked at several of them, I would say that a great many young men are needlessly deferred. I am certain that they could be replaced by IV-F's, fathers, women, and older men.

In one large plant, great numbers of young men, foremen and assistant foremen, sit for hours with their feet on the desks with very little to do. I am telling you the things I have seen.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator very much. I am glad that there are at least one or two Senators who are sufficiently interested in the country, and sufficiently interested in the drafting of fathers, to obtain and to listen to facts.

When I returned after the recess of Congress some of my Democratic colleagues said they did not know anything about the bill or about the facts and that they wanted some facts. Now when we propose to give them some facts they will not even listen.

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from Montana that during the recess of the Senate, from the middle of July until the middle of September, I spent the time entirely in my own section of the country. In the 5 years I have been a Member of the Senate, in all the trips combined I have made home,

I do not think I have talked to so many people as I talked to during the recess. Kansas and Colorado, where I spent a couple of weeks, happen to have a very large number of defense plants, a very large number of air bases, and other Army camps. Everywhere I went, without exception, in Kansas, Missouri, in Colorado, I heard constant discussion and statements made by people of conditions that come under their own observation in their own localities, dealing, for instance, with the excessive number of men in the camps, indicating that the Army really had more men than it knew what to do with, and dealing also with the very definite factor that the defense plants had been used with the approval, and in fact, by the management for the purpose of accumulating young manpower to help them in avoiding the draft. I can make that statement after the most thorough and satisfactory contacts with my own constituents in Kansas and in other midwest States in the 2 months I was home.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

As I was saying a moment ago, my Democratic friends on this side desired to have hearings before the committee because they wanted to get the facts; they were not familiar with them. All that it is necessary to do is to take a look on the Democratic side today and see how many of them are interested in obtaining the facts. The truth about the matter is that if they want to get men for the Army without taking fathers they can get them; they do not have to take a father; but, apparently, the Senate of the United States or at least my Democratic colleagues, prefer to take fathers.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at this point?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I happen to have another letter that touches upon a different factor, but a very important factor, in this situation. I read from a letter addressed to me from a town in western Kansas, in which this statement appears:

If the Congress does not assert itself, this country is going to be in a hell of a shape. I have a good friend who is county chairman of a bond drive in the eastern part of Kansas, who made this statement recently: "It takes a hell of a lot of guts for me to ask people to buy bonds when we all know that about three-fourths of all the money obtained from these bonds will be wasted in the administration of the war and the Federal Government."

I may add at this point, having read the letter, that when I was at home many people inquired of me, "Now, if we buy bonds, may we have some assurance that the money we invest in the bonds will not be wasted?" I will ask the Senator from Montana what kind of a reply he would suggest I make to such inquiries which were addressed to me a hundred times, and which show the temper of the people? If that kind of a situation continues, there will be a break-down in the morale of the people of this country.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that the same question propounded to him was asked me hundreds of times by farmers and others all over the country. Not only have such questions been asked me, but the people have come to see me. I have repeatedly pointed out that if this waste of manpower, of materials, and of money continues in this country, we are going to have a complete break-down of the morale of the people. One of the reasons why more small people are not buying bonds, one reason why more of the bonds have to be taken by bankers, insurance companies, and others, is the waste of manpower, the waste of materials, and the waste of money going on all over the country.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I might add to what I said a moment ago that those who ask me this question are not slackers; they are not unpatriotic; they are as good Americans as can be found in this country. They are mostly people I have known all my life. They are earnest people, good people, patriotic people who want to help, but they are in despair over the extravagance and inefficiency and tremendous bureaucracy and waste of money under the policies which have been followed and which continue to be followed by the present administration.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I have invariably said to those who asked me similar questions that, notwithstanding the waste of manpower, notwithstanding the waste of materials, and notwithstanding the tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money, we have got to go ahead, now that we are in the war, and buy bonds and more bonds. But let me say to the Senator and to the Senate of the United States that, in my judgment, this colossal waste and extravagance, and their aftermath, are going to have a harmful effect upon the Army and upon the Navy and on the morale of the people generally and upon the Government.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I may say that I agree entirely with the Senator from Montana. That is about the only kind of an answer that a responsible person could make.

I may add at this point, lest someone may feel that I have not sufficient concern about the welfare of the Army, that I have a son in north Africa now; I have a son-in-law at the Pendleton air base in Oregon; I have another son-in-law at Wright Field at Dayton; I have a grandson in one of the camps in Mississippi; I have another grandson attending school under a scholarship from the Army. I do not want anybody to question my patriotism unless he can equal my record.

Mr. WHEELER. Many of those who are questioning the Senator's patriotism or my patriotism or the patriotism of someone else are the very ones in some of the Government bureaus who are themselves getting out propoganda and evading the draft.

I quote from a statement issued by William Green:

Boston, September 30.—President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, said today that labor hoarding is common and has resulted in apparent shortages.

Arriving here for the sixty-third annual A. F. of L. convention that opens Monday, Green said managers of many plants have accumulated labor by asking for more workers than actually are needed.

"A situation of apparent labor shortage can usually be relieved by developing a community program," Green said.

The way to do it is for the Government of the United States to check up on these plants and to take these young men.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Montana if, in his opinion, 90 percent of the conditions which are being discussed and complained of could not be cured by proper administration by the administrative authorities?

Mr. WHEELER. There is no question about that, in my mind, and it is not only my opinion, but it is in accordance with the report of Mr. Baruch, the adviser to Mr. Byrnes. I shall come to that later on and read a portion of the report.

I quote from a news dispatch dated Harrisburg, September 8, under the heading "Plenty of men available."

Clifford A. Gnau, Harrisburg, adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Pennsylvania Department, was on record today with the assertion that the huge Army air depot at nearby Middletown is overstaffed with draft-age men "whose presence is unnecessary to its efficient operation."

Declared that more than 30 percent of present personnel could be lopped from the depot's pay roll, Gnau said:

"Congress talks about drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Such men are expected to leave their families and enter the armed services while hundreds of thousands of dollar-patriotic Americans—many of them at Middletown—hide behind a so-called essential wartime job, aided and abetted by young Army officers."

Mr. President, I could call attention to any number of letters I have received similar to those I have read, and before the day is over I expect to do so.

I have here a letter from a man residing in Baltimore, Md. He is with the Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., the district representative of the company. He says in his letter:

I am a member of local draft board No. 7 of the city of Baltimore, Md. What I am writing is my own personal feelings, and is not to be considered as an expression of the board as a whole.

I am and have been very much opposed to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers until a thorough examination has been made of all single men, etc., presently deferred. In other words, I heartily concur in your present efforts along this line.

Local board No. 7 has already observed several cases which are just the opposite to the idea expressed above. On recent 42-A's submitted from the manning tables of certain Baltimore war industrials, we have found cases where these married men are to be replaced in from as little as 2 months to

4 months from the effective date of the schedule.

He says further:

I decided some time ago to resign from Selective Service unless your proposed bill or one along similar lines is passed by Congress.

I have here a letter from a man in the air service, who says:

I hope this reaches you because what I have to say is important—important to me—, not just because it's what I feel but what I'm sure thousands of other men in the service feel.

I am a fully trained soldier—by the Air Corps' standards, at any rate—qualified and physically fit for overseas combat duty. I have been in that status for some time now and will probably remain in my present stagnant state for some time to come unless, of course, the Army I know changes to a businesslike, efficiently operated organization. Until I am allowed the privilege of fighting for my country, which I thought was my right as a soldier, I'll never consider it anything but outright folly to take family men into the service.

There seems always to be a lot of talk about a soldier's morale—the one thing that will give my morale the bolstering it needs is the chance to do the job I came into the Army to do; I'm sick and tired of doing absolutely nothing.

When the trained Army already in existence is put to some worth-while use, I doubt that a single father will object to wearing a uniform.

Whether or not my ideas are of any importance to you, the writing of this has given me the opportunity to get off my chest what I feel so strongly.

I thank you for your time.

That is signed by an officer in the Air Corps, but I shall not give his name.

Next is a letter from St. Louis, Mo. The Senator from Kentucky a few days ago asked me to give names. This letter is dated September 29, 1943, and the writer says:

I think I can furnish you with one or two examples of draft dodging by a Government agency—or perhaps I should say by a clique of officials within a Government agency.

Then he gives the name of the deputy administrator, who, he says, "put in by Agriculture has signed deferments for two of his henchmen." He says further:

Mr. ———, chief of the personnel division, a Mr. ———'s orders, made a special trip to Washington, D. C., to make sure the deferments go through. I think it is a shame to waste the taxpayers' money on such grossly unnecessary travel for such an unpatriotic gesture.

P. S.—The R. E. A. Veterans' Association was so mad when they heard of the deferments they passed a resolution to make it public that it was not their policy to ask deferments for anyone. They are going to send their resolution to all division chiefs in R. E. A. I understand.

I have here a letter from another writer, who says:

I am employed in a large aircraft plant in St. Louis.

I wonder if you know that many of those (key) positions of importance that they speak of, to get deferments for their pets, are made especially for deferment purposes. One of the many cases, from office boy to foreman



overnight, age 22 years, healthy, strong man; another general foreman, age 26; assistant general foreman, age 24.

It is common gossip you don't have to go to the Army if you know the right guy.

Many of us fume and are very dissatisfied with this set-up, not that we dislike these young men, but feel that they should take their turn to serve when it comes, just like our sons do.

Wish we had more men with your views. Good luck and success to you.

The correspondent signs her name and gives her address.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss now the Baruch report, and to call attention to the fact that, in general, Mr. Baruch has agreed with everything I have said on this subject on the floor of the Senate. Mr. Baruch made a first report months ago. That report has not even yet been released by the Government. While I do not know what is in the report, we all know that it was suppressed. Had this report been brought out at the time it was prepared, the possibility is that we would not be in the present manpower muddle, and the question of drafting fathers at this time would not have arisen.

Mr. Baruch's second report, just released, has not been released voluntarily, but was forced out by the pressure of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This report shows that the manpower muddle is not new, that it has existed for a long time, and the question is, What is responsible for it, the complacency of the people, the Congress, or the War Manpower Commission?

In his report Mr. Baruch states:

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program.

Stop and think of that:

Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies.

Because of the "failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program," we are faced with a situation in which fathers are to be taken into the Army, homes are to be broken up, and children are to be put out into the street.

According to Mr. Baruch's report, there are three root causes for our manpower difficulties:

First. Bad planning.

Second. The attempt to do the job from Washington, and

Third. The failure to enlist the services of the best men available.

In the first respect the report states:

The second root cause of our manpower difficulties has been that production has been planned, new facilities built, and contracts awarded without adequate regard to the supplies of labor available locally.

This is, in fact, the primary reason we have critical areas at the present time. Had production been properly

planned geographically and had orders not been concentrated in the hands of the few at the expense of the small businessmen and other localities, there would be far fewer critical areas today, and there would have been much less labor hoarding of young men in factories, and we would not have been in the muddle we are now in.

Mr. President, let me ask, Who is responsible for this bad planning? Is it due to the complacency of the people? Is the Congress responsible? Or are the Federal bureaus responsible?

As to the second cause of our manpower difficulties, the attempt to do the job from Washington, the report states:

If this labor budget plan is to work, there must be adequate delegation of power from all Washington agencies to their west coast representatives, and the communities themselves must get on the team. The job cannot be done from Washington.

This, of course, is the truth and fact of the matter.

The report states further:

An immediate survey should be made of the possibilities of subcontracting in nearby communities.

Had this been done earlier, fewer small businesses would have had to go out of business.

Who is responsible for this failure to decentralize power? Certainly that is not the fault of the people of the country; it is not the fault of the Congress; but again I say the fault rests entirely upon the Federal bureaus in Washington.

As to a third cause of our manpower difficulties, the report states:

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the importance of selecting the best man possible in the community to serve as chairman of the local priorities committee and the necessity for giving him the fullest community support.

The principles there laid down are unquestionably sound, and they could and should be applied on a national scale so that here in Washington we would find, especially in time of war, the best men possible heading the departments and the bureaus, able, public-spirited citizens, but, as the report states, instead we have heading these agencies men "spending their energies battling to build up empires."

Who is responsible for this? Certainly not the Congress of the United States. Certainly it is not due to the complacency of the people. Certainly the responsibility rests nowhere except with the bureaus in Washington.

At the conclusion of the report, it is stated:

Our study of this problem also emphasizes anew the necessity for your constant review of military and lend-lease requirements to see that all different parts of the program are in balance with one another and that the program as a whole is balanced against the essential needs of the civilian economy. We have reached the stage of our war economy where there is not much to spare. Something gained in one direction means a loss in the other direction.

There are, then, three main needs which must be balanced so far as this general manpower problem is concerned:

First. Military needs.

Second. Production needs—which is subdivided, in turn, into needs for ourselves and lend-lease; and,

Third. Needs for carrying on the civilian economy.

Whose business is it to do this balancing?

This, obviously, is not purely a military question. What the military say they need is one consideration; what producers say they need is another, and the need of the civilian population of the country is another, so that the morale of the people, which Mr. Hershey speaks of, will not break down.

It is the obligation of the Government, and, Mr. President, the Government of the United States includes the Congress, to determine on the evidence submitted what the true facts are and to act accordingly. So when Members of the Senate stand on this floor and say that they do not want to take the responsibility, in the face of the responsibilities which are given to them, they are shirking the responsibility which the Constitution of the United States imposes upon them.

Mr. President, for Congress simply to say, "Well, the military men say they want this; let them have it" is, to state it plainly, for Congress to shirk its responsibility. When Members of Congress say that some Government official or Army official—I care not who he may be—wants this or that, and so they are going to give it to him, they are not acting in the spirit of the principles upon which the Government is based. When a Government official comes to Congress and says "I want this" or "I want that," and Members of Congress say they will grant the request simply because it is made, that, Mr. President, is merely acting in the spirit of fascism. That is what was done in Italy, that is what was done in Germany, and that is what brought fascism and nazi-ism to those countries.

I continue to read from the Baruch report:

The manpower needs of our Nation are so intertwined that to permit excess labor to remain anywhere may force the closing of business, the drafting of fathers—

And so forth. These principles apply with equal force to the over-all picture. So that if the military are wasting men now, we will permit them to waste more men by the additional drafting of men, or if men are being hoarded in industry it will only aggravate the whole situation. It follows that the Congress should examine into the use to which our manpower is being put, both in the Army and in industry; it should be carefully considered before consenting to further drafts of fathers or anybody else.

Army officials have testified that the Army will have in this country January 1, 1944, over 5,000,000 men. That of these 5,000,000 the Army cannot move overseas for fighting purposes during the whole of the year, 1944, up to January

1, 1945, over half this number, and that the Army will have in this country, in uniform, January 1, 1945, in excess of two and a half million men. Yet, General Marshall has previously testified that 500,000 men were sufficient for the defense of this country.

There is no question that the men who are drafted come out of the labor pool, and the more taken the more serious the labor shortage will become.

It follows, if we are to get any stability into the manpower situation at home, that we must begin by getting some stability into the Selective Service System and the military demands.

The fact is, the Army should have not all it wants but all it can effectively use.

The determining factor should be what the Army can use, and what the country can support, considering lend-lease, rather than a purely arbitrary figure greatly in excess of it. Also, we must consider the effect upon the morale of our people.

It stands to reason, the larger the Army, the larger the labor force needed to supply it, and the less the available supply of labor for munitions, lend-lease and other essentials of war as well as of our civilian population.

I have tried to find out from the Army and again from Mr. Baruch, but without success, how many men it takes on the production front to supply a given number of men in the Army stationed in this country. Obviously one man is taken when he goes into the Army. The Army takes other men who are needed for the purpose of supplying this man who has been removed from production.

Furthermore, the men who are so used to furnish supplies to the inducted men must in turn be supplied by the men then remaining; so that every time a man is inducted into the Army, there is, in fact, a triple drain on manpower.

Yet, Mr. President, the other day when I asked General Marshall for the figures, he said he could not give them, but that someone would furnish them to me. They were sent to me yesterday. The statement made is:

However, as a general approximation it is believed that the ratio of men and women on the production front to those on the fighting front is 1.4 to 1.

Let me read now from an article entitled "Is Our Army Too Large?", by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, published in the November 1942 issue of the American Mercury:

In the days of archery, one artisan could make weapons for 20 soldiers. In Napoleon's time, every man in the ranks called for one man behind the lines to keep him armed. A century later, in World War No. 1, it took 6 civilians to provide weapons for one soldier in action. In the present war, it is estimated that about 18 civilians in agriculture and industry are needed to keep one soldier continually supplied and equipped. The Selective Service goal, therefore, implies labor support to the tune of 234,000,000.

That was when they were talking about an Army of 13,000,000 persons.

I quote further from the article by Major de Seversky:

Brig. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, chief quartermaster in the American European theater of war, recently told the press that the maintenance of one American soldier in Britain requires 1½ tons of shipping monthly, even in this period of lull, and despite the fact that Britain supplies one-third of the necessary food, all the necessary coal and a variety of other goods. Obviously, this British contribution to the pool of supplies must diminish as our forces in Europe increase.

Then, in speaking about the Army, Major de Seversky said:

No one can blame Army leaders for insisting on the largest possible mass of land force, with all that this connotes in weapons, motorized equipment, auxiliary aviation. In the nature of the case, Army heads plan and act on the assumption that the war will be won or lost in hand-to-hand combat on terra firma. They live by the dictum that wars are won at the point of a bayonet.

The Navy command is no less certain that the global conflict will be decided on the high seas. As a matter of fact, every enlargement of the land forces predicates an equivalent enlargement of naval forces to place these soldiers on distant shores and to keep them continually provisioned and armed.

In short, every branch of the armed services, and every civilian group entrusted with vital tasks behind the lines, strives patriotically to increase its own share of the national potential. As one raises the ante, the others necessarily follow suit. What if certain contingents of men and production are not needed now? They may be needed in the future and must, in view of the departmental administrator, be husbanded for that coming need. Hence, battleships which cannot be finished until 1948, additional millions of soldiers who cannot conceivably be transported and put into action until 1945 or later, mountains of equipment for tasks which cannot even be started until the skies overhead are cleared of hostile air power. Hence, the ludicrous and dangerous pyramiding of armed forces and types of production without reference to what comes first, what can be postponed, what can be kept down to a minimum. In effect, every service, in uniform or in mufti, is hoarding manpower and materials.

Yet, Mr. President, as I say, in the face of the statement of some men that everything the Army and Navy says should be done is what we must do, is there any Senator on the floor of the Senate who thinks for one moment that only 1.4 men and women are required to keep each soldier in action? If that be true, then, instead of needing all the 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 people who are engaged in the production of war equipment alone, we could do with about one-fourth that number. Then we could do with many less men in agriculture and with many less men engaged in working on the railroads, and we could do with many less men in the shipbuilding industry and in other industries.

I venture the assertion that there is not a Member of the Senate who does not recognize the fact that there has been a tremendous waste of manpower in industry—a hoarding of manpower in industry—from one end of the country to the other, and that in industries single men are being deferred. As a result, married men will have to be taken. I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate

who does not know there is extravagance and waste of material and manpower in industry, and I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who does not know there has been a tremendous waste of manpower in the Army itself. Certainly every congressional committee which has passed upon the question has said so. Every Senate committee and every House committee which has looked into the matter has pointed that out. Yet, in the face of all that, it is said that because someone says, "We must have these men now, at this moment, and if we do not we will lose the war," they must be taken.

As I listened to General Marshall's testimony the other day, I gathered that the 200,000 men who are about to be taken into the Army—because approximately half the men taken will go into the Army and half will go into the Navy—will be used for replacements, if I correctly understood General Marshall's testimony. If those men are to be used for replacements, that means that, instead of using as replacements the men who have been trained for 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, or sending them overseas to do other tasks or to fill up the divisions which the Army tells us must be completed, the fathers will be used for those purposes. I do not see how anyone can study General Marshall's testimony—to which I shall call attention a little later—without coming to exactly that conclusion.

Reading further from the article by Major de Seversky:

The swift disintegration of the magnificent French Armies under the pressure of Hitler's superior mechanized strength tells a story.

We said the French had the finest and greatest Army in the world, the best equipped and best maintained, and that her soldiers were among the best fighters. Yet, with a comparatively small mechanized force, the Germans went through them and ground them to pieces, and that also in the face of the Maginot line.

Major de Seversky further said:

So do the cumulative Russian disasters, despite the country's almost inexhaustible manpower and heroic morale. Neither can we ignore the fact that the most decisive single engagement of the war to date, the Battle of Britain, was fought and won by a handful of British airmen, while great armies on both sides and a great Navy on the British side were wholly immobilized and reduced to the status of impotent onlookers. Crete was conquered by a navyless enemy in the face of immense naval forces massed for the defense.

If there is one thing that this war has proven beyond doubt, it is that the decision will not be scored by sheer volume of men and metal, but by superior weapons and superior strategy. Whenever we sacrifice quality for bulk, brain power for manpower, we are playing into the hands of the enemy. In the final analysis, America's principal assets are its natural resources and productive genius. Insofar as we weaken or handicap these assets, we are unwittingly undermining our own strength.

The implication that this is still an old-style, trench-and-bayonet war simply doesn't jibe with elementary truths obvious to any lay observer. The most diehard of old-line strategists no longer contend that armies can

operate under skies dominated by the enemy; he thus admits, in effect, that conquest of the skies must come first.

I might read further from De Seversky. I quote him only to point out the absurdity of the position of the man who says that only one and a quarter persons on the home front are required to take care of a man in the armed forces; and secondly, to point out the absurdity of building up a huge army which we can not possibly use effectively unless we have the airpower to drive the enemy out.

So I say that the determining factor should be, What can the Army use, and what can the country support, considering lend-lease; and what is the effect going to be on the home front? rather than a purely arbitrary figure greatly in excess of our requirements. It stands to reason that the larger the Army, the larger the labor force needed to supply it, and the less the available supply of labor for munitions, lend-lease, and other essentials.

The fact is that the Army, if it asks for more men than it can use, not only takes out of the labor pool the men actually drafted, but also takes away from the number of men who must be employed to support them. It would seem wiser for the Army to time the induction of these men in accordance with the ability to place them in effective action rather than in accordance with some arbitrary figures based on the size of some other army, friend or foe.

It has been reported by the British high command in Egypt, and not denied, that the surrender of Italy has already eliminated from the Axis side 65 divisions, or approximately 1,000,000 men. If we can believe the newspapers, those men have now joined our side, which would make a total change of approximately 2,000,000 men in our favor; yet this fact does not seem to have been given any serious consideration in determining what the size of our Army should be at this time. It was taken into consideration by the Canadians, because the Canadians said that because of this situation they were releasing some of their men.

I have already called attention to the statement by the Canadian Minister of National Defense, Colonel the Honorable J. L. Ralston. I read again from the press release in that connection:

The Canadian Minister of National Defense, Colonel the Honorable J. L. Ralston, announced today that a plan has been approved for the reorganization of the Canadian Army in Canada under which the Seventh and Eighth Divisions now on duty in Canada will be disbanded and the Sixth Division will be partially disbanded.

The plan particularly affects that portion of the Army in Canada which is allotted operational tasks. It will result in a reduction in the number of troops required to carry out those tasks. It will also have consequential effects in reducing the number of personnel required for servicing operational troops. The plan is made possible by the improved strategic position on both coasts of Canada resulting from the eviction of the Japs from the Aleutians; the military victories in the Mediterranean and the Russian

successes; and the striking betterment in antisubmarine activities in the Atlantic.

The scheme will involve a readjustment downward of local defenses on both the east and west coasts.

The Minister's statement is in part:

"Events of recent months have greatly improved the general strategic situation in respect to the defense of both coastal regions of Canada.

"In the Pacific there has been the eviction of the Japanese from the Aleutians and the increasing scale of operations in the southwest Pacific."

Yet, Mr. President, in the face of what the Canadians are doing, and in the face of the fact that it has been stated that no man in Canada may be sent out of the country unless he volunteers for that purpose, we in the United States are proposing to break up American homes and say that the war will be lost unless between now and the 1st of January 446,000 fathers are inducted into the Army. I ask any reasonable man if that makes common ordinary sense, particularly in view of the fact that we have 7,300,000 men in the Army, and at the end of 1945 we shall still have approximately 2,500,000 or 3,000,000 men in the United States who will have been trained for more than a year, some of them for more than 2 years.

The Italian Navy has also surrendered, and has been added, to a large extent, to our side. With both the French and the Italian Navies now accounted for, it would seem possible for our Navy to make some reduction, in turn, and not ask for an increase at this particular time. Yet, after the first of the year the Navy will ask for a large number of men, to continue building up our Navy, when there is no navy on the face of the globe, with the exception of the Japanese Navy, which can interfere with us. Germany has no navy to speak of, and the combined British, American, Italian, and French Navies are in the possession of the Allies.

No one knows, neither the Army generals nor civilians, the number of men who will eventually be required to finish the job; but from time to time we do have exact figures from the Army as to the number which can be fed, equipped, and transported. No matter how the fortunes of war go, whether we lose thousands of men or whether we do not, the fact is that we cannot transport more men than the Army estimates can be transported. Under those circumstances, would it not be sounder to time the induction of these men in accordance with the actual schedules of ability to use them effectively, rather than in accordance with some preconceived idea of the Army as to the number of men who will be eventually needed, which, being speculative, is subject to change from time to time?

Looked at from another angle, first, there are the men actually in the armed forces. Then there are the men who are engaged in war industries. Both classes of men must be supported by the remaining population. So the burden on the civilian economy becomes increasingly greater with each man drafted and each

man taken for industry. The standard of life under this pressure is of necessity constantly reduced; yet it is because of this standard of life that we are able to outstrip the whole world in production. From the evidence, we are approaching the limit, the fair minimum to which this standard of life can be reduced without seriously affecting the productivity of the worker and upsetting the national morale.

With respect to industrial waste, the Baruch report speaks for itself of the great wastage of labor, and labor hoarding, which, if relieved, would go a long way toward correcting any local labor shortage, and would go a long way toward preventing the drafting of fathers. Speaking of cost-plus contracts, the Baruch report points out:

Not alone on the west coast, but all through the country, much labor is being hoarded and poorly utilized.

How can anyone insist upon taking fathers and breaking up American homes when Mr. Baruch admits, first, that the situation is the fault of the various bureaus in Washington; second, that labor is being hoarded in industry; and third, as everyone knows, that labor is being hoarded in the Government by every department in Washington and throughout the country?

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. At that point I should like to add to what the Senator from Montana has said that when I was at home I visited three airplane-manufacturing establishments in Wichita. One of them employs 5,000 men, another 11,000 men, and the third 26,000 men. There are 45,000 men engaged in the airplane-manufacturing business in that one city in Kansas.

A representative of one of those factories told me that their first contract was a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. They did not like that. It meant a waste of labor. So they changed their contracts, and they are currently operating upon fixed-price contracts. Under those fixed-price contracts they offered what, for want of a better term, we may call incentive wages, which had some relation to the productivity of the employees as a whole. Under the present arrangement that factory has increased the production per man 25 percent. That is the experience of one very efficient airplane manufacturing concern in my own State. I visited the plant when I was at home.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his observation.

I have in my files a letter from a large contractor in my State, who has been building and is now building Army bases and doing other construction work throughout the country. He has written to me saying that the idea of renegotiating contracts is the greatest incentive to hoarding labor there could possibly be.

They take contracts at huge prices with the idea they are going to renegotiate them. That is what has been done in a great many instances. Contracts

have been made at exorbitant prices in some instances with the idea they will be renegotiated. As the writer points out in this letter, it is the greatest incentive to the hoarding of labor that could possibly be given. He says:

If you eliminate that and put them on a regular basis you will find out how much labor will immediately be freed and will not be hoarded.

I quote further from the Baruch report:

Such wasteful practices are encouraged, among other things, by prevailing cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Under these contracts the Government pays all costs—whatever they are. Since the Government is footing the bill, there is no incentive for manufacturers to economize in the use of materials, facilities, or labor. More workers are hired than are needed. Workers may stand idle—it costs the manufacturers nothing. Much labor is wasted.

Mr. President, I inquire, who is responsible for that situation? Is it due to the complacency of the people of the country? Is it the fault of the Congress of the United States, or does the fault lie in the administrative departments of the Government? Unless we solve this problem, what responsibility do we have? I do not wish to, and would not, interfere with the executive departments if it were not necessary. But when the executive departments themselves have completely broken down and have not done their job—as is said by Mr. Baruch in his report—then whose responsibility is it to take charge and do something about it? If the administration will not do anything about it, the only place left for the people to come to is the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Montana and myself share the view which he has expressed. Both of us have had long public life and many contacts. I venture the assertion, with which I believe the Senator will agree, that not in my lifetime have I seen such a profligate waste of money, so much inefficiency, so much confusion, and such a lack of a sense of proportion with regard to costs as related to production, as exists at the present time. If the morale of the country breaks down under that kind of a situation it is the fault of the administration and the administrative policy.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. In his report Mr. Baruch states:

In the early stages of war production when manufacturers were asked to produce things they never made before, there might have been some justification for cost-plus arrangements. By now, Government and industry surely have had sufficient experience in the manufacture of many munitions for fixed prices to be agreed upon.

However, there are only comparatively few industries of that kind.

With reference to Government waste, the report of the Byrd committee, Senate

Document No. 66, page 4, of June 18, 1943, states:

With 55 percent of the Federal employees not engaged in direct war production—

Fifty-five percent, the report states—it is obvious that cuts may be made in Federal personnel without hindering direct mechanical war production. Consequently a drastic reduction can be made in the number of Federal employees without harmful effect to the war-production effort.

This morning I received a letter from a lady engaged in Government service in the Middle West. In her letter she said:

Keep up your fight.

She said:

Already, because of the speeches you have made, some of the people who have been hiding and have been deferred because they are essential to the departments have been told that they must leave the departments, and have been getting into the war.

I continue reading from the Byrd committee report:

That is to say, nonessential employees may be removed from Federal pay rolls by the Budget Bureau, which already has the power to make such reductions in over one-half of the Federal personnel pursuant to the authority contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment to the Overtime Pay Act.

Other portions of the report show that the efforts of the 55 percent of the Federal employees who are not engaged in mechanical war-production work have not been fully utilized because of the lack of a vigorously administered war-transfer program, and the failure to establish an effective Federal employee manpower pool.

The report shows an alarming increase in personnel and in the monthly pay rolls to meet it. It sets forth a table showing the Federal employment increase which, through the activity of the Byrd committee, has been brought up to date.

It reads as follows:

Year	Personnel	Monthly pay roll
Nov. 11, 1918.....	917,760	
August 1939.....	933,386	\$141,733,064
August 1940.....	1,039,451	159,260,975
August 1941.....	1,444,985	217,772,054
August 1942.....	2,450,759	391,502,171
March 1943.....	2,478,824	638,926,265
August 1943.....	3,063,379	\$46,372,969

So the Government personnel has jumped from 917,760 on November 11, 1918, to 3,063,379, in August 1943, and the monthly pay roll has expanded from \$141,733,064 in August 1939—and the Lord knows it was high at that time—to \$46,372,969 in August of 1943. It has been constantly increased every month. From August 1942, when the Government personnel was 2,450,759, to August 1943, the personnel increased to 3,063,379. From August 1939 to August 1943 the pay roll increased from \$141,733,064 to \$46,372,969.

The total number of civilians in the War Department alone, according to the July figures, was 1,355,515. That covers the War Department alone, for July.

In the Navy Department, according to July figures, the civilian employees alone numbered 697,475.

These figures have not been broken down to show the number of nonfighters and single men, nor do they show the extent to which the Army and the Navy have simply replaced civilian employees with military personnel. They do not show the male noncommissioned and enlisted personnel between the ages of 18 and 35 years who are physically fit for active service. Data as to both these classifications and the number of men in them engaged in purely clerical work have been requested of the Departments, but so far the Departments have failed to furnish the information.

Here is a copy of a letter which was sent by the Byrd committee to the Secretary of the Navy—and I understand that a similar letter was sent to the Secretary of War:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is requested that the enclosed form be filled out and returned to the committee at your earliest convenience.

Items 1, 2, and 3 should include all naval personnel, except those attached to task forces or combat units, training units, and supply units servicing those task forces or combat units and training units; unless such naval service personnel is located outside a permanent shore establishment, in which case they should be included.

Items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 should be mutually exclusive of each other, and should apply to all naval personnel.

If there are any questions in connection with providing this information, please call the committee's staff at National 3120, branch 1187.

Cordially yours.

Then there is attached a list of the questions. Up to yesterday, at least, no answer had been received in reply to that request.

If the War Department were really conducted on business principles, they would have this information at their fingertips. The plain truth about the matter is that the War Department has not been operated on a business basis, and I do not know of anyone in Washington who thinks it has been. General Marshall testified the other day about conducting the Army on a business basis; but certainly the War Department has not been conducted on a business basis. I think others have had the same experience I have had. A number of employees—not one, not two, but a good many, such as stenographers and others—have come to me and stated that they did not have anything to do in the War Department.

I was shocked when the Army officials advised the committee that it would take at least 10 days in which to report the number of men in this country who had been in the service for a year or longer, for 2 years, for 3 years, or for over 3 years. They, apparently, do not even know the number of fully trained men they have.

But to return to the Byrd report, there would seem to be no reason, in the nature of things, why there should not be a drastic curtailment in nonwar

agencies. This took place in the last war. Is there any possible excuse, when they talk about drafting fathers, for it not taking place in this war?

I understand that when the Byrd committee makes its new report it will recommend that there should be a reduction of at least 200,000 in the clerical category now employed in the War Department.

There would seem to be no excuse for the delay in liquidating those agencies which have been ordered to liquidate and whose liquidation would release manpower. The least the Government and the War Department can do before they undertake to draft fathers and break up American homes is to clean their own house.

The Baruch report states:

In any drive against the hoarding and poor utilization of labor Government-operated plants should set an example.

What applies to Government-operated plants applies with greater force to non-essential Government bureaus and the waste of manpower in those bureaus which are essential to the conduct of the war.

I pick up a Boston newspaper and note that charges are being made that in the navy yard in that vicinity, there are several times as many men as are needed, and some of the great newspapers of that city are calling for an investigation.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. At that point, if I may break in upon the Senator from Montana, I wish to read a letter which was received at my office today and brought over to me by my secretary, who knew the Senator from Montana had the floor, and that from time to time I was interrupting the Senator from Montana for the purpose of illustrating the conditions which prevail the country over. The letter is dated Augusta, Kans., September 27, 1943, and reads:

Just heard a broadcast where the speaker seems in great fear that the Third War Loan drive will not be filled and in a nice way he considers the home people a bunch of tightwads and slackers. I wonder how many bonds he has and what he received per minute for that talk. He really is no worse than some newspaper writers.

In regard to such people, I wonder if in their shriveled one-track minds they can have the intelligence to know that there are very few of us who would not give our last dollar or bite to one of those boys over there but that we are getting d— sick and tired of buying bonds and seeing the money go for such things as the Office of War Information, Commodity Credit Corporation, Office of Price Administration, and a hundred other bureaus that the country would be better off without. Yes; and money for the radio corporations for fireside chats.

Get rid of these bureaus, take the personnel in them that are of draft age and put them in the Army and stop this draft of fathers not to speak of the saving to the taxpayers.

As for the draft, it is nowhere near as bad for Secretary Ickes to lose his secre-

tary as for Jim Jones to lose his hired man when he is trying to raise beef for the soldiers.

I have a son in the Air Force and am proud of it but I hate to see him fight to protect some rat hiding in a Government job, and there are still plenty of single and non-fathers in the defense plants; believe me I am not quoting hearsay.

And the writer underscores the word "hearsay"—

Senator, I hate to be a crab, but take a tip from Senator WHEELER and the more h— you can raise about anything that does not pertain directly to the war effort, the more we folks at home are going to back you.

I think that letter is quite apropos to the remarks of the Senator from Montana at this point, and, if I may do so, I should like to add that while the writer of the letter makes a rather extreme and impatient statement, yet he reasonably reflects the attitude and sentiment of 90 percent of the population of the Middle West.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator entirely. I have said since I came back from the West that I have never known so much bitterness and resentment on the part of people in my section of the country as there are at the present time over the waste, extravagance, the misuse of manpower, and also the waste by industries in the hoarding of labor, slow-downs, and so forth.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me for a further interjection, I have lived a long time, and have had a long public experience; I have been Governor of my State in addition to the honor I have received at the hands of the people of Kansas who voted to send me as one of their representatives to the Senate, but in a long public life I have never seen public sentiment so inflamed, public indignation so aroused, and people so incensed over waste, inefficiency, and extravagance in governmental administration—whether county, State, or Federal—as they are now.

Mr. WHEELER. I want to say to the Senator, in response to his statement, that if the Government in Washington does not wake up to what is the real feeling of the people in the Middle West and West, I fear for what is going to happen.

As I suggested Tuesday when I was speaking, some have said that I was wrong, but I want to tell Senators who do not want to listen to the facts, Senators who are not interested, apparently, in saving fathers, but are willing to break up the American homes, that when they come up for election and return home they will find out the feelings and sentiments and temper of the American people.

What applies to Government-operated plants applies with greater force to non-essential Government bureaus and also to the waste of manpower in those bureaus which are essential to the conduct of the war.

Mr. President, I now wish to call attention to another report. I may say that this report is marked confidential,

but nothing I shall read from the report is of a confidential nature, because it applies only to a survey of the congested war-production areas for the Army and Navy Munitions Board. There is not anything stated in the report except what has been stated by Mr. Baruch, but this report was gotten out by Mr. Robert Moses, of New York. It is Survey of Congested War Production Areas for the Army and Navy Munitions Board, by Andrews and Skidmore and Madigan-Hyland, under the direction of Robert Moses, and it is dated January 15, 1943.

I wish to call attention to a few things in the report. First it is said:

The civilian labor turn-over and absentee percentages in the Norfolk Navy Yard and Newport News shipyards in every month last year were excessive. Unaccounted absences indicate that many employees simply take a short vacation when they get a pay check. It is interesting to note that in Canada, a recent production drive at one of the big war plants reduced absentees last December to a low of 1.1 percent for all causes, including illness.

Why can we not bring about a similar condition in this country generally? It will not be brought about because of the hoarding of labor, because the men in the plants who see the wastage and extravagance feel that if money is being wasted, what difference does it make to them whether or not they waste their time? There cannot be effective employment and there cannot be good morale among employees when they see money being poured down a rat hole, and wastage and extravagance on every hand throughout the Government of the United States.

I read again from the report:

In the face of these conditions, the commandant of the Norfolk Yard has asked for thousands of additional civilian personnel, and some representatives of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. also seek many more employees.

It is a curious fact that the president of the Newport News shipbuilding plant does not agree with his own assistants as to the need of additional workers in his plant. He states without qualification that if excessive turn-over and absences can be stopped, he can fulfill all present and anticipated production schedules and contract obligations without bringing new workers and their families into the community.

Is the Government doing anything about that? Again I say, that because these conditions exist and because the Government, either on account of political reasons or otherwise, does not do anything about them, it is going to be necessary to take the fathers of the country into the armed services.

I read further from the report:

The usual union affiliation and prevailing rate difficulties stand in the way, and the tendency is for these men to look for work in their trade elsewhere. Plant expansion and other construction is being rapidly curtailed all over the country, because this stage has been passed and because of shortage of material. Under these circumstances construction workers should be steered into local war production plants by persuasion. If this

falls, more drastic steps should be taken by the War Manpower Commission.

The report further states:

These men have all sorts of family and other personal problems to meet, and they can't be expected to be reasonably satisfied and sufficiently free in their minds to do their work well if they are kept in constant anxiety. The major employment problems can be traced straight to Washington.

The report further states:

Uncertainty as to draft and manpower policies has contributed largely to the problem of steady employment, morale, and production. The graphs in this and other companies show that there has been a noticeable drop in employment and efficiency whenever announcements, orders, and rumors were current of wholesale drafting of war workers. It is foolish to argue that patriotic workers are not affected by conflicting policies and regulations affecting their draft status.

The report discusses the destroyer base, and says:

Work is being done in the expansion of this yard which seems to us highly questionable, including among other things, reclamation and filling for the storage of landing boats which probably should never be stored at San Diego anyway, and certainly should not be lugged to and from the water front to filled land in the rear as an intermediate operation on their way to shipment overseas from San Francisco.

I read further:

The housing situation at San Diego is precisely like that in the other congested areas. The work was not properly laid out by the proper authorities, has never been coordinated, and is still in various stages of construction.

Who is responsible for that? Certainly not the people of the country.

The report says further:

The captain at the head of the Naval Torpedo Station wants more help. The turnover and absentee figures are too large for a plant in which it takes months to train substitutes. The explanations given by employees who leave are of doubtful value here and elsewhere. The facts, however, speak for themselves. Employment should be stabilized.

The report further states:

The Maritime Commission working through the old management of the south Portland yard is in the midst of constructing 922 units for single men and couples in the face of the fact that no one in the yard even attempts to explain who will live there. There are trailers at Cape Elizabeth supplied by the Farm Security Administration and operated by the National Housing Agency.

The report states:

The conclusions to be derived from this report may be summarized as follows:

No more workers should be brought into these areas.

Employment should be stabilized by providing decent community facilities.

In every area, frequent contradictory announcements as to draft, and manpower policies, by equally authoritative officers, have confused, frightened, and discouraged workers in war plants. As a result they have been driven to enlist, resign, move, and make all sorts of personal and family adjustments,

often contrary to the best public as well as private interests.

Housing, sanitation, transportation, health, school, recreation, and other community facilities authorized and begun but not yet completed, should be speeded up, and glib excuses should not be accepted as a substitute for action.

The report lays the blame for these conditions on Washington.

Mr. President, it would seem to me, as it must seem to anyone else, for that matter, that to ask for more men, when the supplying of those men will involve the calling of fathers with children into the armed services, and the breaking up of American homes, puts it up to the Army to show two things: first, that they are making the best possible use of the men they now have, and, second, that men in other categories will not answer the need as well as if fathers were drafted.

On the general proposition of whether the Army would prefer single men to fathers, I asked General Marshall—page 282 of hearings:

Now, if you could get more men out of where they are hoarding men, either for industry or for the Army, that would fit your picture, you would prefer that to taking fathers, would you not?

General MARSHALL. If they are hoarding men who are unmarried men or young men, I would say that would be desirable.

It would follow that what the Army really wants is young single men.

I have already introduced or will introduce evidence to show that there are many men today in the Army fit for line duty who are being utilized for necessary "housekeeping" duties. If these men were replaced by an equal number of men with lesser physical qualifications, it would, of course, furnish additional young men for combat service without detriment to the Army as a whole.

If no further men are drafted, other than the 18-year-olds, it has been testified that owing to shipping conditions there would be in the Army in this country on January 1, 1945, 2,300,000 men, and if the Army is increased from 7,300,000 to 7,700,000 men there would be in the Army in this country on January 1, 1945, 2,700,000 trained men. The question arose in the testimony whether, under these conditions, a reduction of 500,000 in the total asked for would make any difference in the ultimate outcome. The questions and answers on this point follow:

Senator DOWNEY. If at this time the armed forces were to be cut approximately 500,000 under present plans, would it not be possible to rearrange the plans so that there would be no loss of effective power—I mean by that power outside the United States—until January 1, 1945?

General MARSHALL. I do not think so, sir. Senator DOWNEY. Will you explain why not, General?

General MARSHALL. Because by the end of 1944 we will have moved out of this country practically all of the fighting divisions and special troops, and we will be engaged within

this country in operating a huge base for operations extending all over the world for the supplying of matériel and personnel and for the small security detachments that will still be required over here.

That, of course, is a very general statement. Obviously, when General Marshall says, "We will be engaged within this country in operating a huge base for operations extending all over the world for the supplying of matériel and personnel," he does not refer to the Army alone but to the Nation as a whole. It is the productive organization of the country which supplies the matériel and it is the Navy and merchant marine which moves it.

It is, then, necessary to revert to the testimony of General Marshall's Deputy Chief of Staff, General McNarney, to find out the purposes and uses to which these 2,700,000 men are to be put.

General McNarney, in his prepared statement, page 26 of the hearings, set out the following:

Original allotments for the 1943 Army provided in round numbers for:	
(a) Air forces and supporting arms and services.....	2,800,000
(b) Defense of continental United States, Panama, the Caribbean bases, Alaska, and Aleutians....	590,000
(c) Defense of our lines of communication to include Australia, the numerous islands of the Pacific, maintenance of our Pacific bases, and the defense of Hawaii.....	350,000
(d) Zone of the interior activities—ports, prisoners of war enclosures, depots, etc., in the continental United States.....	400,000
(e) Men in schools—replacements, training centers, replacement depots, colleges (Army Specialized Training Program), and in hospitals recovering from sickness or wounds.....	650,000
(f) Overhead in the United States. These men furnish the house-keeping troops for all training stations. They provide medical care, operate utilities, perform local guard, and do all the necessary chores so that field force units can devote their time to intensive training.....	400,000
(g) Ground striking force—combat divisions and supporting units.....	3,118,000
Total .....	8,748,000

It will be noted, Mr. President, that the above is based on an Army of 8,200,000, as distinguished from the present request for 7,700,000. The above figures have been reduced, according to General McNarney, so far as (b) classification above is concerned, by 93,000, and so far as the (e) and (f) classifications are concerned, by 80,000, and because of shipping difficulties the War Department revised its troop schedules and reduced the planned strength of the Army by a total of 562,000. (See page 27 of hearings.) That would leave the figure of 7,700,000 by December 31, 1943, as the total force required; or, in other words, an increase of some 400,000 over the 7,300,000 which the Army now has.

Of the additional number demanded, General McNarney says—page 35:

We hope to get 70,000 women.

On page 42 of the hearings General McNarney answered the following question asked by me:

Senator WHEELER. Now, how many men, General—how many men do you figure on for the other services, such as loading of ships, unloading of ships, and manual labor—service of supply?

General McNARNEY. Services of Supply in the zone of the interior—that means continental United States of America. Well, there are 400,000, plus about an additional 400,000 for other overhead, which permits the units who are in training to spend all of their time on training.

On page 49 Senator WALLGREN asked:

Well, just what is the over-all picture? How many men are engaged in "housekeeping" for the Army in all theaters of war as well as the United States?

General McNARNEY. The figures will run nearly a third of the Army.

It follows from the above, on General McNarney's own testimony, so far as the continental United States alone is concerned, that 800,000 men of limited qualifications could be utilized in the Services of Supply and Allied services. It is a well-known fact that much of this work is now being done by men qualified for combat service. General McNarney's figures also show that class (e), comprising 650,000 persons of limited qualification, might perform services of this kind. There are, then, it would seem, positions in the Army in the continental United States alone, amounting in all to approximately 1,450,000, where limited-service men could be used to advantage.

But let us take the over-all picture. General McNarney states that so far as the over-all picture is concerned it is necessary to have at least one-third of the total armed forces doing "housekeeping" and related duties.

One-third of a total army of 8,200,000 would be approximately 2,700,000 men.

One-third of a total army of 7,700,000 in turn would be approximately 2,500,000 men.

But it has been stated in the evidence that at no time has the Army taken in excess of 10 percent for limited service, and last April or May this was cut to 5 percent.

Not only is the above true, but the actual cut in the Army this year of 562,000, according to General McNarney—page 127 of hearings—does not come in the men to be used for limited service or Services of Supply but in its troop schedules; in other words, in the ground troops. Only the limited number of 98,000 of this total reduction of 562,000 came out of class (b)—defense of continental United States—and 80,000 came out of classes (e) and (f). In other words, there was an actual reduction of 384,000 in the number of ground troops, combat troops, if you please.

Where is there need for more ground troops in the face of this statement?

Continuing, General Marshall said in his statement, beginning at page 261:

Now if we administer a cut of the nature you describe, that would mean offhand, I

will say, that approximately that many divisions will not sail in the fall of 1944.

It is difficult to follow the reasoning behind that statement, since the reason 2,700,000 men will remain in this country is not for lack of trained men but for lack of shipping facilities necessary to move them.

As General Marshall in another place in his testimony has said, if we had the shipping facilities we would move overseas at once the 5,000,000 who will be on hand January 1, 1944.

The fact is that regardless of whether he gets those men, and even if he moves the men abroad as fast as he can, he will still have 2,300,000 men in this country on January 1, 1945, without any present increase in the Army.

Continuing with General Marshall's statement, we find that he says:

You would be speculating on the war coming to a conclusion as rapidly as has been implied in some of the press and radio statements.

The truth is that the only thing of which we seem to be sure is, not the ultimate size of the Army needed to do the job, which is a speculative figure, but the limited number of men who from time to time can be moved to the front, due to shipping restrictions. It would seem, then, that inductions into the Army should be gaged in accordance with the Army's ability to use men effectively, as determined by the shipping restrictions, rather than by any preconceived figure as to what the ultimate size of the Army should be, and that the timing of the inductions should relate to those known figures, rather than to the speculative figure as to the number of men ultimately needed.

General Marshall also said:

You would have to go to work and demobilize divisions right now—right now, this week, this month—to provide men we must have between now and the end of the calendar year.

That statement cannot be separated from the whole answer of the general at that point. When read in their context, it is obvious that those words were used in conjunction with a discussion of a particular problem then before the general, a problem which called for immediate solution and which he did not see how he was going to solve without breaking down divisions right then, to wit, September 20. The general was stating a problem, as I say, which called for immediate solution, to wit, the supplying at that particular time of specialized troops needed for a particular purpose at the front. He obviously did not plan to solve the problem by utilizing men who have not even yet completed their basic training. He certainly could not solve it, since the problem was immediate, through the utilization of men which had not even been drafted at that time. His statement, then, had no direct connection with the problem which is facing this body, to wit, the drafting of fathers. It was simply the statement of a problem which then was very much on his mind, and gives merely an insight into some of the difficulties which beset a chief of staff. It is impossible to come

to any other conclusion; General Marshall said he had to do it "right now, this week, this month." However, we are considering the matter of the drafting of fathers in the months of October, November, and December.

The one distinguishing feature of the present Army, as the general repeatedly stated throughout his testimony, is that no man has been or is going to be sent abroad for service until he has been fully trained and prepared at home.

As a practical matter, if the Army had been run on the businesslike basis on which General Marshall says it has, he would have no difficulty in supplying the men at the time when he spoke.

In order to furnish replacements of specialized troops or others, there have been set up in this country, on paper at least, replacement depots. The replacement depots are presumed to have on hand men purposely sent there to meet sudden demands for replacements. But before a man is sent to a replacement depot he is presumed to have had 17 weeks of basic training.

Apparently, however, the Army had fallen down in that regard, and was unable to provide from the replacement depots the men who then were on demand from abroad.

That, however, has nothing whatsoever to do with the problem we are facing today, to wit, the drafting of fathers—a question which General Marshall says is one for Congress and for the War Manpower Commission.

Certainly, Mr. President, it cannot be the purpose of General Marshall to take married men into the Army, place them in the replacement depots, and then send them overseas with less than 17 weeks of training, when everyone knows, and even the Army concedes that it has trained troops and trained divisions in the country—men who have had training for at least 2 years, and some of them 3 years.

In addition to that, today many of the fathers could do the work which is being done by thousands of men who are doing so-called housekeeping work in the United States—guarding bridges and other places located in various sections.

This morning I received a letter from Walter B. Wanamaker, judge of the Summit County Court of Common Pleas, Akron, Ohio. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing an article from the morning paper which is self-explanatory. What I can't understand is why this youngster has been deferred all this time when old men with families have been taken.

The article enclosed in the letter is a clipping from the Cleveland Plain Dealer. The article reads, in part, as follows:

#### LAYS DOWN SHEARS TO ENTER SERVICE

Latest Plain Dealer employee to enter the Nation's armed services is Jason Rouby, 20, editorial department copy cutter, who was inducted into the Army this week. He will report for active duty October 19.

Mr. President, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the greatest newspapers in the country, a newspaper which had been calling for war, writes that one of

its 20-year-old employees has been inducted for service in the Army; and yet Judge Wanamaker writes that he cannot understand why that youngster has been deferred until this time, when older men with families have been taken.

I read further from Judge Wanamaker's letter:

May I be so bold as to criticize opposition to the fathers' draft as one of emotional appeal rather than the appeal to reason.

The real test is: Do our transportation and training and equipment facilities, which we now possess, assure us the exhaustion of the present supply of men on hand in this country. If the General or anybody else would be so bold as to say that we will have transported, equipped, and have the capacity in transportation to supply the men already in the armed service by a year from now, then these fathers are needed now.

If they cannot say this, then these fathers will not be needed until the year before the present armed supply is exhausted.

I have read all of the testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee by the various generals who testified to the conscripted army. None of them estimated that more than 8 months was required to make a thoroughly trained soldier out of a raw recruit. I have used the figure of 12 months for an abundance of safety.

However, if we need these men, the drive and sentimentality about them being fathers is pure emotionalism. If we do not need them, the drive of General Marshall that the failure to take them would strike a worse blow than the Japs or Germans could do to our war effort is likewise pure emotionalism.

May I further add, that to assume that anyone working for Franklin D. Roosevelt is expressing his own personal good judgment instead of the opinion of the President is a violent assumption.

I have heard over the radio this morning an announcement of the various States where the fathers draft was to begin immediately to operate. In these States, however, certain cities have been excepted where the population is dense, such as Chicago, from the rest of the State of Illinois. If there are men still in the city of Chicago to fill the draft quotas without the need of taking fathers and the same thing applies to New York City under this announcement, then certainly those men who are not fathers should be exhausted first.

Very cordially yours,

W. B. WANAMAKER.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Preferential Draft Treatment for Young Married Men," by Dr. Constantine Panunzio, of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, the University of California, Los Angeles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

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

[From Scientific Monthly of April 1943]

PREFERENTIAL DRAFT TREATMENT FOR YOUNG MARRIED MEN

(By Dr. Constantine Panunzio, department of anthropology and sociology, the University of California, Los Angeles)

In former wars nations generally considered only the emergency of the moment and drew upon all men of military age regardless of marital status and without considering

the effect on future manpower. In general, this haphazard practice is still being followed. However, the experience of the last war plus recent studies of population furnishes evidence which indicates that calling men of certain ages may produce very serious results in terms of future military power.

The outcome of diverse policies may perhaps be best illustrated by recalling what happened during the First World War in France and England. France, in response to the urgency of the moment, recruited from all the men of military age, regardless of their marital status or the reproduction-age to which they belonged. The result was that France had 1,040,000 fewer births during 1915-19 than it would have had if it had not been at war. This, of course, had no apparent result at the time. But 20 years later the loss did have a profound effect. When in 1940 France called its men to arms, it found itself with approximately 700,000 fewer men, 20 to 25 years of age. Germany also had fewer births—about 2,900,000—as a result of the First World War, but Germany was able to make up the loss by its larger and rapidly-growing population, whereas France, with a smaller and stationary population was unable to do so. At least one scholar foresaw the potential danger of that difference. In a remarkable statement, penned in 1918, Savorgnan, an Italian student of population, said that it would be between 1935 and 1940 that "the shadow of that loss in births" would hang most heavily over France. What that loss did actually mean to France in the crucial hour of 1940 no one can measure. There is documentary proof, however, that German officials were well aware of the fact and they seem to have timed their attack to coincide with the very moment when France was weakest in manpower.

England, on the other hand, employed a far-seeing policy. Utilizing the knowledge available at the time as to the high proportion of children which the younger segments produce, England adopted a recruitment method which made possible the maintenance of a relatively high birth rate during the war period. Briefly stated, England's policy generally encouraged child-bearing: (1) it deferred married men until the end of 1916, (2) it provided family allowances for men who married after enlistment, (3) it granted generous allowances to the wives of enlisted men and for each child, and (4) later, it made similar provisions for drafted married men. Largely as a result of this recruitment policy, the United Kingdom was able to sustain its birth rate to a remarkable degree. Consequently, while France lost 1,040,000 births during the war, the United Kingdom, with a population greater by more than four million persons, had only 650,000 fewer live births than it might have had. Moreover, with a faster-growing population, England was able to repair the loss while France was not. Inasmuch as these differences bore results in terms of effective manpower 20 years later, or between 1935 and 1940, they gave England a greater manpower than it would have had if it had not followed that policy. And this extra strength may have been a decisive factor in the resistance England was able to give Germany in 1940.

In order to realize the effect on future manpower when youthful married men are called to arms, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the United States the younger mothers give birth to a very large proportion of all children. In 1930 (the 1940 census data are not yet available), mothers between the ages of 20 and 34, inclusive, produced 72.6 percent of all live births. Moreover, within this group, it was the mothers between 20 and 24 who contributed the largest proportion. Since males on the average are 3 years older than females at first marriage, about three-quarters of all births occur roughly

when the fathers are between 23 and 37, and within that group the greatest contribution is made by men between 23 and 27 years of age. Or if we take into consideration a more significant fact, age of conception, the men would be 22 to 36 years old for the entire group and 22 to 26 for the more productive element.

In terms of future manpower, then it is a very serious matter to call any considerable number of the married men between 22 and 36, and even more so to call married men between the ages 22 and 26. It is true that some of these men are urgently needed; still, the future strength of the Nation makes it imperative to give some consideration to deferring them, whenever possible. It is a striking fact that Germany, though facing a far more difficult situation, is doing everything in its power to maintain or even raise the birth rate in the midst of war.

For the United States the problem is even more acute because our military forces are stationed far away, which in most cases renders it impossible for men to return home even though on leave. Because of this fact, the withdrawal of men of the specified ages cuts down births at a greater rate and creates more of a loss in future manpower than in countries close to the scenes of operations.

Likewise, the withdrawal from home of married women between the ages of 20 and 32, even for essential war industry and service, is a matter of great concern, since such a procedure inevitably decreases the reproduction activity of these women.

Our situation is even more serious because the population of this country is fast becoming stationary, while the populations of some rival countries are still growing rapidly. Our present rate of increase is barely enough for replacement, while that of Japan, for example, is considerably above it. By 1970, Japan's total population is expected to increase by about 30,000,000, while that of the United States will add 18,000,000. And since the age structure of the two nations is markedly different, Japan will have an appreciably greater proportionate increase in manpower than will the United States. Any loss in births at present on the part of the United States will, therefore, be far more serious than that which Japan can experience. In view of these facts, the United States and Japan will face a manpower situation somewhat similar to that which France and Germany faced in 1940. This statement is intended to create alarm, but even more to stress the full import of the situation. Even if we should deal Japan a knock-out blow now, in the next generation we may be obliged to confront a nation with an even greater manpower than it now possesses.

As one authoritative voice has expressed it, "With a large element of our able-bodied men in the armed services—and the consequent disruption of family life and postponements of marriage—the effective fertility of the American people is likely to fall below the level required to maintain a stationary population. Evidently our population policy must be given serious consideration in the councils that are guiding the Nation through its problems in these difficult times."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in commenting on the article by Dr. Panunzio, the Washington Post, in an editorial in its issue of July 6, said:

LOST GENERATION?

The induction of married men into the Army appears to be proceeding steadily, but the discussion as to the wisdom or unwisdom of this policy also continues. In all the discussion an aspect of the question has up to now been pretty generally overlooked. And that is the effect of the policy on the national birthrate. The relationship of the national birthrate to the national manpower



is, or should be, self-evident. It is also pretty obvious that the present manpower crisis is to a large extent a consequence of the steeply declining birthrate of the past 2 decades.

In the June issue of the Scientific Monthly, Dr. Constantine Panunzio, sociologist of the University of California, points out that the age groups from which married men are now being drafted into service are precisely the ages which represent the period of maximum fertility. "In terms of future manpower," observes Dr. Panunzio, "it is a very serious matter to call any considerable number of the married men between 22 and 36. \* \* \* For the United States the problem is even more acute because our military forces are stationed far away, which in most cases renders it impossible for men to return home even though on leave. \* \* \* Likewise, the withdrawal from home of married women between the ages of 20 and 32, even for essential war industry and service, is a matter of grave concern, since such a procedure inevitably decreases the reproduction activity of these women."

Long before Pearl Harbor the net reproductive rate in the United States had fallen below the replacement level, and the country was approaching the point of a stationary population. Dr. Panunzio evidently fears that the mobilization of so many young men and women in the most fertile age groups may make even a stationary population impossible.

At the same time the birthrate of exactly those nations which seem most likely to become our rivals in future is steadily rising. By 1970, Dr. Panunzio points out, for example, Japan's population will have increased by 40,000,000, while ours will have increased at best only 18,000,000. Not only that, but because of the much more favorable distribution of age groups Japan will have "an appreciably greater proportionate increase in manpower" than we. Japan, indeed, may be decisively defeated this time, and so be deprived of sustenance at home and abroad for a thriving population. But so were the Germans decisively defeated in 1918, and look what happened to them. There is no assurance that a generation hence we may not have to confront a Japan "with an even greater manpower than it now possesses." That also applies to the Germans, who are now building up future reserves of manpower by forced breeding and by drafting the young men of the occupied countries. It looks as if they are bent upon trying again to win the peace as the prospect of winning the war becomes overcast.

History, we think, might possibly show that this matter of national birthrates may have a good deal more to do with deciding the political destiny of the world than any number of peace plans, charters, or vice presidential speeches. Anyway, however much we may hope for permanent peace, it would not be the part of statesmanship to ignore utterly the possibility that 25 years from now we may have to fight yet another war of survival. If so, let us hope the manpower and Selective Service authorities of that war will have no reason to curse the short-sightedness of their predecessors, as the British are now cursing the haphazardness in manpower policy of their rulers in World War No. 1.

From the social angle, the fact is that when we draft American fathers we jeopardize the existence of the American home. The wife and mother is left with bewildering and cruel alternatives. She must either depend upon her parents for support, always supposing her parents are able to help her, or she must place her children in an institution while she looks for work—if she is able to work—in order

to help support them. It is impossible for a mother to support herself and her children on the allotment she receives from the Government; and each day of rising prices for foodstuffs makes the task more impossible. But even if the allotment were doubled or tripled, the chief problem would not be met; that is, the problem of making American children wards of the state and of breaking up the American home.

It is unthinkable that an administration which has talked more about building and making secure the home should unwittingly countenance policies which will destroy the very essence of American democracy. Today, we have the Social Security Act, the home owners' loan, Federal housing law, and many others, all aimed at strengthening the family.

No administration in the history of this country has ever talked more about preserving the American home and about humanitarian policies than has the present administration; and yet the act of taking fathers into the Army when it is not necessary is having a worse effect upon the future of the country and upon American homes and children than have the evils sought to be corrected by all the social legislation which this administration has sponsored, and which has been enacted by a Democratic Congress. We are undoing everything that has been done to help American homes and to help the children of the country. We are not only destroying what we have done but we are completely breaking down the moral standards of our young people, as has been pointed out time and time again by ministers of the gospel from one end of the country to the other, by workers in child-welfare organizations, by school teachers, professors, and many others, even including J. Edgar Hoover.

So much for the social angle. Now, for the economic angle. It is a known fact that the key men in most war plants are married men and the single men hold the less important and replaceable jobs.

Second. The turn-over in those plants, as I have previously stated, runs as high as 300 percent; and it is stated that turn-over is the biggest problem. I have tried to get, without success, figures broken down to show whether or not the men involved in the business of turn-over are single men or married men. It stands to reason, however, that men with wives and children cannot move with the rapidity of single men; and it is my belief that when these figures are obtained they will show that this turn-over applies almost exclusively to single men and nonfathers.

Thirdly. From the financial angle, allotments will have to be substantially increased in the event of the drafting of men with families, and in case of disability from service the Government would be called upon to pay out greatly increased sums of money for the support of families, as compared with similar disability allowances in the cases of single men.

Lastly, from the businessmen with whom I have talked I believe it will be

found that if we draft these men we will undermine the whole civilian economy of the Nation, which is today dependent upon the continued ability to use these men.

From the strictly military point of view, I have already stated General Marshall's preference for single men. In this connection Lieutenant General McNarney had previously testified that, all things being equal, the Army would prefer single men and nonfathers to fathers with children. This, it seems to me, should be self-evident.

From all angles—social, economic, financial, and military—there seems to be no question in anyone's mind that the drafting of single men and nonfathers is preferable to the drafting of married men with children. The adoption of an opposite policy would run counter to the long-term interests of the Nation. I do not believe that anyone will dispute that conclusion.

Mr. President, I now wish to take up some questions dealt with by the Truman committee report. When the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] spoke it was late in the day. I wish to call attention to some of the things which he said. He had made a long study of the whole manpower situation. In a recent address he said:

It is only by actually engaging the enemy in combat that victory can be achieved. The enemy is not impressed by news that we are inducting more men into the Army. He is only impressed by the soldiers that he is forced to meet in combat. For these reasons it is idle and foolish to talk of mere numbers in our Army or to seek to have as many men in the Army in this country as there are in the Army inside Japan.

In theory our job is to induct men into the Army at the rate and at the time that will enable them upon completion of their training to go abroad, either for actual combat or as reserves to support those in actual combat in case of need.

We should not induct men before there is a reasonable expectancy that they can be sent abroad at the end of their training. For these reasons I strongly urged about a year ago in Boston that the Army should exercise the utmost care in determining its size and the rate of induction, so as not unnecessarily and carelessly to increase our manpower shortage, which even then was our greatest single limiting factor.

I am glad to note that the Army has reduced its original estimate of requirements of 8,248,000 men by 562,000, part of which was achieved by reductions in its overhead and in the replacement and school programs. But even with these reductions (the reductions from 8,248,000 by 562,000 men) and even assuming that the Army is successful in its efforts to transport abroad 4,750,000 men by the end of 1944, we still would have almost 3,000,000 men in uniform within the continental limits of the United States at the end of 1944. The great majority of these would have been in the Army from 1 to 2 years.

I am well aware that we need many men in essential activities at home such as house-keeping at the numerous Army posts, defense of Continental United States and guard duties over prisoners. \* \* \* But I do question whether we need 5,000,000 men in the Army this month in Continental United States and whether the Army needs this year an additional 630,000 men, so that even if we achieve our hoped-for goal of 4,750,000

men abroad by the end of 1944, we shall still have 3,000,000 men left in this country.

The fact is that the number of men who have been in the Army for 12 months or more and are still in the United States has been steadily increasing until today we have many hundreds of thousands of men in the Army who are impatient to be sent abroad or home. The other members of the committee, of which I am chairman, and myself have inspected a large number of Army camps and have had the privilege of talking with hundreds of the men in the ranks about their work.

Over and over again we have been told that the soldier is doing now the same thing that he was doing 6 months or a year or even 2 years ago and that he is learning nothing new.

The boys themselves and their relatives and friends are fully aware of this situation, and they properly resent it.

That statement was not made by me. It was not made by an individual who has not visited the Army camps. It was made by the chairman of the Truman committee, the Senator from Missouri, who has investigated war plants and Army camps from one end of the country to the other.

I continue to quote from the address delivered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]:

There are many reasons for this waste of manpower by the Army itself. But, after making full allowance for all these things, the fact still remains that many who have been inducted into the Army are not being productively employed. If and when they are productively employed, the total requirements of the Army can safely be reduced very substantially. The same is true of the Navy. Surely it is the duty of the Army before disrupting families and civilian industries to make sure that it is effectively utilizing the men it already has and that it can effectively utilize those that it still seeks to induct.

Mr. President, all I have asked for and all I am seeking is that the men who now are in the Army be utilized, that the men in the camps be properly utilized, that the military authorities use the manpower they can obtain before they take married men who are fathers.

Mr. President, I would be the last one to stand on this floor and say that if the Army needed married fathers, I should want to prevent their being taken. I know of no member of the Senate who would say such a thing. However, I submit there is no one who has investigated the situation, including Mr. Baruch, who admits he has not visited a single Army camp, but has had other persons visit camps for him, and there is not a Senate committee which has investigated the situation, who does not know that the manpower of the United States is not being properly used.

Again, the Senator from Missouri said in his address:

There is a most serious question as to whether the attempt to take more than a million more men during the next 3 months will not do more harm than good. The induction of fathers must stand or fall on its own merits, and it is my opinion that before undertaking that very serious step with all the disruptive consequences that would be entailed, it is up to the Army and the

Navy to demonstrate that they have reduced their requirements to the bare minimum by efficiently utilizing all the men that they now have. I believe that by so doing they can reduce their requirements by several hundred thousand men without impairing their striking power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remaining quotations from the address delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). Is there objection?

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

If and when they are productively employed the total requirements of the Army can safely be reduced very substantially. The same is true of the Navy. Surely it is the duty of the Army before disrupting families and civilian industries to make sure that it is effectively utilizing the men it already has and that it can effectively utilize those that it still seeks to induct. We are engaged in total war. The armed services have properly been accorded a first call upon the Nation's manhood, but it is not and cannot safely be a blank check. To win this war mass production is essential. We must have an uninterrupted flow of materials from the mines and quarries, forests and farms, on through to the finished products. We must not only have the materials needed for our armed forces, but we must have those needed to supply our essential civilian requirements. We must maintain our transportation industry and provide the railroad, truck, and bus companies with the facilities to continue their vital work. We must provide the farmer with machinery to enable him to raise greater crops with less labor. In short, we must maintain a sound, healthy economy, so that the fearful burden of the greatest war in history can be sustained, not for months or for a year or so, but for as many years as are necessary to achieve total victory. The more that can be left for civilian use the stronger we will become. After we have won the war we must have a foundation on which to rebuild and make secure the American way of life. Any frittering away of our resources of manpower or materials, whether by the armed forces or by civilians, will weaken us, and if carried too far, will sow the seeds of discord and dissatisfaction that might make us a prey to overtures for a stalemate peace.

Nearly a year ago the committee of which I am chairman, in its report on manpower, warned that a serious manpower shortage existed, and pointed out a number of simple and practical means of alleviating the shortage by the efficient utilization by industry and the armed services of the men available to them. Huge blocks of manpower are still being hoarded or wasted by the continuance of practices which management and labor have a clear duty to end. It has been suggested that the way to abolish these evils is to pass a national service act, and the Under Secretary of War has frankly admitted that a major reason for the Army's desire to induct fathers is to force them into war work. Such proposals are attractive because of their simplicity. But, unfortunately, it is not possible to end these problems by legislative fiat, especially where that action simply sets up a huge, unwieldy bureaucratic organization with a direction to make literally thousands of important determinations. Our prior experience with such bureaus and with the existing manpower agencies does not warrant any confidence that the benefits would

equal or exceed the decided detriment of trying to get production out of forced labor.

There is no substitute for efficiency. It is efficiency that we must seek, and not more complex and unworkable controls. Certainly the draft of fathers is not warranted as a mere scheme to force a shift of manpower.

This was recognized by the Under Secretary of War, who stated that he realized that men in aircraft plants should be deferred. Work in aircraft plants is by no means the only essential occupation. A truck driver moving important freight may be even more necessary, even though on first impression he appears to be engaged in a strictly non-war activity.

At the same time I believe that both industry and labor are under obligation to stop practices that hoard and waste manpower, and that every man, including fathers, who hopes for deferment should be very certain that he is actually engaged in the type of work in which he can make the best contribution to the war effort. The lessened pressure on local draft boards to meet stiff quotas should enable them to exercise a careful discretion, so as not to take men where great hardship would be involved, who are already usefully employed in work which, although not always war work, is essential to the country.

We must not permit hardship and suffering by drafting men whose families will be left without support and will become a burden on the public, just because we lack the courage and ability to force the armed services and industry and labor to utilize efficiently a supply of manpower that is adequate to do all that needs to be done.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that anything I may say upon this subject will not change any votes in this body. I appreciate that my Democratic colleagues are apparently not particularly interested in ascertaining the facts. I wish to say, however, in all seriousness, that the time will come in the not far distant future when they will be interested. If they follow blindly—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield there, I should like to call attention, for the RECORD, inasmuch as the Senator from Montana has singled out his Democratic colleagues, that there are as many Democratic colleagues present in the Senate as there are Republican colleagues.

Mr. WHEELER. Well, Mr. President, there have not been all afternoon. If there are now, it is the first time there have been. However, the time will come, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, when they will be interested in the subject; because it is one which affects not only 446,000 fathers, but also 446,000 mothers, countless children, and grandparents and other relatives. If any Members of the Senate do not believe for one moment that the people of the United States are interested in endeavoring to prevent the breaking up of American homes and the throwing into the streets of children, and if Members of the Senate do not think the people of the country believe it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to stop the waste of manpower in the Government bureaus and the hoarding which is taking place

in various industries throughout the country, whether such Senators are Republicans or Democrats, they will be sadly mistaken. If they do not believe they are breaking down the morale of the American people in the war effort by inducting fathers into the military service they are sadly mistaken.

Anyone who examines the mail I have received cannot fail to be impressed by the recital in the letters of the facts upon which the writers base their opinions and conclusions. I refer not merely to persons who have written to me "I agree with you," but to specific instances of Army officers and privates who, in writing about such matters are violating the rules of the service but who, nevertheless, are writing to me because they are distressed because they are lying around doing nothing—not untrained men, but men who have been trained. I have also received letters from labor organizations pointing out the waste of manpower, the hoarding of young men who are being deferred while fathers are being taken into the service. I have received letters stating that draft boards all over the United States are resigning because of resentment over the drafting of fathers. I have received letters from ministers of the gospel, lawyers, doctors, and businessmen.

As I have said, I am not interested in any particular piece of legislation. I should like to see the problem worked out by the departments, by the Government itself. There is no excuse under the sun why it has not been worked out before. However, after making a very brilliant speech with reference to the matter, and after criticizing the situation more severely than I have criticized it, my distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], has said that legislation which would defer the drafting of fathers would be class legislation, and that the matter should be left to the departments. Of course, Mr. President, the whole Selective Service Act is class legislation. When by Executive order the President of the United States exempted 275,000 men between the ages of 38 and 45, that was class legislation. So the whole thing is based upon class legislation, and of necessity, so.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to read for the RECORD, whether anyone is interested or not, a newspaper article concerning draft board 20B. The headline reads:

Draft board 20B, made to defer 28 EB Co. men by higher-ups, will not induct men in their places.

The article reads as follows:

STONINGTON.—The selective service board at Stonington, covering district 20-B, and long known as opposed to any plan to send fathers to the front so long as there are single men in defense plants who could be replaced, was forced last night to change its idea of fairness in the matter of deferments, according to the chairman, Col. Bourdon A. Babcock, of Pawcatuck.

The board has been at odds with the State and National selective-service headquarters on the subject for some time, but no open break came until last night, when it received

instructions from the headquarters of the State selective service in Hartford to reverse its decision and attitude on the manning-replacement table.

More specifically, the order concerned 28 single men in the employ of Electric Boat Co. who have been ordered to report for induction on May 18, but who now can count on further deferment.

Members of the draft board indicated through a spokesman following the meeting that they were bowing humbly to influence from Hartford and Washington, but their "forced" decision is not going to put 28 married men or men with dependents 28 steps nearer the Army, as it would appear, for they voted not to call an additional 28 men to replace those given deferments. Thus when the May 18 contingent leaves, it will be 28 men short.

Under the manning replacement table, every man who has a deferment because of war industry activity has a date set against his name when his deferment ends. The State board gets a copy of this deferment, and they order the local boards to defer the man until that date, when he will again be placed in I-A.

Members of the board in Stonington have steadfastly maintained that this was not binding upon them. Colonel Babcock said the matter came to an issue March 11 when the board refused to defer 28 employees of the Electric Boat Co. and placed them all in I-A. The manning table would give them deferment anywhere from 2 to 12 months.

#### SUBMIT UNDER COMPULSION

The State ordered them reclassified. Colonel Babcock said his group reopened the cases, considered each one of them and refused to change the classifications, and on April 22 sent notice to each one to report for induction on May 18.

This action was taken by the local board because of commitments and agreements previously made by the Electric Boat Co. officials releasing these men for induction during April, Colonel Babcock said.

Friday, April 23, according to the Stonington board, Col. George Sturges, executive officer of the selective-service board in Connecticut, and Col. George Morin, who is in charge of occupational deferment, attended the meeting of the board in Stonington town hall. They were quoted as making a personal appeal to the 20-B officials to go along with the manning plan "as advocated in Washington." The board refused by unanimous vote to grant the request.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator cited an instance in Connecticut of a local board refusing to fill its quota by inducting married men. I am informed that in a number of States that practice has been followed for some time, while in other States when the quota has been assigned and the local boards have used up the single men, then they have taken married men. Now I should like to ask the Senator a question. Has the local board plenary power in that respect? Has it the complete power to refuse to induct married men to meet the quota, as the board in Connecticut has done, until all boards have reached the position where they have no single men to induct?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say, in answer to the Senator's question, that many persons say that it is all up to the local boards, but I noticed the other day that

in one place where a draft board refused to take married men they were ousted from their positions by the National Selective Service Board. I think that will answer the question.

Here is another case. I quote from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Telegram of September 27 under the heading "Base overstaffed with young men eligible for Army, G. A. Gnau asserts." The article reads:

Clifford A. Gnau, quartermaster-adjutant of the Pennsylvania department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today delivered a broadside against alleged practices at the Middletown Air Depot and asserted that he is in full accord with statements of Congressman FOREST A. HARNES, Indiana, regarding deferments at the air post.

Gnau is also chairman of Harrisburg City Draft Board No. 1, which he says alone has two to three hundred registrants employed at Middletown.

"The depot is over staffed with young men whose presence is unnecessary to its efficient operation," declared Gnau, "and from reports received women at the depot perform more work per capita than the young 'heroes' who virtuously proclaim to all who will listen that they are performing a vital service to their country."

Gnau, a veteran of World War No. 1, wounded in action overseas, added, "I further believe most of the Army officers stationed at the depot will sign any request for deferment placed on their desk by a subordinate, inasmuch as a considerable number of the officers have no conception of what it is all about and should be assigned to combat duty, instead of fighting the 'battle of Middletown'."

Here is a letter which comes from headquarters, Camp Tyson, office of Post Engineer, Camp Tyson, Tenn., September 28, 1943:

I read in the morning paper that you charge that the Army is not making full use of its manpower. You state that there are at present experienced pilots in the Army that are driving jeeps and doing menial tasks, while the Army proceeds to spend millions of dollars training inexperienced men.

Let me say that I agree with you 100 percent on this statement. Only I say that you do not state the truly full extent to which the Army is wasting these men.

I know that you are very busy, but if you care to have additional information, sworn to, I will be glad to do what I can.

Many men that are in the Army now, doing menial tasks, were in the Royal Canadian Air Force. They returned to the United States with the idea that they would get a fair chance to fly, only once they were here they were told that they were physically unqualified and all this time Canada had been training these men for combat flying. Certainly no one can object to the record of the Royal Air Force, and the Canadian Air Force in this war. They have set an enviable record, a record which this country has not touched even if given the same amount of time in comparison with the time element under which the R. C. A. F. and the R. A. F. have operated.

I say that there are many pilots in the Army who could be used for less exacting duties than combat flying. These men would right now for the most part, qualify in the R. C. A. F. as combat pilots. I have logged 180 hours, I was in the Air Corps last year, I was finally disqualified because of so-called faulty color vision. The odd part is that 2

months earlier I had passed a combat physical examination in Montreal, Canada. When I was enlisted in the United States, they were aware of this, but I was told that I would obtain a waiver in consideration of my flying hours. Of course, I never received it. At present I am doing drafting work for the post engineers here at Camp Tyson, Tenn. I assure you that in the last 3 months I have made but one drawing. All we do is to sit around day after day. I would like to see combat duty, but I have experience in flying, and I will only fight when I am given a fair chance to fly. There are many fellows like myself who grew up with aviation in the past 10 years. These fellows are no better treated than I was. Flying means all to fellows that have grown up with it, and the last 10 years have been the fastest that aviation has ever experienced.

The other day I quoted a statement that there were several thousand—I think the number was between three and five thousand—capable of flying who were doing other things. That information was given to me by a high Government official who was in a position to know what he was talking about. Obviously, he told me he could not let me use his name; but he said it was costing \$35,000 to train a flyer; that, scattered from one end of the country to the other, they had men who had flown all the way from 160 or 180 up to 1,000 hours who were now doing menial work. That may be a businesslike way to conduct such affairs.

I read now from a letter from Green Bay, Wis.:

Just recently our local chapter, Fort Howard, No. 164, Military Order of the Purple Heart, sent a resolution to the two Wisconsin Senators and to our Congressman \* \* \* opposing the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers until all single men of military fitness, regardless of their station in life or position, were given the opportunity to serve in the armed forces.

Next is a letter from New York regarding draft board No. 2 in Union, N. J., and I read the following clipping:

Vincent deP. Slavin, chairman of local board 2 in Union Township, today called upon Congress to investigate the "unfair conditions" within the Selective Service System.

Declaring abuse of the replacement schedule has reached a point where industry is controlling the local boards, Slavin said War Manpower Commissioner McNutt's recent order to call fathers October 1 would be unnecessary if deferments were taken away from available single men. Slavin asked the legislators to "upset McNutt's plans until the system operates fairly."

Slavin said a conference with Erwin L. Meisel, his board's secretary; Frank J. Ott, a board member, and Harrison B. Johnson, Government appeal agent, resulted in a decision to classify all fathers in 3-D so long as the board has one unmarried man deferred.

#### LETTER TO ROOSEVELT

Slavin, who recently stirred Nation-wide comment by posting a list of his board's deferred registrants and the reasons for their deferment, revealed he has sent letters of protest to State and Federal authorities, declaring his board is "disgusted and discouraged in an apparent unfairness in the operation of the Selective Service System." The letters, mailed last night, went to President Roosevelt, each Senator and Representative, Secretary of War Stimson, McNutt, Na-

tional Selective Service Director Hershey, and New Jersey Director Bloomer.

From Tacoma, Wash., comes the following letter:

When you say the shipyards in Tacoma are overstaffed you are right. Three men for every job. Young single men being deferred every 6 months under the pretext of necessity.

I talked with a single man 23 years of age yesterday. He is supposed to have a key position. He gets a deferment every 6 months. I asked him whether he could be replaced. He laughed and said, "Hell, yes. I could break in a man in 2 weeks' time on my job. All I have got down there is a perpetual vacation."

That is signed by E. C. Carlson, Tacoma, Wash.

I have received the following telegram from Nashville, Tenn.:

Have Gilbert Biron, chairman, local draft board No. 4, Mobile, Ala., testify during the present manpower hearing. He recently resigned in protest over blanket deferment being given new workers in his district. Make the committee hear both sides.

I read the following from a letter I have received from Gulfport, Miss.:

I am 43 years old. I enlisted April 27, 1943. At the time of my enlistment I was making approximately \$135 per week. I have went through boot training and I am now ready to sail overseas. Many men younger than I am are getting out of the armed forces on account of their age. That, sir, is a condition of their mind rather than a condition of their bodies. Truthfully speaking, sir, can't this age limit be raised? Let's have less orphans; let's have more men my age in this thing.

The writer adds, "I am a Democrat."

I have here a letter from the past commander of Furniture City Post, No. 258, of the American Legion, in which he states:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am very much opposed to the drafting of fathers until a thorough investigation of all occupational deferments is made. There are too many doubtful deferments in this community, and they have been too freely resorted to. Why not purge the selective service lists so that all available manpower can be taken before drafting fathers?

Who is going to take care of the families of drafted fathers?

Frankly, this is the opinion of a majority of the World War No. 1 veterans and the man on the street.

Respectfully yours,

THORNE J. BROWN,  
Past Commander.

That is from Grand Rapids. I read now from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 29:

Expressing indignation at exaggerated claims of young men in war plants concerning their essentiality, three members of the five-man draft board in St. Charles County, just out of St. Louis, resigned yesterday rather than draft fathers instead of these men.

"We have been hesitant to take this action," a letter signed by the three and sent to State selective service headquarters pointed out, "but have felt for some days that our usefulness to the Selective Service has definitely been curtailed."

The following appeared in the Boston Herald on September 28:

NAVY YARD LABOR WASTE IS CHARGED—MANY DO NOTHING, CITY COUNCIL TOLD

If Boston has become a critical labor shortage area, the Federal Government has made it so by permitting or helping to foster "intolerable" conditions at the Charlestown Navy Yard, City Councilman Michael L. Kinsella, of Charlestown, declared at yesterday's council meeting.

Kinsella, himself employed at the navy yard as a clerk for a private contractor, asserted that a great wealth of manpower was being wasted through mismanagement both at the Charlestown yard and its annex in South Boston. Directing his criticism largely at the Navy officers in charge of the yard, he said that "because of mismanagement, some 56,000 workers are employed in Charlestown and South Boston when 30,000 could do the work."

#### CHARGES OVERMANNING

"Go in the navy yard and you'll find the men stumbling all over each other," he said. "Go by the admiral's house, and you'll find able-bodied civilians—some in their early 30's—doing nothing but keeping the admiral's hedge in good condition."

He said that among the naval officers are some "who make their betters defer to them, and they have a great talent for countermanding the orders of high-ranking civilian employees who in many instances have 25 to 30 years experience in the yard."

He declared that among the personnel at the yard are "the worst frauds and fakers, starting with the naval officers and going down the line to the last man employed, that this city has ever had to tolerate."

#### "STANDING AROUND"

"Go through the yard and you'll see hundreds of male employees doing nothing but standing around and chewing the fat with good-looking girls who also are stalling," he said.

"You'll find two able-bodied men carrying a piece of steel six to eight feet long—one of them at each end—because of some silly yard rule that in the case of a piece of steel over a certain length, two men must be used to carry it.

"They want gardeners there to take care of the admiral's lawn, and laborers to take care of the captains' lawns. Some of the officers still have their tennis courts. They didn't convert them into Victory gardens."

He said that in his "honest opinion," not less than one-fourth of the 30,000 employed in the yard from 7 a. m. to 3:40 p. m. are "unproductive for eight hours of the day because they cannot possibly work in such numbers; the space is not there."

"They say Boston is a critical labor shortage area," Kinsella said. "If this is true, the Government has made it so. They should survey the labor situation at the navy yard, and when they start kicking out the fakers and phonies, they should throw out some of the 'brass hats' with them."

I call the attention of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the following telegram from his State:

Check Brookley Field about draft dodgers. It's full of them. It takes 10 men to do 1 man's job.

BURT SHERMAN.

The following is a letter written to a Member of the House of Representatives from St. Louis, Mo.:

As you know I have been here at Curtiss-Wright for the past 5 months and I am taking advantage of our past friendship to write you this letter.

Our plant here, and I imagine it is true of most plants, has an unbelievable number of single and just married men in their early twenties, who could be replaced to good advantage by any normal girl. These boys are out-and-out draft dodgers and in most cases when I talk to them they laugh and admit it.

I read a telegram from Jacksonville, Ill.:

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.:

You are right. We have dozens of 4-F slackers in this town. Some have no children. Some are single, never been examined.  
Dr. AUSTIN C. KINGSLEY.

I read another sent to me from San Francisco by E. C. Nelson:

I agree with your position in the manpower situation, particularly with respect to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. As a practicing certified public accountant, engaged principally in work for contractors handling war contracts, I have observed that this type of contract encourages the hoarding of manpower as well as tying up thousands of Government auditors who are engaged in the detail of auditing of costs under these contracts. The Government could obtain a huge pool of manpower and better results by granting lump-sum contracts subject to renegotiation for excessive profits and, at the same time, encourage competent contractors by providing for higher profit incentives based on low costs.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a sworn statement of conditions on war jobs in California from which I read as follows:

DINUBA, CALIF., September 17, 1943.

I, the undersigned, Claud Columbus Smith, 34 years of age and an American citizen, do hereby swear that the following is a true statement of facts and conditions:

That I was employed as steamfitter at \$1.75 per hour on September 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1943, on the construction of an Army hospital in Van Nuys, Calif. Work conditions were so lax that actual work accomplished could have been done in half the time if there had been proper supervision, and I attribute the poor supervision to the cost-plus practice of doing business. Here is an example: I asked the foreman for permission to send my helper for a piece of 2-inch pipe, 7½ inches long. He would have had to have gone a distance of 450 yards which would have consumed about 5 minutes. The foreman said, "No. The boss doesn't want you down there, because you are supposed to be out in the field working. If he sees you or your helper down there, he knows you are not working." So we did 15 minutes' work that day and 20 minutes' the next. On the third day, the needed piece was delivered by truck. In the meantime we were trying to catch this truck driver to deliver it for us. When the delivery was made by a ton-and-a-half truck, this one piece, weighing about 8 pounds, was all that was on it.

I have three brothers with the armed forces, and was too disgusted with the job to continue. I quit of my own free will. In fact, I haven't gone around for my check yet. The idea that someone was making 10 or 20 percent—through various subcontractors—on the \$17.33 a day I was receiving, and stabbing the taxpayers in the back at the same time, was too much for me to take. The Army needs this hospital, more beds for wounded Americans, and contractors encourage stalling around so their profits will run higher.

I have worked on various construction jobs in California during the past 2 years, and I have seen blueprints put out by rookier engineers that were all wrong. And when we knew they were wrong, we had to use them anyway. Later, some of them had to be broken out, others that were welded had to be cut out and thrown in the scrap pile.

Then the man making the statement proceeds to give other illustrations.

I read from a letter addressed to me from Madison, Wis., by a sergeant in the Army:

I am a soldier at Truax Field, Madison, Wis. I heard your address the 24th of September on Deferring Fathers.

I heartily agree with you that fathers should be deferred from military service, and I term they would be useless to us even as common supply men. Their spirit would be low because of their constant worrying over their families; and a low morale can cause discontent among other members of the service.

The Army needs clear minds and capable men for the many changes in assignments given to the men daily.

Then the writer describes some of the Army personnel.

The Government was just paying out a lot of wasted money by having this type of personnel in the service.

My duties here are those of shipping and receiving men. I am always in contact with men, so I know many of their problems. They are constantly complaining because they were not classified for the job they are best qualified to do in the Army.

May I state another example of waste. A large group of men classified as aircraft mechanics were shipped to Lincoln, Nebr., to become mechanics. There was no room for them, so they were sent here at Truax Field to learn radio code. As they were not classified as radiomen, 90 percent of the total group was washed out within 1 month, this idea costing the taxpayers a lot of foolish dollars. These are the things I object to; so if General Marshall thinks he needs more men, let's give him those men in the Air Corps, who are traveling from one camp to another in search of something to do.

Here is another letter addressed to me by an officer in the Army:

It has been my duty to examine for the final physical examination a great number of the men from 38 to 45 which the Army has released over the past many months. I can recall but one man who wasn't tickled to death at the prospect of getting out of the Army. They all had the same opinion—the Army was not training them for a useful role; there were unbelievable bottlenecks in the training program; the Army was wasting manpower on a scale that would not be believed by anyone not actually a witness to it. There is a lack of feeling and understanding in the army of democracy that would do credit to a Hitler.

In a given set-up in a hospital, for instance, if at one time of the day four men are needed for, say, an hour, they have four men all day, and probably two all night. None of them put in a good day's work, with rare exception, where, like as not, some poor devil has more work than two could do. Army men will admit to Army men that the whole business is more of a rest than they have ever had in their whole life, and this

at a time when our national existence hangs in the balance. I am not in favor of making men do a lot of work that amounts to "leaf raking" a la W. P. A., of which there is already entirely too much in the Army as it is. If forms and statistics could win the war we would have had it won long ago. The amount of records and red tape required when a soldier develops a sore throat keeps three people busy for a week.

I have a letter from the chairman of a draft board at Carthage, Miss., from which I read as follows:

You are right when you say stop the draft for awhile and you will correct the manpower shortage. Give the millions of idle men that we already have in uniform a chance to do something.

I am chairman of the draft board of my county, above 45 years of age, and don't have any relatives to be drafted into the armed forces, but I have sense enough to see that the drafting of manpower in the armed forces of this Nation is about 12 months ahead of everything else of the war effort.

Best of luck to you.

W. H. WHITE.

Mr. President, I have an article published in the Philadelphia Record, a newspaper which certainly is not anti-administration. I shall read only a portion of the article. The heading is:

Record man slept as much as he worked.

Then a subheading:

Long found all "beds" in bombers filled; craps games and checkers helped kill time.

The article, in part, is:

The night shift bomber line at the Brewster plant in Johnsville is a wonderful place for people who "can go to sleep any time."

A considerable number of my coworkers had that trait—or had acquired it in self-defense after a few nights of boring idleness.

Several times I myself slept more hours than I worked. That wasn't hard to do, because usually my gang got only enough parts to keep us occupied for 2 hours of the 10-hour shift.

There are three good "beds" in every bomber, the front and rear cockpits and the tail. The cockpits have a maximum capacity of four and the tail of one—five sleepers to a plane.

One difficulty was you couldn't use the cockpits of the planes nearest the timekeeper's "crow's nest" over the stockroom. The foreman climbed up there every now and then and might catch you.

As I figured it, there were only 62 safe beds on my section of the line.

On Tuesday, September 7, I ran out of parts at 3 a. m. and started looking for a bed.

I got a board and mat, intending to make a bed in a plane tail.

At the first plane I found three girls asleep in the rear cockpit. I went on down the line. Every cockpit was filled to capacity.

I couldn't get into a tail without climbing over the cockpit sleepers, and I didn't want to disturb them. Besides, I might find the tail occupied when I got there. One night when I was doing in a tail another worker crawled in on top of me, begged my pardon, and crawled out.

Mr. President, can anyone tell me how we are to have good morale in this country when conditions of that sort exist in the factories which are being overstocked with young single men, and when it is then proposed not only to draft fathers but to break up homes and to put out of business many little businessmen?

I read now from a letter received by me from a naval petty officer now stationed at San Francisco:

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT,

San Francisco, Calif., September 17, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: This may be a little unusual but I want to speak my little piece. I have been reading in the papers about your fight against the father draft, and I wholeheartedly agree with you on your stand. As you may surmise, I am a sailor, storekeeper, first-class, to be specific, married, and the father of a 2½-month-old baby. I want to take the opportunity to point out a few pointed facts in regard to the present draft problem. First: The fathers and the family men of the country are the backbone of the Nation. Solid, dependable, and planning for the future of the families and the welfare of the Nation. If a man with three or four children is drafted into the Army or Navy, receiving a low salary which naturally means a lower standard of living for his family, he wants to feel, and should feel, that his being drafted is because the country really needs his services in the armed forces. However, if such a man is drafted, and, after he is a part of the service, this man cannot help but feel bitterness if he sees many, many young single men with no dependents still in civilian life at good salaries, enjoying all the benefits of a civilian because those men are receiving deferments. By that I mean there is no shortage of men for the services if a great many of the draft deferred were exempt from deferments. May I quote a case or two. In the Navy on Treasure Island we have single, draft-deferred men who are pulling down good wages. Those men are deferred because they are engaged in vital war industry. So what. We sailors are holding down the same types of jobs but we have a uniform. Those men could do the same job in the same degree of efficiency if they were also wearing the uniform. The same holds true in Army and Navy shore establishments all over the country. Why should those men be deferred? Another point is the fact that many men have been turned down because they could not pass a strict physical examination. True, they are not fighting material, but they are working material. Put those men in a special branch of the service where they would be eligible for positions that do not require physical fitness. If a man has flat feet that should not rule him out from doing office work or work that does not require him to be on his feet.

Lately, here on the coast, there has been a big hullabaloo about the shortage of labor. It would make any true American sick to go through the shipyards and see thousands of men standing around, doing little odd jobs to fill in their time. Ten men engaged in a certain piece of work that 2 men could handle. The colleges are filled with young men 18 to 21 taking up social science, history, ancient history, and other subjects that in wartime are silly. If they are not educating themselves along a line that is helpful to their country in time of war they should be pulled out and allowed to finish their education after this mess is over. Take the single men first, there are plenty of them if they would be ferreted out. The trouble with the whole labor situation is that thousands are being used where, before in peacetime (when they were being paid out of the pockets of the employers), hundreds were engaged. And, by God, I'll bet my last nickel that when the war is over and the victory parades are marching up the main streets you will find the slackers riding the white horses at the head, taking all the credit for winning the damn thing. I had better quit now because my blood pressure is going up. This may not make a lot of sense, but I hope you will be able to grasp the gen-

eral idea. Let them call you a troublemaker and an opportunist, but get the single men who are hiding out before you let them take the fathers.

I am a Montana boy, 26 years old, who has voted for you before and will do it again (if you go after them). I was formerly the State purchasing agent for the National Youth Administration, and was also procurement officer of the proposed winter training camp at West Yellowstone. You have known my father, United States Treasury State procurement officer (formerly) for many years. I have applied for my commission as an ensign in the Supply Corps based on my purchasing experience, but so far have not heard as to whether or not I have received it. I quote the above to show you that I am an average young American. I really have no resentment or rancor against the young civilians, but I do believe that we can win this war without disrupting the families of our country.

I am not sure if this letter will get me in trouble with the Navy, and I am leaving it up to your best judgment as to whether or not you wish to reveal that I wrote it. I do not believe that it contains anything detrimental to the service, but I am still an American with an American's privilege of free speech. Go get 'em.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter coming to me from the State's attorney of Tazewell County, Ill., be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

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

TAZEWELL COUNTY, ILL., August 5, 1943.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,

United States Senator, Belton, Mont.

DEAR FRIEND: May I congratulate you on your stand against McNutt. There can be no doubt that the people are behind you and they want Congress and not Mr. McNutt or any other administrator to determine the selective-service policy of the country. It seems to me that Congress and the people were lulled into the belief that fathers would not be drafted until later, and that this order of Mr. McNutt's is intended to prevent congressional action on the matter.

I hope you may be given strength in your courageous fight to prevent the drafting of fathers. To further threaten the home by taking fathers seems to me would be disastrous.

Besides the harm to the moral fiber of our country, it is monstrously unjust to draft fathers when single men in such countries as Canada, South Africa, and even Australia are not compelled to leave the shores of their homeland.

I have witnessed the moral degeneracy of the people in my community in the administration of the affairs of my office since this war began, and I know the average citizen has no idea of the magnitude of it, and to what extent the absence of married men and fathers has contributed to it.

Was not the plan for a 10,000,000-man Army devised when we were at our blackest hour? It looked like Russia would collapse then, but now she is on the offensive—and look what has happened in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the submarine warfare.

May God give you strength to continue to preserve this great Nation.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD E. SCHMIDGALL.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Jesuit Catholic weekly, *America*, the issue of September 4, 1943, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

"Biologically," writes a correspondent, "every child has two parents, but in daily life most of them only one. The father has disappeared." Not completely like the vanishing Indian, but in his capacity as father. Not the least difficult part of any program of family rehabilitation is the task of driving home to fathers the realization that their vocation in life, their essential occupation is, in cooperation with their wives, the building of a home, the raising of a family. Working at a job to supply roof and food and clothing is only part of this essential occupation. Provider and father are not synonymous.

Life in a highly specialized industrial system renders real fatherhood extremely difficult. The very struggle for existence makes the father in many cases a stranger to his family, little more than a frequent or not so frequent guest. At best, the hours he may work at being a father are severely limited. And now comes the draft of all fathers who do not immediately find their way into essential war occupations. Mere fatherhood, the mere responsibility and service of raising a family, is not to be any longer a reason for deferment. Still less the need that the children have of him.

We wish that Washington had found a better way of phrasing that order. If being a father and raising a family is not an essential occupation in war or peace, then what is? We wish, too, that we could feel more certain that this draft of fathers is really what it should be, the last resort of an army that cannot possibly fill its absolutely necessary quota in any other way. It will do us little good to fight this war to victory if at its end family life should have been destroyed.

Already alarming reports from all over the country tell of the evils consequent upon mothers in war work. Some of them have to work, but while they work little children are locked in parked cars all day long, spend lonely hours seeing the same movie over and over again while waiting for mother's return, and worse still are falling in frightening numbers into ways of crime from which there is seldom any escape. Shall we now add to working wives those 400,000 more whose husbands are to be drafted? It is not a pleasant prospect.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me read now a letter written by a resident of Portland, Ore. In the letter the writer quotes a letter he received from a soldier. The letter reads as follows:

AUGUST 9, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I note with appreciation your effort to protect the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers from the designs of the great politician from Indiana—Paul McNutt.

I wonder how many of these men, with this plan in mind, were reared in homes without a father; do they know the unbalanced home life this situation brings upon a growing family of boys and girls. No woman can rear a family, educate it, give them all the moral support they require and earn a living for them. Whether the family is large or small. Such families are cheated in many ways. I know, I was one of six reared without a father.

When one goes to an orphanage to adopt a boy or girl, will that orphanage let that child go into a home where there is no father, or no mother; they will not.

Then, why is this demented group trying to make a law to do just that?

There is something that the people working in defense work know, that if every man and woman on the job, put their shoulder to the wheel and did a real day's work, they could run the plant on about one-half the personnel. The waste in money and man-hours is a disgrace, but with cost plus—who cares. In some Army camps, I do not know that this applies to all, but I understand there is one man in the medical division to every seven soldiers, and a lot of people think that there are a lot in this part of the service to avoid combat duty, more wasted men. Why all the men in the Ordnance, and just look who they are, people have a lot of opinions about that too, and they are not complimentary to the Ordnance Department.

When we Americans are called upon to ruin America, we begin to wonder why.

A man is put in the air division, and after 6 months or so of training, at enormous expense to the taxpayer, and a loss of his time, he is given a physical, and at a long last it is discovered that his eyes do not cross properly over the bridge of his nose. Why was not this physical given before he started such training, and all this waste in time and money prevented?

Here is an excerpt from a letter just received from a soldier, "the Army has so many men they don't know what to do with them. I used to say the shipyards were inefficient and wasteful, but this Army takes the prize. There are millions of man-hours wasted that could be used in defense plants." One hears things like this on all sides.

Then the administration wonders about why the riots.

One in Vancouver, Wash., last week.

One really wonders how long Americans will be pushed around by a bunch of sadistic nit-wits.

And then they ask children to give up their fathers.

Having been one of a family reared without a father I am bitterly against it.

With the greatest respect for the Senate and Congress of the United States of America, may they now represent the people and protect them from a frankenstein executive.

Respectfully,

J. A. STARR,  
Portland, Oreg.

Mr. President, I next ask to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter received by me from a resident of Baltimore, Md.

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

BALTIMORE, MD., September 17, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been following up your plan on the subject to defer fathers from draft and place unmarried men in position to be drafted. I heartily endorse your plan as I consider your viewpoint the only true and best one.

For the past 6 months I have tried to enlist in the Army Air Corps, but was told by my employer that my services were essential to the war effort and that I could not be replaced. Due to a change in operating conditions the company now has a replacement for my job but still refuses to release me.

I am single, 23 years of age, have no dependents and have passed both the mental and physical examinations of the Army Air Corps. I applied for immediate voluntary induction at my draft board but was refused

on the ground that I have no release from my employer.

At the present time my draft board is inducting fathers. This action is not justified!

I have resigned my position at the Glenn L. Martin Aircraft Co., therefore I'll have plenty of spare time on my hands.

I am willing to appear in Washington at any time to give you the details on this case if you so desire.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. ZGUD.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent that a letter received by me from the president of the Maywood Electric Co., Maywood, Ill., be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

MAYWOOD ELECTRIC Co., Inc.,  
Maywood, Ill., September 18, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In sympathy with your efforts in connection with the draft, I have some information which might help you. A relation of mine is working on aircraft motors at the Melrose Park Buick plant and finishes his consignment of work before his lunch period and has no work to do thereafter. This condition exists in other plants in this section, but would be hard for an outsider to detect as the foreman has a signal by which he signals the men when a stranger or a higher-up approaches and the men then become active at any old thing.

I know that in the end we are paying for this waste and hope that it will do some good to uncover the waste and help the war effort, and help to show that the plants do not need all the draft-exempt single men.

Very truly yours,

DON ZUGENBUEHLER.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter received by me from Harry J. Ferguson, of Philadelphia, Pa.

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

PHILADELPHIA, September 20, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: The writer wishes to inform you that he is 100 percent behind you in your fight against the drafting of fathers and breaking up of American homes, unless absolutely necessary.

As you are well aware, the Government, the arsenals, and navy yards, besides ship-building corporations, and airplane factories all claim exemption for single men, most of whom never worked at the occupations they are now employed at until the war or draft came along.

Keep up the good fight, and I know that plenty of my friends feel that you are doing something that will pay dividends to the country as a whole in many years to come.

Yours very truly,

HARRY J. FERGUSON.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I read now a telegram received by me from St. Petersburg, Fla.:

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., September 15, 1943.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.:

Associated Press story August 22, 1943, from London quoting Brazilian ambassador

stating Brazil has army of 300,000 and expeditionary force ready to fight and awaiting orders from Allied high command to proceed to battle front. Can't 19 other New World nations provide enough men to prevent drafting fathers? They, too, have something to safeguard. Drafting fathers is definitely a job for Congress.

THOMAS G. GREENE,  
President, National Policy Association.

Incidentally, Mr. President, when questions were asked about what South American countries were furnishing men or were to furnish men, I thought it was stated that such information was a military secret and could not be given to the public. However, now we find that a man in St. Petersburg, Fla., has obtained the information from an article by the Associated Press, coming from London.

I read now a letter from the pastor of the Methodist Church at Hiltons, Va.:

MARSH FELLOWSHIP GROUP,  
Hiltons, Va., September 20, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for the stand you have taken in drafting fathers.

You are not fighting alone.

We are with you in sentiment and with our prayers, in the common sense demand to investigate the hoarding of manpower in so many of our plants.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. WILLIAM MARSH,  
Pastor, Methodist Church, Hiltons, Va.

I read now a telegram coming to me from an official of a radio station at St. Joseph, Mo.:

ST. JOSEPH, MO., September 15, 1943.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.:

I believe sentiment strong against draft of fathers. Let the rest of the world help fight its own war. Favor drafting Canadians and South Americans. Would like to know if only Russians and Americans have the heritage to die on a battlefield for democracy.

LEE BARRON.

I read now an extract from a letter coming to me from Mr. Sam Clark, of Winston-Salem, N. C.:

What does the Army need with the fathers of our country when it is releasing thousands of men every day that have only minor defects?

I know that every father in our country would consider it an honor to serve his country if they were needed, but we want to be sure of it before we break up our homes.

Mr. President, I have received the following letter from C. F. Lacy, of Tyler, Tex.:

TYLER DAD'S CLUB,  
Tyler, Tex., September 15, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Your efforts toward preventing the drafting of fathers is greatly appreciated by the membership of this organization and also by other fathers the country over.

One of our members works in the finance office at Camp Fannin, Tex., and has talked with the 702 enlisted men of that camp who were discharged last month as they received their final pay from him. Having previously worked at the east Texas induction station in Tyler, he knows that fully 75 percent of

these 702 men discharged from Camp Fannin last month are physically better fit than are many men now being drafted at the Tyler station.

Can these discharges be the Army's way of building up figures to help defeat your proposal? We think so.

Very sincerely yours,

C. F. LACY,  
(For the 257 members of the Tyler  
Dad's Club.)

The following is an extract from a letter written to me by Mrs. Perry Eakes, of Sevierville, Tenn.:

Here in this town there are still single boys that have war jobs, but they could be replaced. So until all the single and childless married men are taken, please try your hardest to keep the fathers with the families.

A letter has been forwarded to me by a resident of Fairfax, Va., whose brother is a soldier stationed in Arizona. The following is an extract from the soldier's letter:

I think they may be saving us for a parade in New York when the war is over. Well, you said we should be good soldiers now, after being in so long; well, here's the truth, we have a couple of thousand men in the hospital and about 1,600 A. W. O. L. right now, so I don't think we could fight our way out of a paper bag. We don't even have any rifles and being in 18 months and we used wooden ones on maneuvers. That's a good laugh.

The following letter has been sent to me from Tulsa, Okla.:

TULSA, OKLA., September 19, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: From what I hear, which I think is correct, thousands of people in this and other States are wondering why the Army turns away big husky and healthy men who have a little trouble with their feet and men with punctured ear drums and single men and those with wives only, some married after Pearl Harbor, in order to draft fathers who were married and buying homes and have children. We want to know, too, who can buy War bonds and support their families any better or as well as these fathers. These young husky and healthy young fellows with flat feet, etc., can walk and hear as well as anyone. Why cannot they serve as M. P.'s and put those boys in the ranks? I am certain a great percent of the people of this country stand with you on your position in this regard.

Very respectfully yours,

J. H. ELLIOTT.

The following is an extract from a letter sent to me by a soldier stationed at Hamilton Field, Calif.:

Naturally being a member of the Armed Forces, I cannot speak from any other point of view on the subject of the father draft than that which meets my eye from day to day. My observations have led me to believe that if the present number in the Army Air Corps were used as any going concern would use their men, the present number now in the Army would be sufficient for some time to come.

The following is an extract from a letter addressed to me by Mrs. Don Marsh, of Bristol, Tenn.:

I know from personal observation that labor is being hoarded in cost-plus Government plants. Their actual work is not more than 2 or 3 hours a day. I know, too, that most fathers are not going to make the best

soldiers and when they are taken our country will be disrupted beyond repair.

The following is an extract from a letter received by me from a resident of Glen Gardner, N. J.:

NEW JERSEY SANATORIUM  
FOR TUBERCULOUS DISEASES,  
Glen Gardner, N. J., September 18, 1943.  
Senator B. K. WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In support of your efforts to keep pre-Pearl Harbor fathers at home, may I point your attention to the fact that thousands of single men hide in so-called essential jobs. These young men must be drafted first, as nobody is so essential that he cannot be replaced.

Myself, being a 4-F, like millions in the same classification, could be used more effectively, too.

I agree with you, all should be done to preserve the homes of married people.

Wishing you success in your efforts,

Truly yours,

WALTER RAAE, M. D.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article by Dr. Pitirin A. Sorokin, of Harvard University.

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

HARVARD EXPERT HITS FATHER DRAFT—DR. SOROKIN SEES DROP IN BIRTH RATE, DELINQUENCY, DIVORCE RISE RESULTING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the following dispatch, Dr. Pitirin A. Sorokin, chairman of the sociology department at Harvard, describes the biological, sociological, and moral dangers involved in the proposed drafting of 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.)

(By Dr. Pitirin A. Sorokin)

Drafting of fathers will affect families in many diverse ways. In black and white, the main effects can be cataloged in the following manner:

Biologically: Drafting will tend to decrease the birth rate in many families if fathers are away for a long time. Sickness, accidents, and deterioration of health—especially of children—will increase in some cases, due to a lowered standard of living.

Psychologically: The draft will spread sadness, sorrow, anxiety, and insecurity among most families. Various psychoneuroses will result in a portion of these families. However, the grace of duty and sacrifice for the common good will alleviate this condition.

Economically: The income of a greater part of the families involved will be decreased. Their material standard of living would be lowered. Material hardships would increase. The drafting of fathers would force members of the family to separate to hunt for additional jobs. The work burden of mother and children would increase.

Morally and religiously: For good families with a strong love, devotion, and loyalty, the draft will intensify and deepen moral stamina, religiosity, sense of duty and devotion. In loose and weak families the results are likely to be opposite.

Drafting of fathers in weak families is apt to cause demoralization, irreligiosity, even criminality—especially of the youth and children.

"Loss of dad" has different effects upon children of different families and in different conditions. When children lose their father through divorce (which implies a weak family), a higher juvenile delinquency results than when they lose their fathers by death. In weak families, the draft would increase

the neglect of children in many ways, also contributing to an increase in juvenile delinquency.

Finally, the effects of drafting will also be different in the unity, cohesion, and stability of the family itself—in the union of husband and wife, parents and children. The sacrifice of drafting will reinforce and cement the unity of good families. In families devoid of the grace of love and devotion, conscription will contribute greatly to their disintegration and dissolution.

In such families, we shall expect an increase of marital infidelity on the part of parents, eventually resulting in an increase in divorce, separation, and desertion. Children in such families will scatter and go astray. A portion of these will become "wild," demoralized, and delinquent.

Of these contradictory effects, the negative ones mentioned probably will prevail somewhat in the Nation as a whole over the positive ones. For this reason the drafting of fathers of many and young children must be resorted to only when all the other sources of manpower are exhausted.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the following is a letter received by me from Mr. Tyrus Hillway, dean of the Evening College, Hillyer Junior College, Hartford, Conn.:

HILLYER JUNIOR COLLEGE,  
Hartford, Conn., September 15, 1943.  
Senator EURTON K. WHEELER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: The radio commentators today are saying that the severe fighting at Salerno is causing "many opponents of the father draft to reconsider their positions." If this is true, it reflects a stupidity which I cannot believe characteristic of the Members of Congress.

If our leaders change their long-range plans at every turn of the wind, we are in a desperate position indeed. Certainly, the induction of fathers could not affect the war situation for at least a year. It seems to me that the executive branch of our Government is in dire need of some intelligent guidance from Congress.

American fathers are not opposed to being inducted if the need actually exists, even though it means great suffering for wives and children. They do insist, however, upon fair and honest dealing which it is quite apparent they are not receiving now at the hands of the administration.

Very truly yours,

TYRUS HILLWAY,  
Dean, Evening College.

The following is an extract from a letter received by me from Mrs. Ella Burgess, of Chuckey, Tenn.:

Could you find out why the married men with children are being wanted when able-bodied single men are being sent back home?

Here is one from Caddo, Tex.:

Why doesn't the Army call the Reserves (enrolled as of about June) from such slacker havens as Bruce Field, Ballinger, Tex.? It is not fair for a bunch of newly wed mechanics definitely of draft age to work there as civilians while cadets risk their necks there to learn to die for their country at Army pay. These cadets don't get time and a half for overtime, either.

Here is a telegram from a lawyer of Syracuse, N. Y.:

Canada does not require even single men to be drafted for European service without consent. Ought American fathers be sent to Europe while Canadian single men are permitted to stay home?



Here is a letter from Newport, Ky.:

Irreparable damage to the morale of citizens will certainly follow this apparently unnecessary move.

What kind of spirit can a father married for years display when his constant thought will be at home with his small children? Scores of homes will be broken up permanently, delinquencies will be increased manifold, and human misery will be at its peak.

Here is a letter written from Orlando, Fla., by a salesman connected with the Brown-Williamson Tobacco Co., of Louisville, Ky.:

God speed your bill on this, but make it 50 years of age instead of 45 and start with single men first; married, no children, next, and so on, etc. The day you do I shall be one of the first to leave this nonessential job I am on for the armed forces, as I had started to when all came up some time back and with which I have so many times been discouraged at my age of 42 years and A-1 health.

Here is one from a soldier stationed at the Army airfield at Amarillo, Tex.:

Men in the Army assigned to do clerical work are made up of inexperienced 20- to 25-year-olds who do nothing but blunder, and consequently each job or operation has many more men than are actually needed. To make an estimate, I should say that at least one out of every four men under the age of 30 now doing clerical work could easily be sent to more important theaters of operation without the slightest loss to the efficiency of the organization.

Here is one from Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio:

I congratulate you upon your stand against drafting fathers at this time. There are thousands of unmarried men literally loafing in war plants who should go to the Army first. An investigation by Congress would show that in many of these plants as much work or more could be done by one-half the force. These men do not have sense enough to know that they, their children, and their grandchildren will pay for this loafing at the people's expense.

Here is one from Birmingham, Ala.:

In this district 18- and 19-year-old boys are being employed in industry, listed as "chemists" and granted exemption from the draft for occupational reasons. At the same time applications for employment from older men with equal or superior training are being ignored.

Here is one from Lexington, Ky.:

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in trying to protect the family life of America by preventing the drafting of fathers.

The necessity of drafting fathers, in my opinion, has not come.

When one sees big husky men from 18 to 30 and single, walking the streets and hanging around the beer and pool parlors, he wonders just what the idea is anyway.

Here is one from Savannah, Ga.:

I hope you will get enough support on your bill prohibiting drafting of fathers until it is necessary. It is not my belief that is necessary yet with so many young men walking the streets exempt from some technicality.

I personally know three unmarried young men here in Savannah under the above category, there must be lots more here I don't know about, and millions over the whole country. I also know that one of the above

young men is a good mechanic, one is doing clerical work in a shipyard, the other in school under some pretense. As long as conditions like this exist, I am bitterly opposed to drafting fathers.

Here is one from New Orleans, La.:

In your admirable fight to get the Army to quit hoarding men, you might ask General Marshall why is it that the post exchanges of the Army are run by combat age men instead of older men that cannot go to the front. I call on post exchanges and most of the personnel is composed of younger men, an older man here and there, but in the main they are all young officers.

Here is one from Birmingham, Ala.:

I am 21 years of age, single, in good health, and am not in service because of a minor eye defect. I feel I should have been in service long ago, and know I am better qualified to perform duties in service than some already in. I want to get in very much. I went for a physical examination a few months ago, was turned down and told I would be called back. On the second day of last month, I was given a blood test and reclassified 1-AL. It has now been over a month since this took place and they keep telling me the limited service order has not come in.

Here is one from Maplewood, N. J.:

Ask any of your colleagues, who seem to be faltering under the "upstairs pressure" that is being used on them, the following question: What did the boys who have gone overseas, who have died or been injured, go for? Did they go to protect their counterparts hiding in so-called essential jobs or dubiously referred as 4-F's, who the "pressure" seeks to protect by defeating your bill? Or did they go to protect the American way of living—which is the family and all this responsible way of life represents?

Here is one from Spartanburg, S. C.:

We have thousands of 4-F men and others who were called prior to Pearl Harbor that should be reclassified, and I am sure thousands of these men would now be accepted and should be before the drafting of fathers. I am an old "war one" veteran and I know there are many who were rejected on minor physical defects such as slight eye sight vision, and even flat feet, who could be used in noncombat service and replace thousands of others who could be used in combat service, therefore eliminating the drafting of fathers until it becomes absolutely necessary.

The letter is signed by A. F. Williams.

Here is a telegram from Minneapolis:

Drafting fathers means war is lost on home fronts.

Here is a letter from Asheville, N. C., signed by the owner of the Dr. Pepper Bottling Co.:

DR. PEPPER BOTTLING CO.  
OF ASHEVILLE, INC.,  
Asheville, N. C., September 21, 1943.

Senator WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is not written with any idea of protesting the drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers but to call to your attention the fact that the War Manpower Commission is wasting lots of men.

We are on the nondeferable list and in hiring men we have hundreds of them come in to see us that have been working on defense work and cannot get a job. The employment office will not let them work for us and they cannot place those men. As a result, these men must loaf or be moved to the west coast.

Men are returning to this area every day by the hundreds because they have been cut off of jobs. A few weeks ago they cut off 11,000 men at the shipyards in Wilmington, N. C., and about the same time a large number were cut off the yards at Savannah, Ga. These are facts, as I have known these men for years. They cannot go to work for me or 99 percent of the businesses in this area.

It seems to me that men that have been trained in defense work for a year or two should not be sent back home without any work but should be sent to places where they are needed. These men left the home jobs for the big pay and should not be allowed to come home row and do nothing.

There are more men available for work in this area than at any time in the past 2 years. These things should be corrected, and if you do not believe me send someone down and let me run an ad in the paper for help and see how many men come in and what they say.

Yours very truly,

JACK BARFIELD, Owner,

Here is one from the Switchmen's Union of North America, Local No. 296, at Westweo, La.:

I apologize that I burden you, but I cannot refrain from commending your press statement in substance: "Why continue to draft Americans while we lend-lease billions to European countries that have not contributed one soldier to fight."

Here is one from Dalton Brothers, of Pocahtontas, Ark.:

I speak the sentiment of thousands of folks in my section of the South when I say we highly appreciate the stand which you have taken in regards to the drafting of prewar fathers.

It is the general opinion of the people that we have enough men in the armed forces now. The crying need at the present time is not more men but more equipment and supplies.

Here is a letter from Stephenville, Tex.:

It is widely believed here that a second front has not been opened before because Churchill insisted that the invasion force be composed of 70 percent American and 30 percent British troops, the population ratio.

If this is true our paying tribute to the British Empire has not yet ceased. Must we do the bleeding, the feeding, and the paying?

Let me say that that is not the first time I have heard that statement. I invite attention to an article entitled, "What's Happening in Washington," published in the Accountants Weekly News Letter, section 2, under date of August 30, 1943. As I understand, this news letter is widely read by businessmen.

It is widely believed here that a second front has not been opened before because Churchill insisted that the invasion force be composed of 70 percent Americans and 30 percent British troops, the population ratio.

I certainly hope that nothing of that kind happened, because I am sure it would raise a great deal of bad feeling if it had happened.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a man who signs himself "Thomas Edgar Bussey, a Cleveland Democrat."

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

BALTIMORE, Md., September 18, 1943.  
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Relative to drafting of fathers for the armed forces, may I suggest that generalities and very sketchy statements of needs should not be made the basis for inducting more men or women. Congress most certainly should have facts if we are to believe anything we hear.

There are millions of men and women in uniform scattered all over this vast country. Colleges, hotels, camps are overrun. Also there are vast unused contingents in England, Ireland, and Persia. Besides, every island in the Atlantic, from Iceland to the lower tip of South America, has its quota. And do not overlook Alaska and the adjacent islands.

What is the purpose of building up this tremendous body of fighting men? Do we contemplate fighting Russia and helping England keep India in servitude?

Respectfully,

THOS. EDGAR BUSSEY,  
(A Cleveland Democrat).

Mr. WHEELER. Here is a letter from the Brown Shipbuilding Corporation, of Houston, Tex.:

The Brown Shipbuilding Corporation, of this city, has 60,000 men on their pay roll just to keep 20,000 men at work. Ten thousand of these men are married men without children or single men which have been given deferments due to their jobs. If this condition exists all over the country, I can't see why we should have to draft men with children and break up homes.

Here is one from an English professor at the New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair, N. J.:

In your campaign to prevent induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, suggest you call attention to the Army's systematic release of many thousands of single men, already trained at Government expense, on the ground of disabilities they had when they were inducted. These are the so-called 1-B or limited-service inductees. They were taken in, in great numbers, a year ago, and all were trained to do things a limited-service man can do. Now they are being bounced, and the Army wants fathers of families.

Here is a letter from an official of a firm engaged in defense work in Brillion, Wis.:

Receiving continued expressions on the operation of labor at the shipyards, where a cost-plus contract prevails, makes the writer, together with the general public, feel that Washington does not intend to make any corrections and we will have to continue to suffer due to the lack of manpower, and pay excessive taxes due to conditions of this kind existing throughout the country. We feel satisfied that if all labor is properly utilized in this territory, several thousand men could be released from some of these plants.

Here is a letter from Brownwood, Tex.:

With newspapers all over the country harping on child delinquency, with medical shortage, the nursing shortage, the father is needed at home to take care of these children.

I now read a telegram which I have received from Robertsville, Ala.:

Stick by the ship on draft question. Drafting fathers unnecessary this year. Ask any intelligent businessman with experience and

you will find them all with you. We must carry on at home to back up soldiers abroad.

Here is a letter from Reverend Owen, of the Presbyterian Church, Long Island, N. Y.:

As a clergyman calling on the homes of my parishioners, I hear so many mothers asking "What am I going to do if my husband is called into the Army? I cannot go to work and leave two, three, or four children to carry on as they please."

It seems to me that this thing is going to undermine the whole structure of the home life of our country; we know how difficult it is to manage the children today. With the father's care, guidance, and authority removed, the child life throughout our land will be a chaos.

Another thing, a father dragged from his home, longing and pining for his children, will make a very poor soldier.

I live only a few minutes' ride from Long Beach, Long Island, N. Y. I went there to spend a couple of hours on Labor Day.

I wish some of our draft boards and Congressmen could see the young men sprawling on the beaches whilst other young men of our land are bleeding and dying in Europe and the Pacific.

I now read from a letter which I have received from the pastor of a Baptist Church in North Wales, Pa.:

You may like to hear from one of the many ministers who have the task of maintaining morale on the home front where the drafting of men for the services is felt so keenly. You may be sure that the country is solidly back of you in your fight against the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

A man from Pocahontas, Ark., says he thinks that 95 percent of the people in that State would state frankly and emphatically that they were unconditionally opposed to the drafting of pre-war fathers.

He adds this note:

I am a public official myself and also occupy responsible positions, and I assure you that I will stand behind my statements in this matter before any man or set of men.

A dental surgeon from Raleigh, N. C., says:

I am a life-long Democrat, but not one with a ring in his nose, and I am writing to you to tell you that I believe the South is with you wholeheartedly in your effort to wipe off the slate this defenseless plan to draft fathers.

He adds this postscript:

I am very much beyond the draft age; 60 years old.

I now read from a letter received from the director of a child-care center in Rochester, N. Y., one of the largest cities of New York State:

I am poignantly aware of the problems already created by mothers going to work. How much these problems will be multiplied when any large numbers of fathers are taken out of the homes one prefers not to contemplate. A father draft would most quickly destroy that for which we are ardently fighting, the safeguarding of the American home.

I now read from a letter received from Dallas, Tex. The letter was written by a representative of electrical manufacturers, and states in part as follows:

With our very much "covered up" system of socialized education going on right under our noses, the total number of men now in colleges and schools all over this territory would certainly swell the useful Army a lot.

I know of several cases of young men who were drafted and sent to some college over a year ago and have done nothing but loaf since that time. If they, Selective Service, are so worked up about their being properly educated, set up a plan whereby they could go to school after the war.

Here is a letter from the Irish War Veterans of the United States, Hill Post No. 39, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

We, war veterans of the United States, desire to protest against the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers in the present war, while hundreds of thousands of single, able-bodied young men of draft age continue to occupy "bombproof" Federal positions throughout our country, and particularly in Washington.

I now read from a letter received from the president of the Catholic Women's Club of Rochester, N. Y.:

Twelve hundred members of the Catholic Women's Club of Rochester, N. Y., wish to go on record as opposed to the drafting of men who were married and the fathers of children born previous to Pearl Harbor.

Here is a letter received from an attorney at Raymondville, Tex.:

If it were necessary to draft fathers, their feelings in the matter, and those of the people in general would be different, for you won't find any better Americans than the Texans. But the sentiment of the people in general is that it is not necessary at this time, and that there are too many men in the service now.

Here is a letter from an insurance man at Cranford, N. J.:

Nothing that has happened thus far in this war is more demoralizing to this country than this unnecessary agitation. I do not believe that we are in such a bad way that this needs to take place.

A great many men that I know feel the same as I do on this matter of drafting fathers. I am myself 64 years of age and a member of a draft board in New Jersey.

Here is a letter from the Indianapolis Star:

I'll swear that a married man past 38 (I'm 42) without children can put his mind more on war than can a younger man who has a bunch of kids at home to worry about.

I now read a telegram received from Columbia, Tenn.:

Investigate Tennessee draft board single men and men with no children plentiful. No need to draft fathers. Compromise on 30 years so won't deprive many children of fathers.

Here is a telegram from the Evangelical Ministerial Association of Mobile, Ala.:

You have our sincere appreciation and hearty applause for your stand against drafting fathers of children which sacrifices and jeopardizes our American homes.

Here is a letter from Atlanta, Ga.:

I sincerely appreciate your efforts in delaying the drafting of married men with children under Selective Service until this move is absolutely essential, if ever.

There are many thousands of other persons who feel this same appreciation and who hope that your efforts will continue to be successful. We are all loyal Americans, wanting to help the war effort in every necessary way, but not wanting family life completely disrupted if this is not necessary.

I now read from a letter received from the editor of a church paper, the Evangelical-Messenger, Harrisburg, Pa.:

Only under extreme necessity, which apparently does not presently exist, should homes be broken by the induction of fathers into national service and their wives and children be made to face the privations and sacrifices which would inevitably follow.

Here is a letter from a teacher who is now a private in the Army stationed in Maine:

FORT WILLIAMS, MAINE,  
September 15, 1943.

The Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my thanks for the view you have taken regarding the Army manpower problem. I thoroughly agree with your statement that "the Army is the greatest waster of manpower in the country." I am sure that I am expressing the views of many soldiers when I say that lying around in camps after the basic training has been completed is very detrimental to the morale of the boys.

I am describing briefly my situation, not because I am complaining but because I feel that it is a typical situation of the average soldier in this camp.

Prior to induction I was a high-school teacher in a small Iowa town, and I could have been deferred for several months to finish the school year. However, I felt that my college training and experience would enable me to contribute something useful to the service. After successfully completing my basic training I was assigned to the Coast Artillery, and since then I have been fighting the "battle of Casco Bay" with brooms and mops. The old National Guard men have taken up most of the ratings and apparently are entrenched here for the duration.

The men laugh about the "Boy Scout camp." It is also known to us as "officers' paradise," with the main emphasis being put on "spit and polish."

I could be filling one of the 30,000 teaching vacancies that exist throughout the United States. However, I am going along day after day working at K. P. and other flunky work. My college degree isn't doing me much good.

Last week was the first time that a number of the boys had fired a rifle since 1941.

Again I repeat, I'm not complaining—just wondering.

Yours very respectfully,

Here is a letter from a court reporter of the fourteenth judicial district of the State of Minnesota, reading in part as follows:

What is to become of my family on a soldier's income? Are they to be forced to become dependent on charity? My income as a private plus the Government dependency allowance will only pay my rent and grocery bill. Who is going to furnish clothing, fuel, light, water, medical, dental, recreational, and other necessary items?

I now read from a letter received from Austin, Tex.:

As one of thousands, I merely want to express my feelings about the induction of fathers, knowing full well that my letter will be only a straw trying to stem the tide. It is a known fact—stressed daily by radio, press, and lecture platform—that juvenile delinquency is increasing by leaps and

bounds. J. Edgar Hoover and others are placing most of the blame at the doorsteps of homes, especially of broken homes. When you take the fathers, will not the homes be broken just the same—if not by divorce, by separation nonetheless?

Here is a letter from an attorney in Greensburg, Pa.:

Since the size of the armed forces was numerically fixed several months ago, favorable developments have occurred within recent weeks which should have the effect of revising downward the original statistics. Important strategic bases have been seized by the Allies at the cost of only negligible casualties. France has an Army ready to go of at least 300,000; and, over the past week end, Brazil has offered 300,000 well-trained soldiers for overseas service.

I now read from a letter which I have received from Columbia, S. C.:

I believe the drafting of fathers into the armed forces would be a national calamity, necessitating, as it will and must, the complete disruption of family life and the consequent burden upon our country's social and economic structure.

Here is a letter from Margaret, Ala.:

I don't believe I would miss it very far to say 90 percent of the people would vote against the drafting of fathers. The question would then be, Why not?

Here is a letter from the Union Memorial Hospital, Baltimore, Md.:

Might I suggest that all men rejected at induction for minor ailments be reexamined? For instance, 2 weeks ago I was rejected for a small hernia which I never knew that I had. A minor operation with 2 weeks' hospitalization would remedy this. I have heard of many other men with similar ailments who have also been bitterly disappointed as I was to find that they were rejected.

I now read from a letter received from Long Beach, Calif.:

I am an orphan, 1917 vintage. My father died somewhere in France, leaving my mother, my twin sister and I. We were 18 months old when our dad left us. I've cried many long, weary nights all through my childhood and even yet for my dad.

Here is a letter received from Columbus, Ohio, enclosing a clipping from the Washington Whirligig.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1943.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio, which I believe substantiates your position relative to drafting fathers. I thought this might give you some clue as to the War Department's position when again matters do not seem consistent in Washington.

It certainly is time that men in Washington become more consistent in making statements and not one thing today and something else tomorrow. Many of my friends feel the same way and we are hoping your continued efforts will form a definite plan.

Very truly yours,

H. E. EPLER,  
Columbus, Ohio.

The clipping reads as follows:

WASHINGTON WHIRLIGIG—NO NEED FOR DADS—  
ICKES BURROWS IN—DEWEY HAS A PLAN

(By Ray Tucker)

The War Department's private personnel files reveal that there is no need for drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, according to

insiders. Without tapping this reservoir, the military can obtain all the recruits necessary to wage the conflict to a finish.

Selective Service has mobilized 11,000,000 men for land, air, and sea forces. Approximately 1,500,000 have been rejected for mental or physical reasons, leaving a fighting strength of 9,500,000.

Messrs. Stimson and Knox want another 1,000,000 or thereabouts to fill their quotas. They can muster that number without trouble or calling up newlweds, who often do not make good soldiers and sailors because of loneliness and emotional upsets.

Secretary Stimson's spokesmen have told Capitol Hill committees again and again that the Army opposes conscription of young fathers. But for some unknown reason President Roosevelt insists upon it and his yeomen have had to bow to his wishes.

Selective Service officials, however, may outwit the man in the White House. The Hersheyites have ruled that if they cannot get another 1,000,000 warriors by October 15, they will induct parents. They fully anticipate that Congress will block such a movement by enactment of specific legislation.

I ask that portions of a number of letters which I have received be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, the parts to be inserted being those on the red slips accompanying each letter. By doing so the time of the Senate, as well as space in the RECORD, will be saved.

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

An official of the Combs College of Music in Philadelphia suggests:

We hear a great deal about the size of our armed forces necessary to properly prosecute this war. I think it would be a good idea if we knew something about the size of the armed forces of our allies. Of course, we must figure that Russia has a great Army by what they are accomplishing. We do not hear about the size of the British forces. Early in the war someone in England said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job," and that they did not want our men.

The writer adds:

My opinion is impartial, because none of my family are affected. My two sons have children, quite young, but they (the sons) are both over 45.

From my own State of Montana comes this letter:

Captain Lindstrom (the writer's husband) enlisted in December 1941, and has served in the battle fronts of New Guinea and is now back in Australia.

I am proud of his doing his part, but I do know what it means to have the daddy away from the children and the home.

Captain has had malaria three times and how I do hope and pray that he can be replaced and brought back to the States where he can regain his strength.

This one is from Little Rock, Ark.:

You are correct. There is entirely too much politics during this emergency. In fact this is a weakness of this administration. Politics motivates about every move and not the welfare of the Nation.

If the Constitution is followed, major policies should be decided by Congress, in war as well as in peace, and the President should carry out the wishes of the Congress.

This one is from the United Spanish War Veterans of Friars Point, Miss.:

We have more men now than we can put on the fighting front for at least 3 years

with all the transportation we have in sight, so why take more men out of civilian life to put in the Army?

The other evening I contacted a husky captain of about 34 years at French Lick Hotel, who was recruiting WACS with a nice looking WAC lieutenant and who were paying \$15 a day each at that swanky hotel, and the taxpayers were meeting the bill. I am sure (I am a soldier of two wars) that we have too much social affairs in our Army and a lot of hurrah stuff that can be done away with and if men are needed, let's take some of these nonessential ducks and make 'em fight in place of taking the fathers out of civil life and away from their children.

**From a West Virginia State senator:**

Your efforts in opposition to the drafting of fathers is entitled to, and I believe will, receive universal approval.

**From an official of the Franklin School in West Allis, Wis.:**

The people of this section of Wisconsin admire your stand regarding the drafting of fathers. Should it be necessary to tear apart the American families whose integrity forms the backbone of our fine country?

**From an attorney of Neosho, Mo.:**

It seems like with an Army as big as it is, and all the help we have given the European people, we surely ought to be doing enough.

**From a retired Methodist minister of Hampden-Sydney, Va.:**

Why not raise the age of the single and childless? Are not fathers already serving their country just as needfully in bringing up a family? Let's have a show-down of the numbers England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Africa have in the armed forces.

**This is from a Decherd, Tenn., merchant:**

There is a great hue and cry about juvenile delinquency all over the country, and one wonders how much greater this will become with so many mothers working and fathers taken into the service. The sanctity of our homes is one of the reasons our boys have for fighting this war and to have our homes so upset will be, in my estimation, ruinous.

**Here is a letter from Chillicothe, Mo.:**

I have not changed my original idea in that I feel that it will be disastrous to draft fathers and break up the American homes, and I feel that, if this is done, thousands of these homes will never be reestablished. I also feel that if this matter is left up to the Army and Navy that they will have every man, woman, and child in the armed forces or defense plants, and I feel that it is just as necessary that we keep the home front going, and I feel that the home front has contributed about all that it can to the cause.

**From Haworth, N. J.:**

There is little doubt that manpower is being squandered in many of our most important war industries. One case was reported to me just recently where an individual, after working for a period of 2 days on a job at one of the largest airplane factories in the country, was instructed to slow down because he did an honest, average day's work. I have been told that in this same plant five carpenters spent all of 1 day to hang an ordinary screen door.

While these are isolated incidents there is every reason to believe that it is indicative of general conditions. An honest investigation of the country's manpower situation is urgently needed, not merely in connection with the drafting of fathers but also to curb

the terrific waste of money that is being imposed on the American people.

**From Los Angeles:**

My purpose in writing this letter is to make you forcibly aware of the fact that however inarticulate these people may be, however unable to express their fear and resentment at the treatment dished out to them by this administration, nevertheless they await with great anxiety the outcome of your struggle. For they know it is, in a very deep way, their struggle. A struggle to preserve the only remaining bulwark against the flood of bureaucratic ukases—the home.

**From Weldon, N. C.:**

Your recent remark, "playing politics with American lives" struck a true note of accord with the convictions of my heart. As one in a group of thousands, I fail to see the urgent need of drafting fathers into the armed services when there are thousands of young single men like myself who are eager and willing to go.

**From Lookout, Okla.:**

It is my understanding that Brazil has a trained army of 300,000 men that they have offered us. If our need is so great why don't we accept all soldiers our allies can furnish, or is it a question of politics?

**From an attorney in Newark, N. J.:**

As a lawyer, I am from time to time subjected to the trials and tribulations of various of my clientele who are affected by the draft. I wish to endorse unqualifiedly your untiring efforts on behalf of the fathers of this Nation who would be torn from the side of their beloved children in the event that the legislation you are sponsoring does not succeed.

**From the Federation of Civic Associations, Washington, D. C.:**

Both the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service Headquarters have been apprised of the opinion of the Federation of Civic Associations, particularly as class 4-F which excludes, as one sub class, those who have been convicted of felonies.

We take the position these men should not be completely excused from duty while the cream of manhood is called upon to lay down his life, if need be, for his country.

Class 4-F should be revised, those whom the armed forces feel are morally unfit should be given duty building roads, camps or placed on farms.

**From Hapeville, Ga.:**

Please keep up the good work and rest assured that when the single boys and men married who do not have children are all exhausted then we fellows with children will be ready to do our part.

**From Chicago:**

If only the single men and men who reach the age of 18 years were taken as replacements, we would soon have 10,000,000 men. The administration knows that we can't transport all of these men or anything like all of them to the fighting front for many months or years to come.

The Army and Navy high officials mapped plans for a goal of 10,000,000 men in uniform at a time when the fortunes of war for the Allies were at a low ebb indeed. Today Russia is definitely on the offensive and Italy is on the ropes.

**From Gaffney, S. C.:**

The stand which you have taken against hoarding or protecting the thousands of draft dodgers is most heartily applauded by every soldier and parent of fighting men in this country.

**This is from Pueblo, Colo.:**

Smashing the homes of fathers will at this time smash the hopes of small business to survive. It will also, in my opinion, take fathers away from business operations that are more essential and helpful to the Government than they would be in the Army.

**From Waco, Tex.:**

All of my relatives who are eligible are in the service, some in the Pacific, some in the Continent of Europe. However, the morale of this country will be shattered and shaken if the homes are allowed to be broken up. The home is the foundation of this country, and in my opinion it is unnecessary.

**From Baltimore:**

The American home must not be broken up until all other means have been exhausted, and the thinking public is far from convinced that the country has reached that point.

**From the president of a lumber company in Alexandria, La.:**

Putting more men in the armed forces than are absolutely required is a strain upon industry, disrupts entire organizations that are vital to the war effort. It increases Government taxes by putting more men in there to pay, train, feed, and equip than the country has need for in many cases.

**From Bastrop, La.:**

From a military standpoint it is bad policy to draft heads of families, as their minds are so absorbed in worries over their families that they could not possibly make a really dependable soldier. Therefore, they would neither add efficiency nor morale to the fighting Army.

**From an attorney in Escondido, Calif.:**

In the First World War over half of the men enlisted never went outside the borders of the continental United States, and after this war is done the same will be shown to be the fact in this war.

**From an attorney in Erie, Pa.:**

I believe there is general public agreement with your proposal to prevent as far as possible the drafting of fathers. However, if the draft age for fathers is to remain at the present level, something certainly should be done to get the younger, more physically fit and single men out of replaceable industrial jobs and into the armed services before fathers are called.

**From Elkin, N. C.:**

Although I am a minister, and although my specialty is theology, and not politics, I, nevertheless, because of my Anglo-Saxon background, cannot help being concerned with what happens in the political field. More specifically, I must say that I am glad to see you take up the fight to save fathers of children from the draft. No doubt we must go ahead in the direction of military victory and no doubt there are many sacrifices which lie ahead of us which we must uncomplainingly make, but to draft the fathers of children is to leave thousands of families without a bread winner, without any moral authority or example, is to bring despair, bleak and dark into the hearts of many, is to go a long way toward destroying the home in this country.

**From Louisville, Ky.:**

Why is it necessary for a father to throw away his wife and children to face these perilous times alone when the United States is already carrying the biggest load of any other Allied nation?

**From San Antonio, Tex.:**

I wonder if fathers are taken why it is not the men who have married since Pearl Harbor and many of such whose purpose it was to keep out of the war; how about the thousands married with no children who are exempted when men of more mature age could do all they are doing as good and in many instances better; how about the many single men in Washington, stool sitters who are left out and why have we so many young men in colleges and who have been there for several years.

**From Amarillo, Tex.:**

God knows the American family is already disintegrating with mothers at war work and then to draft fathers or husbands of these mothers, no quicker way could be found to send the parentless child to hell.

**From Sulphur, La.:**

I have two small children, aged 5 and 2 years. Their father is an essential worker in shipbuilding. That's where the fathers are needed. Why half orphan our children until it is absolutely necessary. They are needed behind the man with the gun.

I am patriotic and wish to do everything in my power to hurry and win this war, but I don't see where fathers should be taken now as there seems to be more soldiers around now than they know what to do with.

**From Memphis, Tenn.:**

My reading and sources of information indicate that all available transportation to and in the necessary theaters of war are already congested, impossible or unnecessary, and that normal replacements are adequate. So, this clamor for fathers' induction is not only unnecessary at this time, but will so further deplete the home front that industry and production will be jeopardized throughout our Nation, and actual suffering be the result in many homes.

**An attorney from Pittsburgh writes:**

In my opinion, we shall be doing irreparable harm to society if we break up the thousands of homes which the present program of the War Manpower Commission would make inevitable.

From Syracuse, N. Y., comes this telegram:

Your bill to defer drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers deserves full support and consideration of every person interested in maintaining the United States home and preventing growth of juvenile delinquency. While the Army and Navy should be permitted to run the war they do need a system of check and balance. Before breaking up homes should they not be forced to use every physically fit single man 38 to 45 for noncombatant service?

**From the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Thurmond, W. Va.:**

Have been much interested in your efforts to delay induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers and am heartily in accord, but it looks like the manpower officials won't play ball. I can't see the benefit either for regardless of age, a father is going to make a poor soldier; constantly recurring thoughts of his family and their problems at home are going to make a "defensive" type out of him—no punch, nor the aggressiveness needed for the present warfare.

**From Springfield, Mo.:**

I am writing to commend you for the fight you are making against the drafting of fathers into the armed forces. Too much destruction is being done to our democratic form of government by the innumerable experimental bureaus of the New Deal.

**From Tulsa, Okla.:**

I have followed you along in your ideas for a long time. I wholeheartedly agree with you on the question of drafting fathers. There is one thing I am opposed to, all these boys left in college at the taxpayers' expense.

I know many, many boys who should be serving their country, who are in college.

Thank God my boy isn't that kind of boy, he left school and enlisted in aviation, is training for a bomber pilot.

**From Baltimore, Md.:**

The strength of a nation is vested in the home. No nation can be more powerful nor more formidable than that nation whose homes are stably founded upon a solid foundation of absolute surety.

Our nation can do no greater thing to bolster the Allied cause and to win the peace, as it must surely be won; if we are even to dare hope for a lasting peace after this conflict, then to take steps to ascertain the home life of its people and keep alive those Christian principles for which our Nation was born and by which our homes are founded.

**From Chanute, Kans.:**

Better draft grandfathers than fathers with small children, and even now there are quite a number of single men who are not in the Army.

**From a New York City attorney:**

May I say that many folks in my community are absolutely opposed to drafting men into the armed services who were married prior to Pearl Harbor.

One of the higher officers in the Farmers and Mechanics National Bank in Frederick, Md., says:

Civilian services are being handicapped because of the continued loss of manpower and if many of the remaining men could be left for civilian work until the need for military service is more acute, it would be better for those of us who wish to carry on at the home front.

Here is a telegram from Burlington, N. C.:

If drafting of fathers actually necessary to successfully expedite war program, believe all Americans more than willing, but this should be proven beyond doubt, as such will affect our civilian economy perhaps more than anything since beginning of war. Too many men already in Army camps state their full time and ability not being utilized. Many industrial plants not engaged in direct war production. Will be forced to close because of loss of keymen.

**From Oklahoma City, Okla.:**

There is not a shortage of manpower, but there does seem to be a shortage of manpower in the right places. If unintelligent drafting continues, it will certainly mean disaster on the home front. But with intelligent drafting of those men left, production and morale on the home front will continue to be high, and there will still be plenty of men in the service.

**From St. Cloud, Fla.:**

I am fully aware of the fact that if such a purpose should be successful, it would mean the breaking and wrecking of millions of homes to the lasting disgrace of our Government. I have a son age 35, with 2 little babies and the mother wearing herself out to care for them. Mortgage, \$3,850. Salary, \$2,700. Should he be drafted, his wife would receive \$72 per month and go on relief for the rest.

**From Sedalia, Mo.:**

What kind of men and women will the world of tomorrow produce with a vast amount of mothers in war plants and fathers in uniforms?

**A Tulsa (Okla.) businessman writes:**

In my business I have occasion to talk to numerous people about this question and I find them uniformly of the opinion that the National Selective Service System under Messrs. McNutt and Hershey have bungled more than any other governmental agency.

**From Smithville, Tex.:**

I guess you will be surprised to hear from folks here in Texas.

We are for you one hundred percent in your draft bill, and we are wondering if you can see that our teen-age boys get their year's training before they are sent overseas, as was promised us.

**From Covington, Ky.:**

With so many single men and childless married men working under deferments why take any father? Why not immediate cancellation of the above deferments?

No man 18 to 25 can be irreplaceable at such a young age. I know the conditions exist as I have been in contact with them for the past 1½ years.

**From Joplin, Mo.:**

I am sitting here in my home tonight. My children are snug in bed and I have been thinking of the effort you have been making these past few days.

I feel that if my husband goes to war it will ruin our home. I will have to work and my children may turn out to be problem children. Now it takes every minute of my time to care for them.

**From Tampa, Fla.:**

We are very glad to know of your action in the drafting of fathers even though it doesn't affect us at all. What many of us wonder is how and why so many escape the draft who should be in it.

The president of a bank in Nebraska writes me:

I have talked with military officers and they tell me that a very few fathers over 28 years of age can take the rap.

**From Salina, Kans.:**

Time will vindicate your position on the drafting of fathers, and what you say about the size of the Army and the number of men who will be left in training in this country at the close of the war because of inadequate transportation.

**From Brookhaven, Ga.:**

I hope you will get on the radio and tell us about those countries which have not contributed any soldiers to the Allied armies.

**From Cresco, Iowa:**

Millions of us have no faith in the doings of the present powers that be, nor do we believe that we should play politics with other people's lives by drafting all the manpower of the United States for the purpose of impressing Joseph Stalin or any other foreign peoples.

**Telegram from Miami, Fla.:**

Your attention is called to ruling of War Department, effective September 30, 1943, retiring all officers 60 years old. The services of these men, the result of long experience and devotion to duty, are needed now at this critical stage of war. This is no time to discard such valuable help.

**From Parsons, Kans.:**

My husband is a chemist, working at the Kansas ordnance shell-loading plant in the capacity of head ordnance inspector in the chemical and physical laboratories. Last week he got his 1-A classification. We are taking out 14 percent of his salary in bonds. That is all we have saved since we came here. Now, with him in class 1-A, do you think we can put anything more in bonds, with a possible expensive move coming up for us? We have a child 5 years old. I cannot find anyone to care for her so that I can work. I will have to go back to live with my parents in a small town where there isn't much work. If he is taken in the Army we will no doubt have to cash some of the bonds we have.

**From Lexington, Ky.:**

Yes; I am 50, and I was in the other war to save England's shipping, and England itself; was wounded, and am told I am no good for this war because of disabilities, but I know plenty able-bodied men who are able to do any of the jobs of recruiting, guard duty, and thousands of other jobs held by the younger set who should be doing some of the fighting. Yes; I am able to and could do the same job held by some of the able-bodied men in recruiting service at the present time.

**From Arlington, Va.:**

Congratulations on your fight to keep the fathers in the homes, where they belong.

We have already more men under arms than we can possibly use for 2 years.

The Army would take 20,000,000 men if they could get away with it.

**From Pawtucket, R. I.:**

These fathers are the backbone and supporters and the workers and producers of America and the builders of the present and future America.

If their homes are broken up by being drafted at any time, there is no telling what will happen to the little children and the wife and the home.

A worrying dad in the war would be a detriment, a very bad one, and a big expense to the Government. I am American born and in my 70th year, and not in the draft. I represent about 1,500 local families.

**From San Antonio, Tex.:**

It seems to me that the Army is one of the greatest hoarders of manpower that we have. If and when the Army and other Governmental agencies can correct these conditions it will not be necessary for them to draft me, just let it be known I am needed.

**From Beauty, Ky.:**

I am a welder 35 years old, work in a war job, have a wife and 7 small children. I am expecting to be drafted any day. Will you please ask why they release men over 38 who have no dependents and take me away from my family?

**From Olympia, Wash.:**

You may be interested in an informal discussion that I had with a group of about 10 fathers, all of whom are eligible for the proposed fathers' draft. They were almost unanimous in their opinions that they would be more than willing to go into the immediate service of the Army or Navy provided there was some way of providing for the care and maintenance of their children.

You will find the fathers of this country just as patriotic as anyone else, but they do not cherish the thought of their families suffering because of the lack of funds to provide the bare necessities of life while they are in the service, when everyone else is enjoying an era of financial prosperity.

**From Atlanta, Ga.:**

No one wishes to deprive our armed forces of men and material that are needed to win the war as quickly as possible. On the other hand, the services could correct many of their ways and use their resources much more efficiently and economically. A reasonable utilization of present men in work which would permit the utilization of their training, both prior to their induction and subsequent to it, would in my opinion help to amply provide for the needs of the armed forces.

This is a letter written by J. H. Bond, deputy executive director, War Manpower Commission, in reply to a letter written by a ship fitter in Brooklyn complaining that he could not get work. Bond's letter is dated August 31. It states in part:

We realize that there is a great deal of labor waste and poor supervision in war industries throughout the country and are taking steps to correct this situation.

**From Ames, Iowa:**

I have no objection to the drafting of any man or any woman that can help in finishing up this war quickly, but it makes me ready to bite nails when I think of 3,000,000 pay-rollers working for the Government in perfectly safe jobs when certainly some of them ought to be out where the shooting is going on. This reduction in the Federal pay roll might well result in increased efficiency all the way round.

**From Rome, Ga.:**

There are hundreds of enlisted trained men in the service now who are doing work and jobs that civilians could just as well do. This sort of thing should not be. These men should be used first before calling men with children into the service.

**From Gilman City, Mo.:**

I want to heartily endorse your amendment to stop the induction of fathers indefinitely. There are still hundreds of single men and married men without children in Harrison County, Mo., and adjoining counties in civilian life while many fathers with children in this county are now in 1-A to be taken October 1, unless it is stopped.

An official of an insurance company in San Diego says:

If the future citizens of our country are to amount to anything, and if we are to have a country worth fighting for when the present generation of children grow to be adults, it is imperative that the family unit be protected now. To deprive families with children of the father's influence and financial support now will simply mean that in most instances, the mother will have to find a job to earn enough for the family to live on, with the obvious result that the children will be forced to shift for themselves or be regimented in child-care centers. Serious difficulties will be bound to develop.

**Telegram from Robertsedale, Ala.:**

For the sake of America and American homes both present and future, prevent the drafting of fathers into the Army, if possible.

From Portland, Oreg., an attorney writes:

I would like to send you a copy of the front page of our Journal, smeared with crime, even vieing with the war news for front-page headlines. The break-down in morals—the gambling, wildness of women, burglaries, murder, suicide, etc.—is terrible. Even the juvenile officers are making a kick as to the

fact whether they would continue with their work.

**From Corpus Christi, Tex.:**

I am 100 percent opposed to this unnecessary action that would disorganize and totally disrupt our home front, not to mention the wrecking of millions of American homes, the backbone to our future America.

**From Memphis, Tenn.:**

Allow me to congratulate you on your stand regarding the drafting of fathers.

I am one of the many men between the ages of 38 and 45 who have no dependents, and I certainly think that we should be inducted before men with children.

There are thousands of men between 38 and 45 who are very sound physically who would make excellent soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have concluded my statement with reference to this question. I am interested only in these propositions: First, the manpower in the War Department and in the Army should be properly utilized before married fathers are drafted.

Secondly, the manpower in the various bureaus where men are being deferred should be used before fathers are drafted.

Thirdly, before fathers are taken the young single men who are being hoarded in industry for the purpose of avoiding the draft should be taken.

If any legislation could be worked out along these lines, or if the Government departments themselves would do what they should do, I would have no objection, and would not be interested in pressing legislation merely because it bears my name.

I am not interested in whose name any particular piece of proposed legislation may bear. I am interested, as I believe the great bulk of the American people are, in not having fathers inducted into the service unless it is absolutely essential. I submit that from the facts which I have presented it is not essential. It is not necessary to draft fathers this month, next month, or the following month if there can be brought about a proper utilization of manpower in the United States. In my judgment the morale of the people of this country will be very severely affected if, under existing conditions, fathers shall be drafted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a list of registrants deferred, the list having been prepared by the Selective Service. It gives in detail the age groups, as well as the various branches of the Government which have asked for the deferments. It also goes into detail by States.

Next week, the Selective Service will have available the names of each and every individual who has asked deferment, so that the public may have the benefit of this knowledge, in keeping with a bill which the able and distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and I introduced and sponsored through the Congress last spring.

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

Age of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943, registrants 18 to 37, inclusive, United States and Territories

[Preliminary]

Agency <sup>1</sup>	Total	Age				
		18 to 21	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 37
All agencies, total.....	115,397	15,812	19,933	36,939	28,974	13,739
Legislative establishments <sup>2</sup> .....	5				3	2
Senate.....	1					1
House of Representatives.....	2			1		1
The Judiciary.....	13	1	1	2	5	4
Department of Agriculture.....	1,509	16	133	535	530	295
Department of Commerce.....	3,230	173	494	1,180	941	442
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	3			1	1	1
Department of the Interior.....	1,056	30	174	387	304	161
Department of Justice.....	4,431	175	632	2,217	1,116	291
Department of Labor.....	30			5	18	7
Navy Department.....	51,875	7,343	9,827	16,415	12,571	5,719
Pearl Harbor <sup>3</sup> .....	2,070	364	491	651	415	149
Post Office Department.....	241	1	6	87	88	59
Department of State.....	430	1	59	150	127	93
Department of Treasury.....	99	1	4	32	35	27
War Department.....	30,423	2,649	4,876	9,843	8,600	4,355
Panama Canal <sup>3</sup> .....	1,594	64	236	602	478	214
Federal Security Agency.....	133	1	10	90	53	39
Federal Works Agency.....	302	15	42	82	94	69
National Housing Agency.....	7				5	2
The White House Office.....	7					
Board of Economic Warfare.....	79	1	2	19	29	28
Bureau of the Budget.....	16			3	6	7
National Resources Planning Board.....	5			1	2	2
Office of Censorship.....	52		1	19	19	13
National War Labor Board.....	22		1	5	9	7
Office of Alien Property Custodian.....	1					1
Office of Civilian Defense.....	17	3	1	3	4	6
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....	27		1	7	7	12
Office of Defense Transportation.....	14		1		5	8
Office of Lend-Lease Administration.....	23	1		3	13	6
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	387	35	85	163	79	25
Office of War Information.....	219	3	13	70	84	49
War Manpower Commission.....	148	8	14	37	53	36
National Youth Administration.....	18		1	2	9	6
War Production Board.....	145	1	5	33	52	54
War Relocation Authority.....	8			1	2	5
War Shipping Administration.....	7,409	2,529	1,314	1,701	1,247	618
Office for Emergency Management <sup>2</sup> .....	67	4	7	28	15	13
Office of Price Administration.....	61	1	1	14	24	21
Office of Strategic Services.....	29	1	1	10	17	
Petroleum Administration for War.....	38		1	7	20	10
National Capital Housing Authority.....	1				1	
Civil Service Commission.....	47	3	6	16	13	9
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	2	1				1
Federal Communications Commission.....	345	27	37	150	96	35
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1					1
Federal Power Commission.....	13			2	5	6
General Accounting Office.....	8		1		6	1
Government Printing Office.....	8			1	2	5
Library of Congress.....	7			3	4	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	805	153	277	239	98	38
National Archives.....	1				1	
National Gallery of Art.....	1					1
National Labor Relations Board.....	5				3	2
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1					1
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	4			1	2	1
Tariff Commission.....	2				1	1
United States Maritime Commission.....	4,309	1,900	675	910	609	215
Veterans' Administration.....	19			7	8	4
Executive Office and independent establishments <sup>2</sup> .....	13	5	1	2	3	2
Federal Reserve System.....	6					3
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	95		4	20	32	39
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	445	8	64	147	148	79
Government corporations and credit agencies <sup>2</sup> .....	37		1	6	12	18
District of Columbia government.....	436		29	152	174	81
Government agencies <sup>2</sup> .....	2,485	294	404	777	672	338

<sup>1</sup> Does not include the following agencies for which no employees were reported classified in II-A, II-A (H), II-B, II-B (H): Office for Emergency Management Division of Central Administrative Services, American Battle Monuments Commission, Bituminous Coal Consumer Council, Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, National Mediation Board, Smithsonian Institution, The Tax Court of the United States, Export-Import Bank.

<sup>2</sup> Not elsewhere classified.

<sup>3</sup> Includes employees of the Panama Canal, a division of the War Department, and may also include employees of other agencies designated by location.

Source: Report of Occupational Deferment of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 38) and Changes in Occupational Deferments of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 39).

National Headquarters, Selective Service System, Oct. 1, 1943.

Age of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by State, Sept. 15, 1943, registrants 18 to 37, inclusive

[Preliminary]

State	Total	Age group				
		18 to 21	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 37
Total.....	115,397	15,812	19,933	36,939	28,974	13,739
United States (continental).....	109,885	14,036	18,888	35,630	27,959	13,372
Alabama.....	1,451	210	236	448	393	164
Arizona.....	213	13	25	80	63	32
Arkansas.....	372	57	48	114	107	46
California.....	12,249	1,014	2,134	3,959	3,435	1,707

Age of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selected service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by State, Sept. 15, 1943, registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—Continued

State	Total	Age group				
		18 to 21	22 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 37
Colorado	723	59	93	237	248	86
Connecticut	859	137	190	292	198	82
Delaware	88	8	10	29	31	20
District of Columbia	5,384	620	691	1,820	1,316	637
Florida	1,488	154	180	465	453	233
Georgia	1,513	247	235	459	384	188
Idaho	636	45	110	219	184	78
Illinois	4,118	412	609	1,440	1,093	564
Indiana	660	141	152	336	226	105
Iowa	1,076	98	199	375	281	123
Kansas	674	61	83	179	170	81
Kentucky	556	48	67	199	161	81
Louisiana	1,671	134	177	325	289	143
Maine	799	111	110	260	211	107
Maryland	2,044	230	244	635	543	292
Massachusetts	5,461	423	1,040	1,665	1,426	607
Michigan	1,809	235	277	583	468	246
Minnesota	1,015	180	160	337	246	92
Mississippi	460	60	53	125	132	60
Missouri	374	42	122	312	248	140
Montana	353	27	75	216	193	72
Nebraska	457	65	65	165	109	53
Nevada	184	6	13	62	68	25
New Hampshire	467	24	76	159	148	60
New Jersey	2,895	261	463	1,566	751	331
New Mexico	300	26	39	82	95	43
New York	14,954	1,385	2,476	5,350	3,937	1,835
North Carolina	1,170	189	189	392	269	139
North Dakota	229	14	52	68	67	28
Ohio	3,609	439	626	1,223	874	447
Oklahoma	1,096	116	126	361	339	154
Oregon	943	91	123	295	238	145
Pennsylvania	10,202	1,370	2,111	3,366	2,294	1,061
Rhode Island	1,115	160	123	336	371	185
South Carolina	3,256	788	669	857	660	262
South Dakota	262	19	33	93	89	28
Tennessee	1,266	138	175	426	343	184
Texas	4,848	728	507	1,464	1,183	633
Utah	757	218	122	226	132	59
Vermont	116	9	9	45	37	16
Virginia	7,271	1,669	1,333	1,633	1,581	755
Washington	6,275	1,315	1,204	1,685	1,368	703
West Virginia	649	165	96	218	160	70
Wisconsin	971	75	147	397	247	105
Wyoming	167	8	21	61	50	27
Off-continent	5,512	1,776	1,045	1,309	1,015	367
Alaska	331	24	31	98	111	67
Hawaii	4,088	1,723	975	1,147	855	288
Puerto Rico	193	29	39	64	49	12

Source: Report of Occupational Deferment of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 38) and Changes in Occupational Deferments of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 39).

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories

[Preliminary!]

Agency <sup>1</sup>	Total	United States (continental)	State							
			Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Co.orado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia
All agencies total	115,397	109,885	1,451	213	372	12,249	723	899	68	5,384
Legislative establishment <sup>2</sup>	5	5						1		1
Senate	1	1								1
House of Representatives	2	2								
The Judiciary	13	12	1			3	1	1		2
Department of Agriculture	1,509	1,474	58	10	20	147	41	5	3	51
Department of Commerce	3,230	3,153	37	20	16	219	41	16	1	270
Civil Aeronautics Board	3	3								3
Department of the Interior	1,056	1,023	11	16	8	109	44	9	1	65
Department of Justice	4,431	4,417	45	24	50	220	49	70	4	588
Department of Labor	30	30						1	1	5
Navy Department	51,875	48,155	222	35	62	5,903	137	309	34	2,944
Pearl Harbor <sup>3</sup>	2,070	2,051	6	1		412	1	1	4	40
Post Office Department	241	228	4	1	2	35	2	6		8
Department of State	430	428	2	2	1	28	1	5	1	156
Department of Treasury	99	96				15				14
War Department	30,423	29,080	575	64	139	3,394	238	171	34	402
Panama Canal <sup>4</sup>	1,594	1,593	19	4	6	166	23	9	2	38
Federal Security Agency	183	180	5		1	10	3	3		26
Federal Works Agency	302	291	3	6	5	46	18	4		20
National Housing Agency	7	7	1			1				1
The White House Office	1	1								
Board of Economic Warfare	79	78				10	1	1		8
Bureau of the Budget	16	16	1							6
National Resources Planning Board	5	5								
Office of Censorship	52	46	1	1		1	1			2
National War Labor Board	22	22				4	1			
Office of Alien Property Custodian	1	1								
Office of Civilian Defense	17	17	1			1				

Footnotes at end of table.



State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	Total	United States (continental)	State							District of Columbia
			Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....	27	27				4				
Office of Defense Transportation.....	14	14				2				
Office of Lend-Lease Administration.....	23	23						1		4
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	387	387	1			30	6	3		6
Office of War Information.....	219	219		1		41	2	4	2	7
War Manpower Commission.....	148	148	1			14	1	1		10
National Youth Administration.....	18	18				1				
War Production Board.....	145	145	1	1		6		2	1	8
War Relocation Authority.....	8	8				3				2
War Shipping Administration.....	7,409	7,281	151	9	7	822	47	110	3	91
Office for Emergency Management <sup>1</sup> .....	67	67				14				3
Office of Price Administration.....	61	61		1		8	1			1
Office of Strategic Services.....	29	29				7	2			1
Petroleum Administration for War.....	38	38				3	1		1	1
National Capital Housing Authority.....	1	1								1
Civil Service Commission.....	47	47	1	1		5				1
Employees Compensation Commission.....	2	2								
Federal Communications Commission.....	345	337	3	4	4	27	2	3		4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1	1								
Federal Power Commission.....	13	13				1	2	1		1
General Accounting Office.....	8	7							1	2
Government Printing Office.....	8	8								6
Library of Congress.....	7	7								3
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	805	805	3	1	1	59		5		10
National Archives.....	1	1								1
National Gallery of Art.....	1	1								1
National Labor Relations Board.....	5	5								
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1	1								
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	4	4								
Tariff Commission.....	2	2								
United States Maritime Commission.....	4,309	4,302	84	4	29	232	32	146	3	134
Veterans' Administration.....	19	19	1			1		1		
Executive Office and independent establishments <sup>2</sup> .....	13	13								1
Federal Reserve System.....	6	6								
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	95	95	2			1	3	1		13
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	446	446	158		4	1		2		
Government corporations and credit agencies <sup>3</sup> .....	37	37	4			8				2
District of Columbia government.....	436	436							1	401
Government agencies <sup>4</sup> .....	2,485	2,399	48	7	14	224	22	5	1	19

Agency	State										
	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland
All agencies, total.....	1,488	1,513	636	4,118	960	1,076	574	556	1,071	799	2,044
Legislative establishments <sup>2</sup> .....											3
Senate.....											
House of Representatives.....											
The Judiciary.....		2									
Department of Agriculture.....	13	42	33	79	12	35	25	11	32	10	35
Department of Commerce.....	50	70	43	144	50	58	69	18	37	14	67
Civil Aeronautics Board.....											
Department of the Interior.....	6	1	20	36	5	4	14	8	10	8	21
Department of Justice.....	41	67	26	181	64	163	49	72	47	9	58
Department of Labor.....				1				2	1	1	1
Navy Department.....	662	515	234	789	241	150	94	104	253	473	580
Pearl Harbor <sup>2</sup> .....	31	13		140	6	1	2	4	1	1	2
Post Office Department.....	1	3	1	13		2	1	1	2	2	3
Department of State.....	7	7		10	2	2	2	3	1	2	6
Department of Treasury.....				4				3	1		1
War Department.....	468	474	178	1,826	340	515	207	218	355	119	502
Panama Canal <sup>2</sup> .....	29	24	5	105	32	13	21	20	45	12	30
Federal Security Agency.....	4	2		7	1	3	1	1	4		9
Federal Works Agency.....	4	1	6	4		3	6	3	1	2	9
National Housing Agency.....				1							
The White House Office.....											
Board of Economic Warfare.....		1	1	6	1				1		
Bureau of the Budget.....											1
National Resources Planning Board.....		1		1							1
Office of Censorship.....	2			4	1				2		
National War Labor Board.....				4							
Office of Alien Property Custodian.....											
Office of Civilian Defense <sup>1</sup> .....				1	1	1		1			
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.....				1							
Office of Defense Transportation.....		1									
Office of Lend-Lease Administration.....	2				1					1	
Office of Scientific Research and Development.....	1	1		38	7	3	2	2	1		9
Office of War Information.....	2		1	7	2			1			1
War Manpower Commission.....	1	1		23	1	2		1	2	1	3
National Youth Administration.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
War Production Board.....	1	1	1	14	2				2		5
War Relocation Authority.....											
War Shipping Administration.....	85	68	42	227	62	42	47	24	157	104	159
Office for Emergency Management <sup>1</sup> .....				2		1					1
Office of Price Administration.....		1		3	2	4					2
Office of Strategic Services.....				2							
Petroleum Administration for War.....				2			1		3		
National Capital Housing Authority.....											
Civil Service Commission.....	1	1		7	1			1			1
Employees Compensation Commission.....											
Federal Communications Commission.....	7	11	3	21	4	1	4	1	7	5	9
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....									1		
Federal Power Commission.....											1

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	State										
	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland
General Accounting Office				1							1
Government Printing Office											
Library of Congress											
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	9	23		17	14	10	3	4	5	2	13
National Gallery of Art											
National Labor Relations Board											
Railroad Retirement Board							1				
Securities and Exchange Commission				1							
Tariff Commission											
United States Maritime Commission	33	141	22	251	83	32	12	32	46	23	46
Veterans' Administration		1	1	1							
Executive Office and independent establishments <sup>2</sup>				5	1						
Federal Reserve System				1							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4	1	2	4		2		2	5		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	13		10	6	1	5	9	7	1	2
Government corporations and credit agencies <sup>2</sup>		1		5							1
District of Columbia government							1				8
Government agencies <sup>2</sup>	23	24	15	118	17	27	6	11	40	9	51

Agency	State										
	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico
A agencies, total	5,461	1,809	1,015	460	874	585	457	184	467	2,895	300
Legislative establishments <sup>2</sup>											
Senate											
House of Representatives										1	
The Judiciary											
Department of Agriculture	24	21	44	21	21	23	11	2	4	19	16
Department of Commerce	58	65	42	26	97	81	35	31	10	58	57
Civil Aeronautics Board											
Department of the Interior	33	18	16	6	26	20	11	11	4	13	13
Department of Justice	186	120	162	51	134	19	87	5	3	108	14
Department of Labor	2		3							1	
Navy Department	3,692	346	212	81	197	229	80	67	363	838	49
Pearl Harbor <sup>2</sup>	9	9	2	7	4	1	1		18	7	1
Post Office Department	2	16	2	3	1	2	3	1		6	
Department of State	19	4	4		6	2	1	1		12	3
Department of Treasury		7	1							2	
War Department	953	590	221	148	272	138	117	44	45	987	109
Panama Canal <sup>3</sup>	56	29	22	16	31	4	10	4	7	41	5
Federal Security Agency	3	4			3					1	
Federal Works Agency	4	5	9	3		5				3	4
National Housing Agency										1	
The White House Office											
Board of Economic Warfare	4					2	1			3	
Bureau of the Budget		1									
National Resources Planning Board											
Office of Censorship	1	1	2							2	1
National War Labor Board	3										
Office of Alien Property Custodian											
Office of Civilian Defense	1	1		1							
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs			1				1			1	
Office of Defense Transportation	2	1			1		1				
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	1	1									
Office of Scientific Research and Development	81	6	7		4	1	2			16	4
Office of War Information	6	1			2					7	
War Manpower Commission	11	3	3	1	4				1	2	1
National Youth Administration		1	1								
War Production Board	6	5			2				2	12	
War Relocation Authority											
War Shipping Administration	106	234	90	26	20	32	15	7	1	391	2
Office for Emergency Management <sup>2</sup>	1	2								3	
Office of Price Administration	1	3	2		3		1			3	
Office of Strategic Services	5	2	1							1	
Petroleum Administration for War		1								5	1
National Capital Housing Authority											
Civil Service Commission	1		1	1						1	
Employees Compensation Commission											
Federal Communications Commission	26	10	14	1	6	2	6			10	2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation											
Federal Power Commission	1		1				1				
General Accounting Office		1									
Government Printing Office											
Library of Congress											
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	19	17	14	2	1	1	4	5	2	7	1
National Archives											
National Gallery of Art											
National Labor Relations Board											
Railroad Retirement Board											
Securities and Exchange Commission											
Tariff Commission	1										
United States Maritime Commission	40	192	121	32	17	7	60	5	4	144	5
Veterans' Administration	1	1			1						
Executive Office and independent establishments <sup>2</sup>											
Federal Reserve System	1		1								
Reconstruction Finance Corporation			1	1	1	3				7	
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	3	2	18	3	2	1			1	1
Government corporations and credit agencies <sup>2</sup>			1		2	1					
District of Columbia government										1	
Government agencies <sup>2</sup>	99	88	12	14	15	8	7	1	3	180	11

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	State										
	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee
All agencies, total	14,954	1,176	229	3,609	1,096	943	10,202	1,115	3,256	262	1,266
Legislative establishments <sup>1</sup>											
Senate											
House of Representatives											
The Judiciary											
Department of Agriculture	52	28	7	35	22	61	66	2	28	19	19
Department of Commerce	246	43	31	90	46	46	134	9	27	21	52
Civil Aeronautics Board											
Department of the Interior	87	4	5	22	17	40	66		1	10	17
Department of Justice	372	66	20	149	116	14	150	8	28	28	78
Department of Labor	2						2				1
Navy Department	6,846	571	56	653	165	212	4,644	906	2,708	58	323
Pearl Harbor <sup>2</sup>	271	9		190	4	17	358	4	119		2
Post Office Department	13	1	1	17	6	3	24	2	2		2
Department of State	46	3		10	3	4	8		2		4
Department of the Treasury	21			11	1		6				
War Department	3,769	192	66	1,404	552	235	3,352	70	163	10	370
Panama Canal <sup>3</sup>	198	21	7	11	17	6	153	6	14	5	33
Federal Security Agency	62	4		7			9		1		3
Federal Works Agency	9	6	2	2	4	6	15	1	2	1	6
National Housing Agency						1					
The White House Office											
Board of Economic Warfare	20			2	1		4		1		2
Bureau of the Budget	1			1			1				1
National Resources Planning Board	1										
Office of Censorship	12			2			2				2
National War Labor Board	2	1					1	2			
Office of Alien Property Custodian											
Office of Civilian Defense	1	2		2							
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	14			1			2				
Office of Defense Transportation	2			2				1			
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	11										
Office of Scientific Research and Development	73			18	1	9	19	2			2
Office of War Information	109			7			8				
War Manpower Commission	20	1		6	1	2	12	1		2	2
National Youth Administration				1			2				
War Production Board	30	2		10	1	1	15		1		
War Relocation Authority											
War Shipping Administration	1,600	116	14	276	62	212	509	47	52	6	69
Office for Emergency Management <sup>2</sup>	28	1		3		3	4				1
Office of Price Administration	9	3		5			3	1			1
Office of Strategic Services	5						1				
Petroleum Administration for War	6						4	1			
National Capital Housing Authority											
Civil Service Commission	3			3			2		2		2
Employees Compensation Commission											
Federal Communications Commission	39	1	3	5	4	8	15		1	6	1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation											
Federal Power Commission	1						1				1
General Accounting Office				1							
Government Printing Office											
Library of Congress	4										
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	69	6	6	84	2	1	31	6	2		7
National Archives											
National Gallery of Art											
National Labor Relations Board	2			1			1				
Railroad Retirement Board											
Securities and Exchange Commission	1										
Tariff Commission											
United States Maritime Commission	668	53	4	310	57	40	403	47	64	5	98
Veterans' Administration	5			1			2				
Executive Office and independent establishments <sup>2</sup>	2						1				
Federal Reserve System				1							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	9	1	3	2	1		5				3
Tennessee Valley Authority	12	15	1	3	1		8		2	1	136
Government corporation and credit agencies <sup>2</sup>	1			2			1				1
District of Columbia government	2	1					1				
Government agencies <sup>2</sup>	197	19	3	89	31	20	156	1	35	10	22

Agency	State								Total off-continent	Alaska	Hawaii	Puerto Rico
	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming				
All agencies, total	4,848	757	116	7,271	6,275	649	971	167	5,512	331	4,988	193
Legislative establishments <sup>1</sup>												
Senate												
House of Representatives												
The Judiciary									1		1	
Department of Agriculture	58	16	2	38	76	12	53	12	35	5	2	28
Department of Commerce	197	38	8	112	172	22	39	20	77	64	11	2
Civil Aeronautics Board												
Department of the Interior	44	30	2	15	79		13	4	33	26	4	3
Department of Justice	307	44	7	110	59	44	95	6	14	4	4	6
Department of Labor				2	2		1					
Navy Department	523	81	41	5,795	3,682	307	239	50	3,720	15	3,681	24
Pearl Harbor <sup>2</sup>	62	1		103	184	1			19		19	
Post Office Department	13			10	6		4	1	13	1	11	1
Department of State	25	1		21	3		5		2			2
Department of the Treasury	1		3	1	2				3			
War Department	2,480	455	31	263	1,150	128	329	48	1,343	126	1,129	88
Panama Canal <sup>3</sup>	106	3	1	43	17	9	29	1			1	
Federal Security Agency	4			6	2				8			
Federal Works Agency	5	11	2	23	9	2	8		11	7	1	3
National Housing Agency	1			1								

Footnotes at end of table.

State of registrants deferred for occupational reasons by selective service local boards because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, by branch, or agency of the Government by which employed, Sept. 15, 1943—registrants 18 to 37, inclusive—United States and Territories—Continued

Agency	State								Total, off-continent	Alaska	Hawaii	Puerto Rico
	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming				
The White House Office												
Board of Economic Warfare	3			3	1				1	1		
Bureau of the Budget	1			3								
National Resources Planning Board												
Office of Censorship	3			1	1				6			6
National War Labor Board				1	2			1				
Office of Alien Property Custodian								1				
Office of Civilian Defense	1			1				1				
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1			1								
Office of Defense Transportation	1											
Office of Lend-Lease Administration				1								
Office of Scientific Research and Development	2	2	4	7	9	4	4					
Office of War Information	1	1	1	3	1	1						
War Manpower Commission	2	1		1	4	4	1					
National Youth Administration	1					3						
War Production Board	3	1		7			3					
War Relocation Authority					1							
War Shipping Administration	283	39		179	528	45	53	10	128	26	86	16
Office for Emergency Management <sup>1</sup>												
Office of Price Administration	1			1	1							
Office of Strategic Services	1						1					
Petroleum Administration for War	8											
National Capital Housing Authority				1	2		1					
Civil Service Commission	7			1								
Employees' Compensation Commission				1								
Federal Communications Commission	19		1	6	21	6	4		8	2	3	3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation												
Federal Power Commission						1						
General Accounting Office				1					1			1
Government Printing Office				1								
Library of Congress												
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5	1	1	311	8	7	6					
National Archives												
National Gallery of Art				1								
National Labor Relations Board												
Railroad Retirement Board												
Securities and Exchange Commission				1	1							
Tariff Commission												
United States Maritime Commission	231	16	8	112	98	30	55	11	7	5	2	
Veterans' Administration	1											
Executive offices and independent establishments <sup>2</sup>	1						2					
Federal Reserve System	1											
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2			2	1	1	2					
Tennessee Valley Authority	3			5		2	3					
Government corporation and credit agencies <sup>2</sup>	1	1		2	3		1					
District of Columbia government				19								
Government agencies <sup>2</sup>	440	13	3	56	150	18	16	1	86	48	31	7

<sup>1</sup> Does not include the following agencies for which no employees were reported classified in II-A, II-A (H), II-B, II-B (H): Office for Emergency Management, Division of Central Administrative Services, American Battle Monuments Commission, Bituminous Coal-Consumer Council, Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, National Mediation Board, Smithsonian Institution, the Tax Court of the United States, Export Import Bank.

<sup>2</sup> Not elsewhere classified.

<sup>3</sup> Includes employees of the Panama Canal, a division of the War Department, and may also include employees of other agencies designated only by location.

Source: Report of Occupational Deferment of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 38) and Changes in Occupational Deferments of Federal Government Employees (DSS Form 39).

**CLAIM OF GENERAL STATE AUTHORITY OF COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 100)**

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 135, a bill "to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

On June 21, 1937, an allotment of \$20,000,000 was made by the Public Works Administration with my approval to the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A portion of the allotment was an outright grant while the balance was a relief-labor grant based on a specified percentage

of the amount of wages paid to workers on the projects involved. Subsequently, the State of Pennsylvania requested a modification of the allotment so as to increase the amount of the outright grant. The Public Works Administration declined to modify the grant on the basis of an opinion of its general counsel that there was no legal ground on which the request could be granted. The bill under consideration would permit the State of Pennsylvania to bring suit against the United States, presumably to secure the payment which would have been made had the allotment been modified in accordance with its request.

The statutes under which the Public Works Administration was operating did not create any vested rights in the States, or in anyone else, to obtain any money thereunder. The matter was entirely within the discretion of the United States. Consequently, a denial of a request for an allotment or a refusal to modify an allotment previously made does not create any justiciable issue that may be appropriately determined by the courts.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I feel constrained to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 1, 1943.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

**EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

**EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:  
By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:  
Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Public Health Service.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Amos E. Taylor, of Pennsylvania, to be Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Oliver P. Hopkins, of Maryland, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and

Raymond C. Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elvin Seibert to be consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Bailey, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 1 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

##### AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals with rank from September 1, 1943

Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, vice

Brig. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Henry C. Pratt, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Joseph Taggart McNarney (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. George Churchill Kenney (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Ernest D. Peek, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz (brigadier general, Assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Frederic H. Smith, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Philip B. Peyton, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Ira Clarence Eaker (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Millard Fillmore Harmon (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Clement A. Trott, retired.

Lt. Gen. Robert Lawrence Eichelberger (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Troy Handy (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Edmond L. Daley, retired.

Maj. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Joseph M. Cummins, retired.

Lt. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. John N. Greely, retired.

To be major general with rank from August 31, 1943

Lt. Gen. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Walter S. Grant, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 1, 1943

Lt. Gen. Joseph Warren Stilwell (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 2, 1943

Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Philip B. Peyton, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 3, 1943

Lt. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Ernest D. Peek, retired.

To be major general with rank from September 4, 1943

Lt. Gen. Joseph Taggart McNarney (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis, retired.

##### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Robert Leonard Colligan, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. James Gleason Foley, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from September 1, 1942.

First Lt. Emil Franklin Hawes, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Second Lt. James Erwin Crosby, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Oliver Morton Legg, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Richard Concklin Snyder, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants with rank from October 12, 1943

Second Lt. Robert Emmet Kennington, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Trabue, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Love Latta, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. John Bangs Corbett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Alfred Martin, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Barwick Strahan, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Richard Greenwood Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Michael Delaney, Cavalry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. Francis Marion Smith, Infantry (temporary captain), subject to examination required by law.

##### MEDICAL CORPS

##### To be colonels

Lt. Col. Theo Wallace O'Brien, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Charles Munly, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. George William Rice, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 7, 1943.

Lt. Col. Robert James Platt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Neal Williams, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 17, 1943.

Lt. Col. Rollo Preston Bourbon, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 29, 1943.

Lt. Col. Wesley Cintra Cox, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Floyd Vern Kilgore, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Christopher Woodland, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Walter Leslie Perry, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 31, 1943.

##### To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Richard Emmons Elvins, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 8, 1943.

##### To be major

Capt. Joseph Pease Russell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 16, 1943.

##### To be captain

First Lt. Edwin Stow Chapman, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 5, 1943.

First Lt. Carl Zeigler Berry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 10, 1943.

First Lt. Other Franklin Speaker, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 14, 1943.

First Lt. Joseph Raymond Henry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. Walton Merideth Edwards, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. George Vernon Potter, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. Harold Leslie Robinson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 19, 1943.

First Lt. William Todd DeVan, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 21, 1943.

First Lt. John Philip Harney, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Harvey George Tousignant, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. James Howard Smith, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Vernon David Pettit, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. John Nicholas Furst, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Lee Frank Ferrell, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. John Lynch Dixon, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Walter Anthony Butkus, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 24, 1943.

#### DENTAL CORPS

##### To be colonels

Lt. Col. Walter Davis Vail, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clement John Gaynor, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Rose, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Alvin Ellsworth Anthony, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Burns Caldwell, Dental Corps, with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Lewis Walter Maly, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Glover Johns, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Leslie Dean Baskin, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Dell Stuart Gray, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Boyd Lee Smith, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Avery Giles Holmes, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. George Robert Kennebeck, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Lyon Boyd, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Richard Foster Thompson, Dental Corps, with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Swann Shuttleworth, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 19, 1943.

#### CHAPLAINS

##### To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John Oscar Lindquist, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 10, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Frank Meredith Thompson, United States Army, with rank from October 10, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Joseph Burt Webster, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 11, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Alfred Cookman Oliver, Jr., United States Army, with rank from October 24, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 1 (legislative day, September 15), 1943:

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

Elvin Seibert to be consul of the United States of America.

John W. Bailey, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### COLORADO

Wesley A. Simmer, Blanca.  
Victor C. Baker, Fairplay.  
Roxie R. Broad, Wheat Ridge.

##### CONNECTICUT

Francis H. Whelan, Darien.  
Arthur H. Forst, Seymour.  
Paul F. Cassidy, Woodbury.

##### DELAWARE

Alexander P. Gallagher, New Castle.

##### GEORGIA

Ola H. Bradbury, Bogart.  
Clarence L. Persons, Eastman.  
Frances Catherine Wingate, Ellijay.  
John Marcus Stubbs, Savannah.  
Annie Lee Baker, Shannan.  
Eloise G. Flanders, Swainsboro.

##### INDIANA

Charles E. Hull, Columbus.  
Flossie L. Waterstraat, Earl Park.  
Closs D. Samuels, Greensburg.  
Ethel Williams, Odon.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

James H. Monahan, Clifton.  
Wilma L. Foster, Hamilton.  
Bertha S. Nelson, Raynham.

##### MONTANA

Allen S. McKenzie, Phillipsburg.

##### NEW MEXICO

Robert F. Fisher, Cuba.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Edgar M. Martin, East Bend.  
James C. Swain, Plymouth.  
Gertrude B. Speir, Winterville.

##### OKLAHOMA

James E. Terrell, Elmore City.

##### VERMONT

Mary A. Keleher, Bethel.  
Earle J. Rogers, Cabot.  
Gertrude L. Cutler, Cambridge.  
Hollis S. Johnson, Castleton.  
Rutherford D. Pfenning, Forest Dale.  
Harriette R. Wilson, Grennsboro.  
William T. Johnson, Hardwick.  
Frank J. Donahue, Middlebury.  
Mabel R. Turner, Rupert.  
Ruth A. Randall, Wells River.  
Ruby C. Gauthier, Wilder.  
Margaret M. Flower, Woodstock.

#### VIRGINIA

Carrie F. Patterson, Greenwood.  
Lexie M. Van Dyke, Jewell Ridge.  
Harris Hill Gee, Meherrin.

#### WISCONSIN

Harold C. Krentz, Westfield.

## SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

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

O God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth amid the tragedy of a broken world, in deep humility of spirit at noonday we ascend the altar stairs of this hallowed temple of our faith and hope. Before we talk of the Nation's good we would lift our needy hearts to the nations' God. For in Thee we trust. When for this dedicated moment we blot out all but Thee in a world of rising and falling empires, we crave the strengthening vista of Thine eternal kingdom whose sun never sets.

Give unto us that greatness of spirit which shall match the vast patterns of this creative day. Save us from setting narrow limits upon our responsibility to our fellow men. May no pettiness in our patriotism rob us of the habitual vision of greatness. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and calculation. Beyond the strategy of war may we see the depth and scope of this historic drama of the centuries, and may that vision turn its blood and sweat and tears into glory. We ask it in the ever-blessed name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 1, 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	Davis	McCarran
Andrews	Eastland	McClellan
Austin	Ellender	McFarland
Bailey	Ferguson	McKellar
Ball	George	McNary
Barbour	Gerry	Maloney
Barkley	Gillette	Maybank
Brooks	Green	Millikin
Buck	Guffey	Moore
Burton	Gurney	Murdoch
Bushfield	Hatch	Murray
Butler	Hayden	Nye
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Capper	Holman	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Reed
Connally	Lodge	Revercomb
Danaher	Lucas	Reynolds