purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3445. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3446. A bill to provide for revocation of naturalization and deportation in the case of certain naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3447. A bill to prescribe additional requirements for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution for the purpose of prohibiting the imposition of conditions upon grants of moneys and rebates of taxes in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3443. A bill for the relief of Guy A. Utter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3444. A bill for the relief of M. J. Beach, Sedgewick Kistler, J. H. Teas, and W. T. Teas, surviving directors of the Chesboard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2867. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc. (adopted at its regular session at Wenatchee, Wash.), asserting that game abounds in the wooded areas of southwest Washington; averring there is a tremendous shortage of meat food in the United States and, therefore, urging that Government agencies grant, on a ration basis, ammunition to all hunters and sportsmen to obtain wildlife for food purposes; also, pointing out that the McCarran bill (S. 1152) seeks to transfer control of all wildlife on Federal lands from the State governments to Federal agents in charge of such Federal lands; arguing that such control would permit the issuance of licenses without regard to residence; contending that this proposed piece of legislation appears to be a deliberate attempt on the part of livestock interests to take unfair advantage of the game situation, under the excuse of war; insisting that this appears as another effort to further centralize all activities in the Federal Government; and, therefore, resolving that the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc., oppose the enactment of the McCarran bill; asserting that the McNary bill (S. 74), which has passed the Senate, provides for placing control of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Ocean south of the fiftieth parallel north latitude in the hands of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; asserting that the bill is based on an unsound premise in that it does not and cannot control fishing; contending that the underlying purpose of the bill is an attempt to divert ocean-caught troll fish into the cans of Oregon packers on the Columbia River; and further insisting that such proposed bill is a violation of the sovereign rights of the States involved to regulate the salmon fisheries within their own 3-mile limits; therefore concluding that the Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Inc., go on record as opposing the enactment of such McNary bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2868. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Resolution of the Cambria County Pomona Grange, No. 51, Pennsylvania, opposing the program of Federal subsidy on agricultural products as detrimental to national prosperity and democratic principles of free enterprise since all such subsidies would lead to excessive inflation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2869. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Pearl Reed, of Elsberry and 90 citizens of Lincoln County, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2870. Also, petition of Delbert Lee of Hannibal, and 78 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2871. Also, petition of Laura Taylor, of Clarksville, and 94 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2872. Also, petition of Mary Brock, of Chamois, and 46 citizens of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2873. Also, petition of Mrs. J. W. Farmer, of Briscoe, and 22 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2874. Also, petition of Mrs. H. V. Hunn, of Moscow Mills, and 51 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2875. Also, petition of Blanche Creamer, of Louisiana, and 84 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2876. Also, petition of Arthur Wheeler, of Eolia, and 113 citizens of the State of Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

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

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

O Thou whose dwelling place is the light of setting suns and the round ocean and the living air and the blue sky and in the mind of man: Shine into our darkness by the light of Thy truth; correct the dismal errors of our judgments and the false perspective of our prejudices by the wisdom Thou dost wait to give liberally to all who ask of Thee and who with pure hearts wait for Thy will and Thy word.

Inspire and guide with the spirit of understanding these Thy servants, the few among the many, in a great and crucial day, lifted by their fellows to high pedestals of power and influence. May their words and counsels, so laden with possibilities to affect this stricken generation, add to the world's store of good will, and may they be for the healing of the nations. May a consuming passion for the commonweal of the human family consume all the dross of unworthy ambition, knowing that without Thee, our God, as Architect our labor is in vain.

May we build, with all Thy wondrous gifts, a kingdom meet for Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Tuesday, October 12, 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.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to submit a Senate resolution known as the post-war peace resolution which has been

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations for some months.

In submitting the resolution, I express the hope that all Senators will carefully and meticulously consider it. The resolution represents many months of very careful labor and consideration by the subcommittee, with a view to all foreign phases and aspects of our policy, and I think it represents, in the main, the views of the American people. I have no doubt that it will be approved by the full Committee on Foreign Relations by a very large majority, and, following that, by a large majority of the Senate.

I hope that the supporters of the so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution will very seriously consider supporting this resolution. It is the best thing they can possibly get, and if they should offer their resolution, and it should be defeated, as it would be, there might ensue some inferences and suggestions which might not react very favorably in certain foreign quarters. This is a matter about which we ought to have harmony and unity. It is a matter that affects our relations with foreign countries, and no consideration other than the national welfare should be borne in mind.

I wish to say, Mr. President, as a personal word, that I have labored as a member of the subcommittee, and expect to labor as a member of the full committee, without any effort that spells exploitation. This is a matter that ought to represent the considered views of the committee, the Senate, and the country, and I submit the resolution in the hope that all Senators will give it very careful consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas desire to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CONNALLY. I request that the resolution be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and I should like to have the clerk report it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States:

That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved;

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace;

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

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	Bankhead	Bridges
Andrews	Barbour	Brooks
Bailey	Barkley	Buck
Ball	Bilbo	Burton
Bushfield	Holman	Radcliffe
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Capper	Kilgore	Shipstead
Caraway	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Taft
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Davis	McNary	Tunnell
Ellender	Maloney	Tydings
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
George	Mead	Van Nuys
Gerry	Millkin	Wagner
Gillette	Murdock	Walsh
Green	Murray	Wheeler
Guffey	Nye	Wherry
Gurney	O'Daniel	White
Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hayden	Overton	Willis
Hill	Pepper	Wilson

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

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], 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 Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RECENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last July I addressed a letter to a number of my colleagues in the Senate, proposing formation of a group to work for decentralization of heavy industry, particularly through the establishment of new or expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel. My letter apparently struck a responsive chord with many Senators.

Shortly after Congress took a recess, in July, I received a letter signed by Members of the House of Representatives asking that a joint meeting of Senators and House Members be arranged in view of the fact that many Members of the House were interested in the same ends and aims to which the Senate group is pledged.

Accordingly, a joint meeting was arranged and was held on October 4, 1943, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. More than 30 Senators and more than 50 Members of the House of Representatives were present. At that meeting, on my motion from the floor, which was carried without dissent, I was authorized to appoint steering committees of seven Members each from the House and from the Senate groups.

After consultation with numerous Members of both Houses, I have, under the authority vested in me at the October 4 meeting, appointed the following steering committees:

For the Senate: Senators McCARRAN, chairman; BANKHEAD; GILLETTE; MURDOCK; NYE; ROBERTSON; and THOMAS of Idaho.

For the House: Representatives COFFEE, chairman; PATMAN; TARVER; MANSFIELD; KING; WINTER; CASE.

I make this statement for the benefit of all Members of either House of Congress who may be interested. An organization meeting of the Senate steering committee will be called in the near future, and I have asked the chairman of the steering committee of the House group to take similar action.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of Oakland and Berkeley, Calif., praying for the adoption of Senate Resolution 114 (submitted by Mr. BALL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HATCH on March 16, 1943), favoring organization of the United Nations to maintain peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1077. A bill for the relief of William A. Haag; with amendments (Rept. No. 465).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1288. A bill for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens; with amendments (Rept. No. 466);

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal; without amendment (Rept. No. 467); and

H. R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Rafael Torres; without amendment (Rept. No. 468).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 12, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 755) to amend the National Housing Act as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 323)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit, and ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, minority views on Senate bill

637. I am submitting the minority views for myself and for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], members of the Committee on Education and Labor. I may say that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] have not expressed their views on either the majority or minority side, and I have not been able to reach them today, but they may later join in the views.

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

We cannot give our support to the bill (S. 637) "to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools," which has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and we are submitting this statement of our views as to this legislation and of the reasons why, in our judgment, it is both unwise and inexpedient for it to pass.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The current bill differs in some important respects from the bills which have been presented in previous sessions of the Senate, but which have never been given consideration by the Senate. It contains two parts based on fundamentally different grounds.

First, it proposes an annual appropriation of $200,000,000 to be divided between all of the States in proportion to the average daily attendance of pupils in the elementary and secondary schools in each State. This money is to be used only for the payment of teachers' salaries. It is provided that the sum so used must be additional to any sum spent by the State for such purposes in 1942, and that the State must continue to pay out of its own funds the average annual salaries which it paid on February 1, 1943. This appropriation has no relation to equalization of educational opportunities nor to the special conditions which may exist in any of the poorer States. While apparently only a relief measure, and stated to be for emergency purposes, there is no time limit on the authorization.

The other portion of the bill appropriates $100,000,000 to be used for equalizing the amounts spent for education in the various States. This means, of course, a distribution to those States which have the lowest per capita income according to a certain formula established in the bill. It results in $58,000,000 of the $100,000,000 being paid to 13 States. The justification for this appropriation is based on the fact that, taking the country as a whole, existing educational opportunities and facilities are variable and unequal, and deficient in many particulars, due to a variety of causes, one of which, without doubt, is an insufficiency of funds; in other cases, indifference or neglect or poor economic conditions, or refusal by local communities to increase the tax burdens to the levy paid by other communities, or refusal by local communities to increase the tax burdens to the levy paid by other communities. No one who is open-minded and acquainted with the facts will dispute these premises. No one will deny that even though educational opportunities in the United States today are greater, and educational facilities are better, and our entire system of education more democratic, than anywhere else in the world, nevertheless there is much room for further improvement. There is some doubt, however, whether money alone will accomplish the betterment that is needed, or whether equalization is in anyway accomplished by the provisions of the bill which is offered to the Senate.

EDUCATION IS NOT A FEDERAL FUNCTION

Taking both parts of this bill together, it is a proposal to establish a Federal subsidy for common-school and high-school education, a function of the State governments and local governments for the last 150 years. There can be no doubt that common-school and high-school education is the obligation of the States and their local subdivisions under our constitutional system and that it is not an obligation of the Federal Government. There is nothing whatever in the Constitution which delegates to the Federal Government power to deal with questions of education. All authority for a Federal subsidy of education must be based upon the spending power, which is sufficiently broad to give a legal basis for the current bill, as for other subsidies to local government.

However, Federal subsidies to the States for matters which are clearly not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government are certainly not justified on the ground that the States are unable to finance adequately the activities which are constitutionally assigned to them. It is undoubtedly true that the taxing powers of the States are somewhat limited and that under some conditions the Federal Government may be in a better position to raise money where it should be raised than the States themselves. It was on this ground that the Federal Government went so extensively into the financing of relief in the great emergency of 1932. Here was a tremendous new expenditure for which no provision was made in the State systems of finance, calling for a very large sum which the States were wholly unable to raise. But as the emergency declined, the Federal Government has gradually withdrawn its aid, and relief today is again administered by the States.

The same conditions do not at all apply to education. The States have always financed education. In nearly every State it has been given a prior consideration in dividing the funds which are available. One-third of all State and local taxes are spent for education. If the States and localities can't finance education, they can't finance any State or local activities. In many other States school boards are independent of cities, towns, and counties, and answerable directly to the people. In Ohio and elsewhere the people of each community are authorized to vote additional tax levies on themselves for schools if they feel that more money is needed for good educational facilities. There is complete home rule in the field of education, and that is what the people want. A curious result of this bill would be to grant additional money to many public schools in such a State as Ohio when often the people of the community have decided that the schools don't need any more money and have refused to vote extra levies for that purpose.

STATES ARE IN BETTER CONDITION THAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There is no real evidence today that the States are unable to finance their own educational system, certainly the many large States in industrial areas which are to receive money out of the $200,000,000 relief fund. We quote from the report made by the senior Senator from Wyoming on Tuesday, October 12, to the George post-war planning committee:

"While the national credit has been under great strain, the fiscal position of the States seems to be improving. The total debt of all of the several States of the Union as of June 30, 1943, was $2,909,000,000. Against this may be charged the growing budget surplus in the States. At the beginning of this year this amounted to $700,000,000, and it is now estimated by officials of the Census Bureau at about $1,000,000,000. The sinking funds of the States on general obligations total $430,000,000 as of June 1943, so that making allowances for the surplus and the sinking funds, the debts of the States amount to a little over $1,000,000,000 as compared with the national debt of $146,000,000,000. * * * I have not had an opportunity to examine the fiscal position of cities and other local subdivisions, but it appears that all of the cities in the United States with a population of 100,000 or more at this moment have an unused debt capacity amounting to $750,000,000. These figures immediately suggest the advisability of an inquiry into the ability of the States and of the cities to carry part of the burden of public responsiblity in the post-war world."

The Senator goes on to point out that many States are setting up post-war funds out of their surplus. The Senator's figures are fully supported by the bulletins of the Bureau of the Census issued from time to time dealing with State finances.

It hardly seems that the States are in a position to demand relief from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, they are not demanding relief. No State has come before us affirming its inability to deal with the educational problem. No legislature has passed any resolutions requesting assistance. The entire proposal is placed before us by representatives of the teachers and other educational interests, who may or may not have exhausted their remedies within the States. How ridiculous it would be for these States, operating with surpluses, to ask for relief from a Government which is running a deficit of $60,000,000,000 a year! As far as we can see, there is not the slightest justification for treating the present condition as an emergency which requires Federal financial assistance.

THIS SUBSIDY WOULD BE A NONWAR ACTIVITY

This Congress has taken the position that all expenditures for nonwar purposes should be eliminated unless they are absolutely necessary, and that our whole attention should be devoted to the prosecution of the war. On that policy we have eliminated the C. C. C., the W. P. A., the N. Y. A., and many other nonwar activities. It is hard to see how any slight improvement in the educational system could be accomplished in time to have any noticeable effect in the present war. Of course every activity of the Government, if it is of any value at all, has some remote relation to the morale of the people and to the prosecution of the war, but certainly the education of minor children is as far from the war as any other civilian department of the Government.

THIS IS THE START OF A REVOLUTIONARY POLICY WHICH MAY COST FOUR BILLION DOLLARS

Apart from the nonexistent emergency feature, the Federal subsidy project has been before Congress for a number of years, promoted by the National Education Association and the Federal Office of Education, but not by the States themselves. Previous bills have been based entirely on the principle of equalization, and have all been based on the argument that because some States spend much less money per pupil than others, the way to improve education is to subsidize those States.

The whole project is based on the assumption that the more money is spent on education, the better the education is. This conclusion is perhaps open to question. Startling ignorance regarding American history, which was discussed in the Senate last spring, certainly could not arise from lack of financial resources. It appeared among students from all over the United States, and in many instances from students who came

from those States which spend the most money on education. Undoubtedly education in some States is handicapped by lack of funds, but there are other ways in which American education can be improved besides granting Federal subsidies.

The adoption of the present bill would undoubtedly embark the Federal Government in a gradually increasing expenditure from which it would never be relieved. If we once pay from two hundred to three hundred dollars of the salary of every school teacher in the country, how can we possibly ever withdraw that support? Even if the States become richer, they will never be willing to take over this burden. Having yielded once to a very strong pressure, there will be no way in which to prevent a further yielding.

The desires of the educators are almost without limit. The whole question of Federal aid to education is discussed in the report of the National Resources Planning Board for 1943, on page 68. That report takes the position that "the Nation is now spending less than 50 percent of the amount needed to provide a justifiable minimum educational program." Current expenditures and capital outlay for education in the United States are shown to be approximately $3,200,000,000. The "justifiable minimum annual expenditures in the post-war period" are said to be $7,385,000,000. The report then says:

"During the years immediately following the war it does not appear probable that the total revenue available for education from State and local systems combined can be greatly increased. * * * It is therefore evident that most of the increase in expenditures for education in the post-war period must be financed almost, if not entirely, by Federal funds. * * * The only agency that can remedy the inequality among the States in the tax burden for education is the Federal Government. It should accept this role."

This report was written by Dr. Floyd W. Reeves, who is also chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education, closely allied with the National Education Association and the original promoter of subsidy legislation. We see, therefore, that the real program of which this is the beginning calls for the Federal Government to finance the greater part of $4,000,000,000 a year.

This proposal is in fact the beginning of a revolutionary change in one of our most fundamental Government activities. It should not be considered except in relation to the entire post-war activities of the Federal Government.

WE SHOULD NOT NOW COMMIT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ANY NEW TYPE OF EXPENSE

The Federal Government faces after the war a tremendously serious financial problem. The annual charge for interest alone will amount to $5,000,000,000. At least $5,000,000,000 will be necessary for the armed forces. At least $5,000,000,000 will be required for existing services, with some moderate increase in expenditures for social security purposes. Many other new items of expense will be clamoring for consideration. We do not know where the point is, but there is a point at which the burden of Government will become so great that it will choke all incentive, initiative, and enterprise. At some point we can kill the goose that lays the golden egg, and force the entire country into a socialistic strait jacket. It seems most unwise to commit ourselves now to any policy which will increase the difficulty of the post-war problem. If expenditures for education are to be undertaken, they should be undertaken when we have the whole problem before us, and can consider the relative merits of each proposal in relation to the over-all expense.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY WOULD DESTROY LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

There is an even more important question. Can Federal subsidies to the public-school system be maintained without ultimately bringing about a nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control? This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insist is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided. They contend that by the provisions of section 1 the danger is removed. We seriously question this conclusion. We believe that in the complexity of reports, of plans, of State legislation to conform to Federal policies, of counsel and advice, and joint participation of the Federal Government and the States, and all of the other manifold details of the operation of the contemplated program of Federal subsidies, our public school systems would be gradually, but no less inevitably, drawn more and more under the thumb of a Federal bureaucracy.

We have pointed out that the ultimate plans call for the Federal Government assuming perhaps half the cost of education. Our experience with the social-security laws and many others lead to the definite conclusion that Federal subsidy in the end means Federal control. Those who put up the money and have the power to refuse it dictate the policies of the local officials. Federal bureaucrats travel the country, checking up on the expenditures and the policies of every school board and other local officials. Of course the very provisions of the act itself contradict in some respects the pious declaration of section 1 against any Federal officer controlling the administration of State schools. Under the provisions of this bill, schools would be unable to decrease their teachers' salaries or their current expenditures for schools, whether those expenditures had been extravagant in the past or not. Under the provisions of this bill, every cent of the $200,000,000 must be spent for teachers' salaries, and not for any other necessary school purposes. Under the provisions of this bill, a new system of reports must be set up from all local schools to a State Educational Authority. These provisions may not require substantial changes in school administration, but they illustrate the principle that it is impossible to give Federal money without controlling to some extent the expenditure of that money and the administration of the schools which spend it. If the amount is increased, it is inevitable that Congress and the Federal authorities will insist upon the natural right to state the conditions of administration on which Federal funds are provided.

Of course, the same thing is true of all Federal-aid programs, but the effect is much worse in the case of education. It is unnecessary to expand on the tremendous danger of centralized control of education, because the authors of the bill agreed to those dangers when they wrote section 1. Centralized control of education gives a power to the central government far beyond that of any other control, as Hitler has illustrated in Germany. It places the whole character and knowledge of the people in the hands of a Federal bureau. That bureau is more than likely to be guided by some small group of men who believe in this method of education or that method of education. It transfers the control from the people of each district to a man or men wholly beyond the control of public opinion.

The people don't want it. There is no matter upon which they are more insistent than local control of education. There has been difficulty in centralizing schools even on a township basis, because the people of each district want to run their own schools. We feel that the bill before us would be the beginning of the end of local self-government in education.

THIS BILL DOES NOT EQUALIZE

The strongest argument for the bill is that we must equalize educational opportunity throughout the United States by providing substantially the same amount of money for the education of each child. We have pointed out that money is only one of the factors in education. A $40 education in some places may be much better than a $60 education in another. But beyond that, this bill does not equalize. Some of the greatest discrepancies occur within a particular State. Some school districts may be very wealthy, where others may be very poor. State equalization does not exist in many States, and there is nothing in this bill to compel it. Within single States there may be wide differences in the money expended on children of different races.

Thus on page 19 of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, we find that in Louisiana the cost per white pupil is $61.21, whereas the cost per Negro pupil is $12.62. Nothing in this act requires any equalization between white and Negro pupils. It is true that the bill requires the Federal funds to be distributed on an equitable basis between white schools and Negro schools, but it does not change the distribution of Louisiana funds. The result, as shown in the hearings under this bill, would be that white students would be educated at an expense of $76.40 apiece as compared to $23.61 per Negro student. The difference would be $52.79 after the passage of the bill as compared to $48.59 today.

The bill, therefore, does not do the very thing which it is supposed to do. Equalization, as a matter of fact, cannot be secured except by complete Federal control and direction. Everyone agrees that complete Federal control and direction are worse than the inequality which now exists. It may be fairly argued that if the States and local communities are to be left alone to run their schools as they see fit, and to spend Federal moneys for school subsidies as they see fit, such an arrangement is indefensible from the standpoint of the Federal Government and the taxpayers generally. Congress ought not to give away Federal funds to the States, with no Federal control over the spending of the funds. If on the other hand the Federal Government is to retain control over the expenditures and to dictate them, then it means Federal control of education—an alternative equally obnoxious. There is no middle ground.

Since the bill proposed does not in fact equalize, it is nothing except a subsidy for the increase of teachers' salaries. Such a subsidy is wholly unjustified when the States are better off financially than the Federal Government. We may admit that many teachers are underpaid, but there may be many who are not underpaid. This bill proposes to increase the salary of every teacher. Certainly Congress is not in a position to judge of the correctness of such a policy.

CONCLUSION

We do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare, they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the national Government.

Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported. We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1437. A bill granting an increase of pension to Isabell Postlethwait; and

S. 1438. A bill granting a pension to Isaac Markum; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 1439, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1440. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1441. A bill to amend section 3 (d) of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1442. A bill to amend section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1443. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended;

S. 1444. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; and

S. 1445. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S.1446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Burks McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious or racial refugees; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 86, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION ON RETIRED LIST OF CERTAIN LINE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and also to present in connection with the bill a resolution adopted by the National Convention of the American Legion in Omaha through its national defense committee. I ask that the bill and resolution be appropriately referred, and that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill and resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the resolution will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The bill (S. 1439) to promote on the retired list all line officers of the Army who have or may be specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The following resolution presented by Mr. MAYBANK was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

That the Congress pass legislation whereby all line officers of the Army who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the Federal Executive Department, under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, when retired, be placed upon the retired list with the rank of the next higher grade and with three-fourths of the active duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement, as now provided for officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

TENURE OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress to 6 years, and so forth. I request that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The term of office of each President of the United States and of each Vice President of the United States elected after the date this article takes effect shall be 6 years; and no person who shall have served as President or Vice President shall be eligible for election to the office of President or the office of Vice President.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be eligible for election or appointment to the office of Senator or Representative in Congress for any term which, if served by such person, would cause the aggregate service of such person as a Member of either or both the Senate and the House of Representatives to exceed 6 years.

"SEC. 3. Nothing contained in section 1 or section 2 of this article shall be construed to prevent any person who may hold the office of President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative in Congress, during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 4. No person shall be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States who holds, or who shall have held within 5 years next preceding the date of such appointment, the office of Senator or Representative in Congress or of judge of any court under the authority of the United States, but nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the appointment or assignment of a person who holds the office of judge of a court under the authority of the United States, to the office of judge of any other court under the authority of the United States.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

FLOOD CONTROL ON THE RIO GRANDE NEAR CREEDE, COLO. (S. DOC. NO. 104)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send to the desk a report received from the Acting Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, addressed to the Senate Committee on Commerce with respect to the Rio Grande River and its tributaries, with the view to providing flood control in the vicinity of Creede, Colo., and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLOOD PROTECTION ON SALT RIVER AT TAYLORSVILLE, KY. (S. DOC. NO. 105)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Under Secretary of War, who is Acting Secretary of War, the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, has sent to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, a report of the Chief of Engineers with reference to flood protection at Taylorsville, Ky. The report is quite comprehensive. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document with illustrations, together with the letter of the Acting Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING (S. DOC. NO. 106)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the hearings before the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, on October 12, 1943, together with certain reports from the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Bank, and the Department of Justice be printed as a Senate document. I make the request for the reason that the demand for certain of this information is very great. The report itself made to the committtee was submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA BEFORE NATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Food Conference at Chicago, September 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BANKHEAD ON NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING BILL

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the Alabama Press Association at Birmingham, Ala., August 13, 1943, on the Bankhead-Cannon paid advertising bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLOTTING A SENSIBLE COURSE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace" delivered by him on the Congressional Record on the Air program on October 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACTS, FIGURES AND PROMISES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Facts, Figures and Promises", delivered by Senator HAWKES at the annual dinner of the Controllers' Institute of America, New York City, September 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY AGRICULTURE HONORS JEFFERSON—ADDRESS BY M. L. WILSON

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Why Agriculture Honors Jefferson," delivered by M. L. Wilson, Director of the Extension Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, before the Nu Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi, Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY SHORTAGE—ADDRESS BY C. C. COGSWELL

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Effect of the Agricultural Machinery Shortage on Production," delivered by C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange, before the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, Chicago, September 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR JOBS—ADDRESS BY ALFRED P. SLOAN, JR.

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Post-War Jobs," delivered by Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board of General Motors, before the Economic Club of Detroit, on Monday, October 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS GOODE JONES, OF ALABAMA—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN S. TILLEY

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John S. Tilley on June 23, 1943, before a joint session of the Senate and House of Alabama, on the occasion of the presentation of a marble bust of Gov. Thomas G. Jones, which appears in the Appendix.]

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Covenant of the League of Nations, together with editorial comment, appearing in the October 15, 1943, issue of the United States News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS REFUGEES

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement by the National Democratic Club and the National Republican Club of New York City, dated September 9, 1943, relative to the admission to the United States of aliens who are racial and religious refugees, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES IN THE SERVICES—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Votes in the Services," published in the Chicago Daily News of October 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JUDGE IS STILL TOPS—EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Judge Is Still Tops," published in Collier's of October 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALMER HOYT'S RULE FOR WAR REPORTING—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Play-by-Play Account," published in the New York Herald Tribune of October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS—LETTER FROM H. A. BENNING

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by H. A. Benning, president of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., of Ogden, Utah, relative to taxes and other problems confronting American business, which appears in the Appendix.]

SERVICEMEN AT THE PEACE TABLE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the Senate and out of the Senate we have heard a great deal of late about the Senate having representation among the plenipotentiaries who will deal for America at the peace table. We recognize, of course, that the matter of designating those who will represent America is an Executive function. We are sure, however, that the Executive is well aware of the growing feeling of the people in this respect. Today I want to say a few words about another group that I feel should have representation at the peace table.

Mr. President, a great national publication has an editorial in its current issue entitled "Soldiers Must Help Make Peace." This editorial was the inspiration for the following article which will appear in my weekly news release.

"The long files of young men march off to war, and as they pass the great men who are sending them into battle, they raise their arms in the salute of those who are about to die."

That striking paragraph appears in a book I just finished reading. It adds force to a suggestion recently made by a national magazine that the men who do the actual fighting be among the negotiators at the peace table. The great men have failed miserably in the past to evolve a formula for a just and lasting peace. Certainly there should be among the conferees at the peace table, those who know war from being actually in and with it.

The editorial upon which the foregoing article was based appears in the October 16 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and reads as follows:

SOLDIERS MUST HELP MAKE PEACE

Although numerous peace plans are being proposed, little is said about who will represent us at the peace conference at which the final terms will be decided. With an election in the offing, we can hardly expect specific information on the make-up of the American delegation, but on one point we can be generally agreed. This time the negotiators certainly should include representatives of the men who actually fought in the war. The results of the 1919 peace conference have been widely criticized as the work of old men who had no part in the fighting. Now is a good time to make sure that the next peace cannot be assailed on that ground.

The peace conferees must, of course, include our political leaders, flanked by experts and observers versed in foreign affairs. We shall need them, but we also shall need men who know something about the consequences of war as well as its causes. And surely, with 10,000,000 men in the armed services, it is more than likely that the expert knowledge we seek will be found among those who fought. A man who has risked his life in Africa or Burma or continental Europe should be able to supply a kind of wisdom on such problems as frontiers or minorities which is often wanting in the academic student of these questions.

Such a man would also supply something even more important. He would bring in a moral fervor for future peace which academicians sometimes lack. It is his generation which has the most at stake in the success of the next peace conference. The men who are doing the fighting will want to see to it that the future is not compromised by any lack of faith and determination.

For our part, we hope that the grim experiences of the battlefield will contribute to the supreme wisdom necessary at this next peace conference. Most of us can think of individuals whose participation in the negotiations would energize and inspire such deliberations. The young men in the fighting forces of the United Nations share a common bond of feeling and understanding forged out of their mutual experiences. It is an international fellowship which can be turned to account by selecting some of our conferees from among their number.

We cannot know what our allies will do in this regard, but we can set an example. If each of our two major political parties were to announce now its determination to see that the men of our fighting forces are represented at the peace table, it would be a source of satisfaction and encouragement both to civilians and to the men who face the enemy.

Mr. President, more than a year ago, I submitted the following resolution providing for a liaison committee between the Senate and the Executive:

Resolved, That the Chief Executive be invited to join with the Senate in the creation of a foreign relations advisory council to be constituted of the following: The Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, other technicians whom the Secretary of State might designate; the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and such other Senators as the President might from time to time designate.

This resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is still there. Inasmuch as I have spoken at length on the need of a foreign relations advisory committee, I shall merely supplement my previous remarks. If such a committee had been appointed, I believe it would have drafted a resolution on post-war collaboration which would meet with the approval of the Senate. Such a resolution, demonstrating to all the world that America is ready to cooperate with like-minded nations, would have a most important bearing on the coming Moscow conference.

Now the Saturday Evening Post suggests this other subject which such a liaison committee could well discuss. No thinking person can dispute the right

of our fighting man to sit at the peace table, nor the value of the contribution he would make toward a solution of the complex problems that will arise. I know of no group of men better qualified to have substantial representation at the peace conference than our 10,000,000 men in the Armed Forces.

They are sailing the seven seas, hearing strange tongues, meeting new philosophies, and getting acquainted with the rest of the world.

The heavens above them at night are strange, and the vegetation, the climate, the food, the habits and customs of the people are different. In close contact with their "comrades in arms" from the other Allied Nations, they will learn tolerance and understanding of the customs and beliefs of other peoples, and they will bring this tolerance and understanding back to America.

A new perspective will come to all of us out of their experiences. The world becomes smaller as the races and peoples of the earth are drawn closer together.

These much-traveled and experienced men in our armed forces will be a great help to America with their broadened outlook and their grasp on world conditions and affairs; we must use their counsel in the great adventure of finding the way to world peace.

It will be said that there have been representatives of the armed forces at every peace conference. That is true, if by this is meant the technical military and naval staffs who sit in as advisers. But these are not the men I have in mind, and they are not the men the Saturday Evening Post has in mind. I have in mind the civilian who left his job in the factory, the bank, the merchant establishment, and the schools to take up arms in defense of his country. I have in mind the buck private, the corporal, the sergeant, and the officers who do the bleeding, sweating, and dying. Great, public-spirited, understanding men have come from their ranks.

Some of our greatest industrial, spiritual, and civic leaders came out of the last war and the wars preceding it. A sizable percentage of our Senators, Representatives, and Governors proudly wear the badge of the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Who, may I ask, are better fitted or more entitled to sit, with equal voice and authority, at the peace table?

Before us there is a tremendous undertaking to provide adequate world leadership. Nothing is impossible for America if we have faith. Faith, as we know, is contagious. These boys of ours are doing the impossible all over the world. With their aid, we will continue the job.

I repeat that the men who are fighting the war and who are paying the real price of war should have something to say about making and maintaining the peace. With their contribution, we should find that formula for peace which is necessary for a war-sick world.

SEEPAGE AND DRAINAGE DAMAGES ON THE ILLINOIS RIVER, ILL.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent that there be taken up for present consideration House bill 3029.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3029) to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

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

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no desire to take from the floor the very distinguished Senator from Illinois; I desire merely to ask a question. As I recall, along in the spring or late summer this bill was brought up in the Senate for consideration. I favored it at that time. I merely wish to know whether the bill to which the Senator now refers is the same measure previously brought before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the able minority leader that this is not the same measure. This measure was passed by unanimous vote of the House, sent to the Senate, and referred to the Commerce Committee, and the Commerce Committee by unanimous vote favorably reported the bill. It authorizes payment for damages which have accrued to landowners in certain drainage districts in the Twentieth Congressional District of Illinois where I live. The damages were caused by the building of the Alton Dam. That dam caused the seepage of water into these various drainage districts. The War Department has approved the measure. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors approved it, and the House passed it by unanimous vote. It is now before the Senate by reason of a unanimous report by the Commerce Committee. The measure has long been delayed, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, and that is why I ask that it be considered at this time. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall not object to having Senate bill 637 laid aside temporarily, if consideration of the bill of the Senator from Illinois will take only 2 or 3 minutes, as the Senator suggests. If consideration of the bill shall result in debate, I think it will be improper for me to allow it to interfere with consideration of Senate bill 637.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah may make demand for the regular order at any time.

Is there objection to the immediate consideration of House bill 3029?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3029) to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. EDWARD W. CREAL, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument, and it was signed by the Vice President.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the pending measure represents very important legislation, to my mind probably as important as any I have had anything to do with since coming to the Senate, and in my opinion probably the most basically important piece of legislation dealing with the welfare of the people of our country which has been presented to the Senate for some time. Every item of the bill has to do with the building of American citizens. Every item of the bill has to do with making our country stronger. I doubt whether anything better can be done for our country than what is proposed to be done by the pending measure.

Mr. President, as the debate proceeds no doubt many questions will be asked. I should like to answer questions and have no objection in the least to being stopped at any time during my discussion of the bill for the purpose of permitting questions, but I think for the welfare of the bill and for the orderly conduct of the debate, if my colleagues will permit me to make a rather formal statement, most of the questions will then be found to have been answered, and the subject matter will be placed in categorical shape in the RECORD. I will therefore proceed with a prepared statement in regard to the bill.

Mr. President, the bill is a very simple one. There is nothing complex about it. If I know anything about the fundamental theories of American government and the aspirations of the fathers who brought it into existence, I know that the very bases of our Government depend upon a universally trained citizenry. I know too from the studies which the Committee on Education and Labor has made and other studies dealing with migratory labor, with strategic materials and with the various types of war activities, manpower, selective service, and all kindred matters, about the economic problems with which we are faced and problems which may affect all the citizens of our country, that there is no problem which cuts so deeply into the basic fundamentals which we call Americanization as does the neglect of our public schools and the neglect of educational opportunity for large sections of our population.

In the midst of our great and unprecedented war for the defense of our ideals and institutions it is necessary that we give due consideration to the education

of our youth both for direct defense activities and for sustaining on a high level our economic and civic life. In order to do this we must look to the long future. The children and youth of today are the men and women of tomorrow on whom the Nation must rely for its very existence. Neglect yesterday of talent, health, and physical fitness has resulted in a mighty toll of losses today, and which similar neglect today is sure to result in other losses tomorrow. We should have learned long ago that it is futile to think that the education of any generation of children and youth can be delayed until they have reached maturity and are needed immediately to meet an emergency.

If we need any evidence of the truth of this statement we can look at the enormous losses of manpower to the armed forces because of the hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million men, who have been unable to take their places with our fighting forces simply because of the lack of education.

But the loss of manpower is perhaps not the consideration which ought to be uppermost in the minds of the American people and especially in the minds of a great deliberative body such as the United States Senate. We need to examine the obligations of the Nation to maintain policies of equalization of opportunity and not merely of equalization of sacrifice. About 2 years ago it was pointed out by the American Youth Commission, Mr. Owen D. Young, chairman, that as a Nation we of necessity have had to launch upon a program of selecting the most promising of young men "who will be trained to kill and to take the risk of being killed in order that the democratic community of free people may continue to exist." When that obligation of the citizens to the state is thus carried to the utmost extreme of duty that can be asked of him, it is imperative to all of us to reexamine the extent to which the state is carrying out its obligation toward the citizen.

Mr. President, in the minds of some there may be the idea that since this is wartime it is not an appropriate time to consider the Federal financing of education. I wish to point out, however, that some of the greatest advances which have ever been made during the entire history of our educational program came during a prior war. It came when Lincoln saw the necessity of equalizing opportunities in education for the people throughout the whole of our land.

When he accomplished what his predecessor, Buchanan, by vetoing what became the great land-grant college bill, had failed to accomplish, Lincoln instituted in time of war the greatest educational experiment the country or the world has ever known. As a result of the establishment of the great land-grant institutions, he brought to the world the greatest single blessing ever given to the people of the world by a single act of any Government. It was a war measure then. Aid to education is a war measure now.

In 1917, when we were at war, the United States Congress established our Federal system of financial assistance to the States for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes Act. We have witnessed the expansion of that program, and today there is scarcely an informed person who does not readily admit that the vocational education work in our public schools throughout the land has proved to be one of the greatest of our national assets in the winning of the war. If we had waited until 1939 or 1941 to begin that great educational program, the consequences might have been dire indeed.

I want to emphasize that one reason for proposing that the United States Government in this time of war adopt a financial policy looking toward the reduction of gross inequalities of educational opportunity is that such a policy is necessary to the success of the prosecution of the war. It is entirely conceivable that the young people who are now in the upper elementary grades of our schools will be called upon to enter the armed services before the present conflict is brought to a successful termination. It is a known and an indisputable fact, Mr. President, that there are millions of children who may within the next 3 or 4 years be expected to be in the armed forces of our country who are not now afforded the kind of education that will enable them to serve with the maximum efficiency required in modern warfare. If we are ever to do anything about that problem, now is the time to do so.

Furthermore, when the war is won, and when we enter again upon our peacetime pursuits, we shall have an enormous public debt to finance. In the final analysis the cost of the war will be paid by the people of the United States, and among those people are our school children of today. Not only the financing of public debt but the maintenance of our entire economic system is going to depend upon the productivity of the American people. It is utterly inconceivable that a highly efficient industrial system can exist without people of high educational attainments and standards of living commensurate with modern and industrial development. The proposal that public education be adequately financed is a proposal that the people through their chosen representatives make a modest investment in the future safety, stability, and development of our entire economic life.

In 1937 the late Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, jointly with the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, former Senator Black, of Alabama, introduced a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for public education. That bill was favorably reported after extensive hearings by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. While the bill was before the House Committee on Education, and hearings were being held, the President requested the Advisory Committee on Education, previously appointed by him to study Federal aid for vocational education, to give more extended consideration to the whole subject of Federal relationship to State and local conduct of education, and to prepare a report. Thereafter the Congress took no further action in the matter pending the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

On February 8, 1938, the President's committee transmitted its report to the President. The report was published by the committee, and also as House Document No. 529, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. The committee found by unanimous agreement that—

> The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level that should be tolerated in a civilized country.

And that—

> Unless the Federal Government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright.

The late Senator Harrison from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee. Some persons have already assumed that the executive branch of our Government has had nothing to do with the bill which is before us. I repeat that the late Senator Harrison from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator please state for the RECORD the persons who compose the Advisory Committee, together with their status in the educational world?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have not the complete list before me, but it is public. The first group of that kind was appointed by former President Hoover during his administration to look into the trends as they affected our social and cultural life, and education was one of their considerations. The President set up the Youth Commission, headed by Mr. Owen D. Young, which also has made recommendations.

The commission which the President appointed had representatives from the American Council on Education, representatives from such educational institutions as the University of Chicago and Columbia University, men who are professional educators separated from the public-school system and men who are leaders in our society. The commission was representative of the whole country. The American Council on Education is in no sense a public institution. It is a private institution, not connected with the public schools.

I imagine the Senator from Oregon wanted to know whether the President's Advisory Committee was a committee which was in favor of the proposition before it started to study it. It was not. It was in every way a bona fide committee, which went into the study from a purely scientific standpoint and drew its conclusions for the advice of the President.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I presume it is possible for the Senator from Utah to obtain those records for the RECORD; is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The House document to which I previously referred, Document No. 529 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, is published as a part of our library. It contains the complete report. It is a public document, and therefore is official.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

I read again the two statements which I have taken from that document:

> The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level which should be tolerated in a civilized country.

That was one of the conclusions. The other was that—

> Unless the Federal Government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright.

Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's advisory committee. After extensive hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the bill S. 1305 was reported to the Senate with the recommendation that it pass. Because of several circumstances which it is not necessary to relate here, the bill died on the calendar of the Seventy-sixth Congress. In 1941 Senator Harrison and I introduced another bill, Senate bill 1313, to provide Federal assistance to the States for education. Extensive hearings were held on the bill. One important aspect of that bill was the proposal to grant financial assistance to the States in providing for school facilities in defense areas. That provision of the bill was taken out of the bill and treated as a separate subject, and became what is known as the Lanham Act; so a part of the recommendations of the committee in regard to the defense areas has already become national policy. Since that time grants have been made available through Public Law 137, known as the Lanham Act, and sometimes referred to as the Community Facilities Act.

S. 1313 was later modified by the Committee on Education and Labor and submitted to the Senate with a favorable recommendation. No further action was taken.

On February 4, 1943, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I introduced the pending bill, S. 637. This bill is designed to meet two distinct needs, and that is all: (1) to meet the current crisis in our schools arising from the inability of the schools to pay salaries necessary to hold the required teaching staff; and (2) to meet the long-standing need for a Federal policy of financial assistance to the States in substantially reducing inequalities of educational opportunities. Extensive hearings have been held and the bill reported favorably to this body (Rept. No. 323).

The pending bill has one distinct characteristic to which I wish to direct attention. It follows a simple constitutional method of Federal relations to the States. It will establish a comprehensive system of direct Federal aid with funds apportioned to the respective States on an objective basis to be administered under the constitutions, laws, and regulations of the respective States. Mr. President, there is not one iota of Federal control in this bill.

No new Federal administrative agencies will be created. No system of Federal patronage will be provided for. There will be no new jobs. We now hear a great deal about bureaucracy. The pending bill is the antithesis of bureaucracy. Federal power being prohibited under the provisions of the bill, it will make unnecessary any machinery through which bureaucracy in educational administration can thrive.

In this bill the technique worked out is as simple, distinct, and fine as the technique worked out in the child welfare bill, a measure which has laid down a model for harmonious relationships between the Federal Government and the various States in such a way that all the constitutional legal departments in the State are recognized, and all Federal activity is carried on under the advice of the Federal agency, but through the constituted State authority. This bill would operate in the same way, without the advice, because there is no need of advice in this connection.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would it be feasible or possible to make an appropriation to the States which find themselves unable to raise sufficient revenue to bring them up to an agreed-upon standard, without giving the money to those States which feel that they are able to maintain an educational standard of the kind the Senator has in mind? The reason I ask the question is that we are trying by this bill, I believe, to lift up those States which, because of lack of natural resources, lack of industry, or what not, do not have sufficient revenues to maintain a high standard of education. Is it possible, in the Senator's judgment, he having made a study of the question, to limit the benefits of the bill to such States, and to exclude, for example, States which have sufficient revenues to carry on an educational program of the proper standard?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In answer to that question I can say point blank that that is exactly what is contemplated. The Senator is speaking of the equalization provisions.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let me answer the Senator from Maryland first, and then I will yield to the Senator from Ohio. I think it is very important that this answer be made. The Senator from Maryland was very courteous in asking the question, and he has given me an opportunity to point out that the whole theory of the bill is based upon need. The objections made to Federal aid in earlier years were always made to the practice of the Federal Government which grew up under a matching process. We all know that there is unequal distribution of children and unequal distribution of wealth; and in those States where there are the most children we sometimes find the least wealth. The operation of the formula in the bill would do exactly what the Senator suggests. Several States would not receive any money at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has anticipated me. I was about to ask him whether, under the arrangement which he visualizes, there would be some States sufficiently wealthy, and with a sufficiently high standard of general education, so that they would not share in this money.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. There are several such States.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many States does the Senator think would share in the appropriation?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator please speak louder? I did not hear his answer to the last question o. the Senator from Maryland. I am sure it is most important.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is the first time in 10 years that it has been suggested that there is any difficulty in hearing me. I assure the Senator from Connecticut that I will try my best. When I am considering a bill such as this I wish to be heard, because there has been a great deal of misinformation about the bill.

We are talking about the equalization provision in the bill not the first provision, which takes care of the present emergency. In the equalization provision, the technique which brings about the distribution of the money provided is built entirely upon the basis of need. There are several States which would not receive any of the $100,000,000 appropriation under the equalization provisions of the bill. All States would receive their share of the appropriation in the first part of the bill, which is to take care of the present emergency.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be grateful if the Senator would tell us what States would not, in his judgment, share in the appropriations. When he names them, it will be assumed that all the remaining States would share. So if he will tell us the States which would not share, I think we will have a clearer understanding of just what is proposed to be done.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on page 17 of the committee report is a statistical table dealing with the data necessary for the distribution of the funds under subsection B. That subsection is the equalization provision. On page 18 of the report there is a table setting forth a combination of allotments. The Senator is inquiring about

equalization. The States are listed on page 18 of the report. It shows that California will receive nothing, Connecticut will receive nothing, Delaware will receive nothing, the District of Columbia will receive nothing, Nevada will receive nothing, Wyoming will receive nothing, and New York will receive nothing.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suppose that the States which the Senator designates as those which would receive no funds have an educational standard which is higher than the one which the bill attempts to establish in a general way. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume that is correct, but there are other standards. The possibility of taking care of children in those States, as compared with the number of children they have to take care of, is great enough so that there is no need.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator is referring in this discussion only to $100,000,000 of the proposed $300,000,000. But $200,000,000 would be distributed, regardless of need, simply as a subsidy to all 48 States in proportion to the number of children in each State regardless of what the wealth of each State might be. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; that is not correct. It would not be in proportion to the number of students in the State. It would be on the basis of the average daily attendance in the States compared with the average daily attendance in the whole school system.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad the Senator asked the question, because I think it will emphasize what I have already said to the Senator from Maryland, namely, that we were talking only about the equalization provisions. When it comes to what the Senator from Ohio has called a subsidy, every State would share because it would receive its proportion.

Mr. TAFT. I call both the $100,000,000 and the $200,000,000 subsidies. I do not think there can be any question about that. The State of Ohio would receive approximately $10,000,000. We do not need $10,000,000. We have a large surplus in the treasury of Ohio. We have a surplus in our operations. Not only that, but is it not true that 44 of 48 States today are operating on a surplus basis?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not think that is correct, Mr. President, so far as the educational provisions are concerned. Everyone knows that when Federal taxation is increased, income taxation is taken away from every State which has an income-tax system. For example, if we double the Federal taxes, which we have done, in a State which may have a 5-percent maximum income tax, we immediately take away 5 percent of each person's tax from that State. That brings us to the question of the responsibility of the Federal Government in relation to this subsidy, as the Senator from Ohio calls it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read to the Senator the statement which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made yesterday to the Post-War Planning Committee after a very careful study which he had made:

> While the national credit has been under great strain, the fiscal position of the States seems to be improving. The total debt of all the several States of the Union as of June 30, 1943, was $2,909,000,000. Against this may be charged the growing budget surplus in the States. At the beginning of this year this amounted to $700,000,000——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senator from Wyoming, when he used the word "States," had made a study of the 48 States of the Union.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Incidentally, the statement is based on the Census Bureau reports which I shall be glad to read later to the Senate.

I continue reading the statement of the Senator from Wyoming—

> and it is now estimated by officials of the Census Bureau at about $1,000,000,000. The sinking funds of the States and general obligations total $430,000,000 as of June 1943, so that making allowances for the surplus and the sinking funds, the debts of the States amount to a little over $1,000,000,000 as compared with the national debt of $146,000,000,000. I have not had an opportunity to examine the fiscal positions of cities and other local subdivisions, but it appears that all of the cities in the United States with a population of 100,000 or more at this moment have an unused debt capacity amounting to $750,000,000. These figures immediately suggest the advisability of an inquiry into the ability of the States and of the cities to carry part of the burden of public responsibility in the post-war world.

The figures suggest even more strongly the possibility of asking the States to deal with the present emergency in their own management of education, which has always been a State and not a Federal function.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the Senator has devoted a great deal of time and study to the pending bill, which I, not being a member of the committee, have not done. I do not have the information which the Senator has. But I should say as a matter of general approach to the subject that I believe he would receive much support for his bill if it were confined only to aiding those States which appear to be unable to aid themselves sufficiently to bring the educational system up to a desired standard.

In the case of my own State of Maryland, I believe we are fully able to pay for such educational system as we need. We have a large surplus in the treasury. We have materially reduced our debt, and, while I do not have a knowledge of all the States, I am of the opinion that we in Maryland can meet the needs of education. However, I know there are certain States in the Union which are not so fortunately circumstanced.

Without committing myself I would approach with friendliness a bill designed to aid those States in coming up to a desired United States level, but I do not believe it would be wise at this time of large expenditures in the midst of a war to appropriate funds for every State regardless of its ability to finance an adequate and proper educational system in the manner for which I understand this bill would provide. So I respectfully suggest to the Senator that if he wants to obtain support for his bill I believe he would receive greater support if the bill applied only to the States which have real need and are unable to meet that need, rather than to the country as a whole.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if I correctly understand what the Senator from Maryland is saying, he is speaking in favor of the equalization provision of the bill, and against what the Senator from Ohio calls a subsidy for the present emergency.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Allow me first to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland.

In regard to what has been called a subsidy for the present emergency, that provision of the bill which would make it possible to increase the salaries of teachers, provide that schools be kept open for 160 days in the year, and meet decent standards throughout the Nation is framed in such a way that the need must be expressed to the Committee on Appropriations. Such aid would be continued only so long as the Congress might be willing to grant it. That provision is in the bill. Legislation would not be required to discontinue the aid. If conditions should become such that a subsidy should not be granted, it would not be granted. After the emergency is over, the aid will be reduced.

The equalization provision would be a permanent attempt to solve the problems which are now facing us.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. As to the equalization provision, is it not true that even that is modified from any relation to direct State financial need in the 65-percent formula? For instance, this gives the State of Ohio $2,357,000 out of $100,000,000. Ohio is above the national average; no one can claim that the amount of money Ohio spends on students is not sufficient for an adequate education. If I understand the provision correctly, the result follows from the fact that the direct relation to the financial need in proportion to population is varied by saying that practically every State, unless it is away out of line, shall get something, so that only about six States in the Union get nothing. Many States well above the average and providing a perfectly adequate sum still get some

payment under this provision. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The Senator has hit upon what was brought about by the result of study. Instead of selecting the whole amount, or 90 percent, 65 percent was hit upon as being the most just, taking into consideration all the needs in all the States so far as this provision is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I may be wrong, but I thought it was hit upon as the result of the study of the situation, for if the formula suggested by the Senator from Maryland were followed, so few States would get money that the bill never could be passed. That is the impression I have always had as to the reason for the 65-percent formula. There have been various formulas. I might say that I do not accuse the author of the bill of that. This bill from the beginning has been sponsored by the National Education Association and by educators.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not resent the statement, but it is unworthy of the Senator from Ohio. He has been on the committee; he has heard the hearings; he has discussed them, and he very courteously allowed us to bring this bill forward; but for him to assume that this bill was in any way fixed up to bring about its passage is suggesting something which is unworthy of one who has been a kind of a model to the educators of this country.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps the Senator can explain, if we are simply trying to equalize and to bring poor States up to a standard why we should put in the 65-percent provision and proceed to pay money to some 44 out of 48 States. What is the reason for that? I had never understood the reason except the one I gave.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If we had taken 100 percent we would not have corrected the evil because there would have been many States that would not have shared. Ninety percent was suggested, then 80 percent, and, finally, it was discovered that 65 percent brought about the most equal distribution of all.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand what the Senator means by "equal." I do not understand the term. Why is it "equal" to give Ohio $2,300,000 when we are well above the national average and when we are perfectly competent to handle our own educational system? Why do we get $2,300,000 if we are proceeding on the theory suggested by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Are the salaries of Ohio teachers equal to the advances we have given persons in the employ of the Federal Government, for example? Is there any illiteracy in Ohio? Is there any need of attempting to overcome conditions in Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. I might ask the same question about New York to which nothing is given under this program.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; we do give to New York under the first provision.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but we are talking entirely about the equalization provision.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; under the equalization provision New York does not get anything; but, under the other provision, New York does get something, for New York has illiteracy and illiteracy should be overcome.

Mr. TAFT. We were discussing only the $100,000,000 under the equalization provision, but I suggest that is not an equalization at all as between the States, because there is inserted the 65-percent figure, which means that many States get money although they are above the national standard, the national average, and there is no particular reason that I can see for them to receive any more Federal financial assistance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me when it is convenient?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Utah brought out the point that the first part of this bill, the $200,000,000 provision, which gives some money to each State, ought to be supported because the State revenues might be cut by increased Federal taxation. The Senator implied in that observation that the States would be less able to pay for their educational program, and the Federal Government, because of the increase in Federal taxation, would be better able to pay for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, not the second statement; I implied the first.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, the first. I do not believe that observation will bear the full light of scrutiny, for I can see no reason why the Federal Government should tax the people of a State and then give them the money back again. If we are going to proceed on that premise, I would rather tax the people of the State less and let them regulate their own affairs than to have the Federal Government take the money and then hand it back to them and have supervision over their affairs.

That statement is not to be taken as in opposition to the provision which sets forth that there ought to be a general educational standard in the United States and provides assistance where States are unable, because of physical, geographical or other impediment to raise revenue sufficient to bring about such a standard, but it is in opposition to the theory that we ought to appropriate generally because the States are unable to raise the money with which to support a sound educational system. In my judgment, a great many of the States can do exactly what the Senator from Utah proposes should be done by the National Government by dealing with the matter locally, and certainly when the national debt is going up, and the same people are going to pay it anyway, it seems to me rather short-sighted to collect money in Washington and turn it back to the States when the educational standard of itself is not the thing we are attempting to raise.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is familiar with history and no doubt recalls the arguments used when the sixteenth amendment was before the various States for ratification. He will remember that at least one State refused to accept that amendment because by formal declaration it said that the income-tax field should be left to the States and should not be taken over by the Federal Government, because as soon as the income tax became a habit with the Federal Government the Federal Government would then have such control over taxation that inevitably the day would come when through direct taxes the Federal Government would curb the ability of the States to tax their own people. Incidentally, that statement, which was not the prevailing statement, has proved to be the fact. Then, it is a matter of arithmetic. For instance, if the States allow a write-off on the State income tax for the amount of the tax paid to the Federal Government, and if ordinarily a person pays the Federal Government a thousand dollars a year but under present extraordinary circumstances he pays the Federal Government $3,000 a year, then the write-off, so far as the State tax is concerned, is $3,000 instead of $1,000, and, of course, if the maximum State income tax is 10 percent anyone can figure the loss to the State through its own taxing technique as a result of the increased taxes. That is the only point the Senator from Utah made, and it is so plain as to be easily understood.

But to assume that the great increase of Federal income taxation has not cut down the amount of taxes which the individual States receive is, of course, wrong. The present gasoline situation shows how wrong it may be.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have the Senator help me, if he will, by turning to the table on page 18 of the report, and for purposes of illustration, take the line which deals with the State of Texas. I assume that the item that is headed "Apportionment on basis of 1940–41 average daily attendance, section 2A" provides to the State of Texas $9,999,000, allotted under section 2 or 2A of the bill. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume that is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Then in column 3 we find an apportionment to the State of Texas on the basis of financial need in the sum of $8,136,254, and I assume that is referable to section 2B. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please tell us what the State of Texas itself appropriates for education to compare with that total apportionment of $18,135,000, which the State would receive under the pending bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I can tell in general terms by referring to the one State the figures as to which I looked up, as an example, but it did not happen to be Texas. It was the State of Alabama, which can be used just as well as any other State, and it happened to be the first one on the list. The figures which I give are figures which were told to me

informally, and are not exact, but they come from an authoritative source.

Alabama should receive $5,000,000 under the first category, and $5,000,000 under the second, a total of $10,000,000. As to the question which deals with State expenditures for education in Alabama, at the present time Alabama spends about twenty or twenty-five million dollars. I cannot give the figures any closer than that.

Mr. DANAHER. Does that twenty or twenty-five million dollars a year include only the Alabama State appropriation, or does it cover appropriations by the municipal subdivisions as well?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It includes all that is spent in Alabama, by all the polititcal units, as I understand.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, let me ask the Senator one other question, which is suggested by his last answer. Suppose the State of Alabama should say, through its duly constituted authority, its own legislature, "The only education we want in Alabama is $25,000,000 worth." May the State of Alabama, under the pending bill, receive $10,000,000 from the Federal Government, and appropriate $15,000,000 itself to make up the total of $25,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There are two answers to the question, and both of them lead to a negative response.

Mr. DANAHER. I assumed as much, and I wish the Senator would explain.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As the Senator knows, I always try to explain.

None of this money is to be forced upon a State. There must be a mutuality before the matter goes into consideration.

To the second question, I refer, for instance, to Alabama, which happens to be a Southern State, where there is a dual system of education, one for the blacks and one for the whites. We will assume that a decision is made that "We will use the money sent for the blacks, and then we will use more money for the whites," or something of that kind, something which is not done, by the way, and I really have no right to make that kind of a reference. Every dollar of Federal money that goes to the States for either the subsidy system—and I may say to the Senator from Ohio that I am beginning to like the word "subsidy" or for the equalization system, must be in addition to the money spent by the State for the year 1943, when the provisions of the proposed act are accepted. The bill refers to 1942. To put it another way, there is no way for a State to say, "As a result of the money coming from the Federal Government, we will merely let the Federal Government take care of this matter, because $10,000,000 is a great deal of money. Therefore we will not use State funds." They cannot use a cent from the Federal Government if they get a State appropriation.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Let us finish with the Senator from Connecticut first.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. The allocations thereafter would proceed in accordance with sections 2A and 2B, and for the purposes therein stated?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator now yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wonder if the Senator will assist me, as well as he can, in understanding the computation provided for the allocation of the $100,000,000 fund. One of the factors is the ratio percentage in the total estimated income payments of a State as compared with the total income payments in the United States under data furnished by the Secretary of Commerce. What is meant by "estimated income payments"?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are called "estimated" here, but they will be exact when the proposed act is in force. They are called "estimated" here for purposes of illustration.

Mr. GILLETTE. What are "income payments"?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Income payments are the total income receipts of the various States each year as reported to the Federal Department of Commerce. There must be some factor, so the factor decided upon was the child and the factor of the State wealth as reflected in the income-tax receipts.

Mr. GILLETTE. The income payments, then, will not reflect the living, for instance, of a farm family?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. If a farmer has a wife and half a dozen children, when he makes his income tax return of course he is given a credit, the same as anyone else. It reflects what the total number of persons in the State pay as income taxes.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a question only for correction?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If it is for a correction, I should like to have the Senator from Ohio help me.

Mr. TAFT. I merely suggest that income payments, as I understand, and as I understand the testimony, mean the aggregate gross incomes of individuals in a State.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The same basis on which we calculate national income at a $100,000,000,000, or whatever it may be.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It is the gross income payments of individuals.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has handed me a statement which I shall read, and probably someone else can explain it to the Senator from Iowa better than I can. I read:

> Estimates of income payments to individuals are distributed among the States on a where-received basis. Income payments comprise (1) salaries and wages net of payroll deductions for social insurance, (2) other labor income, such as pensions, compensation for injuries, direct and work relief and social insurance benefits, (3) net income of proprietors, including farmers, before owner's withdrawals—

I must say I do not know what "owners' withdrawals" are—

> (4) dividends, interest, and net rents and royalties received by individuals. Only payments made to residents of continental United States are included.

All that adds up to what I thought I was saying when I said that the total income payments, as reported by the Department of Commerce, comprise the factor on which the payments are made to the States.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then they definitely exclude the receipts of a family which furnishes its table and part of its living from a farm. Those are definitely excluded in the computation by the use of the word "payments"?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to yield, because I cannot answer the question.

Mr. HILL. The language is "net income of proprietors, including farmers." That would indicate, certainly to me, that, as the Senator has said, it is net income, what the farmer has after he gets through paying all his expenses.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me ask a further question. In addition to that, the income payments are used in this factor regardless of whence they are derived. For instance, a resident of Utah, the honored Senator, for instance, could have in Iowa a large investment from which he received a large return. His returns would be reflected as income payments in Iowa, and also reflected as income payments in the national picture.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then the factor does not reflect a true comparison between the State income and the national income.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it reflects as nearly the truth as possibly can be arrived at. The task of working out this problem of need was a hard one. In fact, several techniques were used and several trials of methods were made. The method contained in the bill seems to be the best one. But this answer should be made, that there is reciprocity between the States. What Iowa loses in one case she may gain in other cases. All States are treated alike, so we do have a proper comparison and a proper factor to arrive at, as just a distribution as possible. I am sure no one in the United States would say that our income-tax system acts with absolute and complete justice to every individual, because we know it simply cannot do so.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator some time ago made the statement that everyone knows that State revenues are less than they previously had been, by reason——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President, I did not say that. Everyone knows when States are prosperous, taxes of various kinds go up. I said this and only this, that everyone knows that in a State which has an income-tax system under which deductions are allowed, with the increase of Federal taxation, there will be greater deduction from the State taxation.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to the report of the Department of Commerce, entitled "State Finances, 1942", and a table which shows the total State revenues in 1941 and 1942. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's speech. I will ask to have the table inserted in the RECORD later. I may suggest that the table shows that in 1941 the total State revenues were $5,457,000,000, whereas in 1942 they were $6,113,000,000. So the effect of the war was actually to increase State revenues by more than 10 percent.

Let us take the State of Alabama. That State received $70,000,000 in 1941 by way of taxation, and in 1942 received $79,000,000. The same ratio of increase occurs in every other State. So I do not think the Senator's conclusions can possibly be borne out by the figures. It seems to me the war has made the States better able to pay their educational expenses instead of less able to do so.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not have the figures for 1941 and 1942. I do have, however, the figures for 1942 and 1943, which are very significant and indicative. I am reading now from the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, September 22 and 23, page 979, from a report entitled "State Finances: 1943, Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce":

STATE TAX COLLECTIONS IN 1943

War conditions noticeably influenced State tax collections in 1943, although total collections of slightly more than $5,000,000,000 were not more than 3 percent above the 1942 figure.

Mark this, because it is important.

Without the unemployment compensation tax, the total was approximately $3,900,000,000, about the same as in 1942 collections.

In determining the financial conditions of the States, and what are surpluses, we have to bear in mind, of course, what the revenues are, what funds they go into, and for what those funds are available. The report speaks of the unemployment compensation tax which has lifted up State incomes by $1,100,000,000. No one would, I take it, suggest that that money be expended for school purposes, for the payment of teachers' salaries. That money goes into a special trust fund for unemployment insurance. We know, of course, that with the employment situation as it is today more money is going into those funds than ordinarily, and there is much less drain on them.

Consider the matter of highway funds. As we know, because of the shortage of critical materials, because of the shortage of manpower, we are doing very little with our highways at the present time. Naturally the highway funds are building up. But, in the first place, under the constitutions and the laws of many States such funds cannot be expended for any purpose other than for highways. In the second place, we know that such funds should not be expended for other purposes for the reason that we are not able now to keep our highways up as we should. We are certainly not expanding our highways. When the war is over we will have to repair the highways, indeed, many of them will have to be rebuilt, and then we will also face the problem represented by many men coming out of the armed services and out of war industries who are going to need very badly jobs on the highways. So taking the over-all figures they do not present the true picture.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it may be said that all taxes have increased in the States with the exception of gasoline taxes. The only decrease in tax collections that I can find is in connection with gasoline. And certainly there is no showing of any emergency that I can see in dealing with teachers' salaries.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have here a report of the Federation of Tax Administrators, Research Report No. 16, 1943. This association is made up of all the tax administrators of the different States, and, I understand, representatives of the Treasury, and some representatives, perhaps, of cities and towns. The report makes this significant statement:

There is general agreement, in view of the uncertainties of the entire revenue picture, that the importance of present budget surpluses should not be overstressed.

I see present the distinguished former mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. He was a great mayor of that city, and I am sure he agrees with that statement because he knows how rapidly the situation may change.

The report continues:

It is very well possible, indeed probable, that declining yields and—what may prove to be more important—rise of expenditures * * * will all but erase the surpluses in many cases.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I was going to bring this subject up in another place, but I shall refer to it now. I want the RECORD to show that in regard to loss to the States of income tax by reason of the high taxation on income by the Federal Government I was making one single point. The point is that the States could not receive what they have received had not the national income been increased.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Permit me to finish, because it is rather hard to make a point when one can make only one-third of a point without being interrupted. State taxes have increased in what are called prosperous times. Some people might call such times a time of inflation. Statistics show, however, that there are counties in many States in the country where the property tax has greatly decreased. I doubt whether anyone can accurately make a complete break-down of the taxation of our country at the present time because there are too many unknown factors. We do, however, have statistics up to the end of 1942, which is as far as we go. Comparisons are made between 1932, 1941, and 1942. In 1932 the State tax was $1,886,000,000. In 1932 the Federal tax was $1,891,000,000. In 1941 the local tax was $4,605,000,000—a slight increase. In 1941 the State tax was $4,498,000,000—a great increase, due to a number of factors. In 1941 the Federal income tax had increased almost six times—$7,813,000,000.

When we come to 1942 we find that the local tax had increased to $5,000,000,000, but the State tax had remained practically constant, increasing to $4,952,000,000, while the Federal tax had increased to $13,700,000,000.

Mr. President, I revert to the only point I have tried to make: With a Federal tax amounting to $13,000,000,000, as compared with $1,800,000,000, anyone can see that if a write-off is allowed on a State income-tax return for Federal income-tax payments the States will not, and cannot possibly, receive what they would have received had the Federal income tax not increased. That is the only point I have made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that one small point?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest first that most States do not permit the deduction of Federal income-tax payments in calculating State income taxes. In fact, I do not think any of the States do. The Federal Government permits the deduction of State income-tax payments, in the calculation of Federal income taxes; but the States do not permit the deduction of Federal income-tax payments in the calculation of State income taxes—that is to say, most of them do not.

Mr HILL. My State does.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. My State does.

Mr. TAFT. I say most of them do not. In Ohio we have a 5-percent tax on income from securities, but the Federal tax has nothing whatever to do with that.

In the second place, I suggest that if the Federal income tax is deducted, the total national income is so much greater than it was a year ago as to be almost inconceivable. As a matter of fact, the national income has increased by three times. Our Federal income taxes do not begin to take up the increase in income.

So, as a matter of fact, even if Federal income taxes are deducted, the income is much greater, and the State income is much greater.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let us see how much greater. In 1941 the State tax revenues amounted to $4,491,000,000. In 1942 they amounted to $4,952,000,000—an increase of $400,000,000. That is the only increase, and it is apparent that the increase is not in any way substantial, nothing like the increase which has occurred in the Federal revenues.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that, of course, we are talking about a minor point, because the percentage of State revenue coming from State income taxes is almost negligible, in terms of the total State income.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the only point I made, Mr. President, and I made it not as one of my arguments, but in answering a question propounded by the Senator from Maryland; because that argument is so small that I would not use it in support of the bill, except for the fact that I was asked a question regarding it.

From the earliest days of the Republic the Federal Government has made financial contributions, directly or indirectly, to the States for the establishment and maintenance of public educational institutions on all levels. From the Revolutionary War to the Civil War the Federal Government endowed common schools and secondary schools with lands, and made grants of surplus tax moneys.

Following the Civil War land grants to new States were continued, and a policy of direct money grants was begun. I am saying these things because of the statement that we are moving into a revolutionary period. Mr. President, there is nothing revolutionary in meeting the demands of the times, and the pending bill has come into existence as a result of the demands of the times.

The Morrill-Nelson Act of 1862 and 1890, appropriating funds for land-grant colleges and universities had exactly the same opposition as that which is being given to the pending bill. The same things were said. The Morrill-Nelson bill was passed by Congress during the administration of President Buchanan. President Buchanan vetoed the bill on the score that education was not a Federal function. President Buchanan felt it was not proper for the Federal Government to enter into the field of education.

However, when the bill became law under the administration of a great statesman, Abraham Lincoln, in the midst of war, Lincoln had foresight, he had statesmanship, he knew the need of his country, and he knew, above all other things, the inequality of educational opportunity, because he had experienced it. Lincoln was not one of those men who said to themselves, "I have made good against all kinds of adversities and all kinds of disadvantages. Therefore, we should not bother about attempting to overcome such disadvantages." Lincoln said, "That which I suffered was not good for me, and not good for the Nation, and it is not good for the people of the Nation."

Lincoln, who had studied Jefferson as he had studied probably no other great American, knew that the very security of the Nation, of democracy itself, rested upon the theory of a trained citizenry, and he knew what it meant. Of all the things Lincoln did, probably the most far-reaching of all, the one which has done the most for his country, and has given opportunities to many million boys and girls of our land, was his act of statesmanship in undoing what Buchanan had done. I think a mistake is made by any Senator on the other side of the aisle who undertakes to oppose a bill which seeks merely to make democracy work, merely to give an equal opportunity to every boy born in the United States, merely to carry out the provisions of the fourteenth amendment, in which was laid down our definition of citizenship:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield, although I was going fairly well then. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President, the Senator has stated that the object is to give every child an equal opportunity. I call the Senator's attention to the fact, appearing in the hearings, that today in the State of Louisiana the amount spent for a white child's education is $61 per child; the amount spent for the education of each colored child is $12. The discrepancy is approximately $48. I do not understand that after the pending bill is passed and becomes law we shall by any means be requiring the State of Louisiana to correct that discrepancy. I do not understand that we shall be giving any colored child in Louisiana an opportunity equal to the opportunity of a white child in Louisiana. Will the Senator state his conclusion on that question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the $100,000,000 of course would not bring about equality. The reason why it would not, however, is no reason for not doing some good and not attempting to overcome an evil which exists.

I will say—and here is where the Federal Government comes into the picture again—that in its decisions the Supreme Court of the United States has laid down the principle that in States which have a dual system of education there must not be a differential on account of race, color, or religion, and that, therefore—to use the State of Louisiana as an illustration—if a colored teacher meets all the requirements laid down for white teachers, the colored teacher can demand equal treatment so far as salary is concerned.

Mr. President, if an attempt were made to enforce that decision, it would ruin the educational system of the entire Southeast.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The table on page 19 of the hearings shows that whereas without this bill the cost per white pupil would be $61, and the cost per Negro pupil $12.62, after the passage of the bill the cost per white pupil would be $76, and the cost per Negro pupil would be $23. As I understand, the bill requires that this particular Federal money be distributed in equal proportion between white and colored pupils.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; that is not correct.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator correct me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The provision is that a State may not say, "We are getting enough money from the Federal Government now; therefore we will not give any more money to colored pupils." The bill would not result in inequality. It provides that no Federal money may be given to a State for use in paying colored teachers or white teachers if the amount they now receive is reduced in any way. So the subsidy would result in an increase and not a reduction.

Mr. TAFT. It appears from this table that whereas the discrepancy before the bill was some $48, the discrepancy after the bill would be some $53. It is true that the position of the colored child would be improved, but it is also true that the position of the white child would be improved even to a greater extent. It appears that Alabama, for example, has plenty of money to educate the white children. Sixty-one dollars per child is a very reasonable expense. However, it has not chosen to educate the colored children on the same basis. Yet the bill, which purports to be an equalization bill, does not attempt to equalize.

The same thing is true with respect to the Northern States. There are more differences between a rich district and a poor district in some States than there are between the State of New York and the State of Alabama; yet the bill would not in any way correct that inequity, any more than it would correct the inequity as between colored and white children.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is not true, Mr. President. Everyone knows that if the white child could have $20 instead of $10, the inequality of opportunity would be greatly reduced, and everyone knows that the opportunities would be increased. As the Senator says, the proportion would not be changed, but the general standard of both would be raised to such an extent they would be given something which they have not had. That is all we can do.

Mr. TAFT. The point I am trying to make is that we are now talking about inequality of educational opportunity. I take Louisiana as an example only because it happens to be set out in the tables. The same thing is true of practically all the States which have separate schools. The inequality is far greater among the children within that State than it is between the children of Louisiana and the children of Ohio. Until we had State equalization in Ohio—which condition does not exist in many States—the differences in Ohio were far greater than the difference between Ohio and New York. The inequalities of education are within the States, and the bill would not even begin to correct those inequalities in any manner.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It would begin to do it. The argument of the Senator from Ohio is similar to that which is advanced in connection with many other things. We cannot have absolute equality; it is utterly impossible. We cannot have absolute justice; it is utterly impossible. We cannot have real democracy; it is utterly impossible. We cannot have any of those things in the absolute sense. Such things are impossible, in the nature of man and in the nature of circumstances. But we can have a pretty good democracy if we work it right. We can have a fair degree of

equality if we work it right. If we overcome abuses, we make a closer approach to equality. This bill is not a bill to usher in the millennium, Mr. President, and I am sure it would not do so.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me invite the attention of the Senator to these further inequalities:

In the State of Alabama, for example, in 1939 and 1940 the cost per white pupil was $47. The cost per Negro pupil was $14. In Arkansas the cost per white pupil was $36; the cost per colored pupil was $13. In Florida the cost per white pupil was $69; the cost per colored pupil, $26. In Georgia the cost per white pupil was $55, and the cost per colored pupil, $16. The figures for Louisiana are on a different basis. They are on the basis of average daily attendance, so the figures are somewhat different from those appearing in the record. The cost per white pupil was $77; the cost per colored pupil was $20. In Mississippi the cost per white pupil was $52; the cost per colored pupil, $7. In North Carolina, which is the best of the States with separate schools, for which the figures are given in the census reports, the cost per white pupil was $46; the cost per colored pupil, $28. In South Carolina the cost per white pupil was $57; the cost per colored pupil, $15. In Texas the cost per white pupil was $72; the cost per colored pupil, $28.

So it appears that even the poorer Southern States are perfectly able to educate white children on a level comparable with that of other States, but they are unable to educate colored children on the same level.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are not educated on a level equal to the others. I think, if the Senator wished to be completely fair, he would compare Louisiana with some of the other States, instead of making this comparison.

There has been no attempt in this bill to equalize the pay of the Negro teacher with that of the white teacher in a given State. There is no attempt to interfere with the State management of such affairs, because they are too complex for us to handle. Objection would be raised if we should attempt to do so. We have other kinds of minorities in our schools besides the Negroes. Certain provisions of the bill should probably be read in connection with this discussion. On page 14, under the heading "Definitions" we find the following:

(c) The term "minority race" or "minority racial group" shall mean any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

That means, for example, that the Spanish schools in New Mexico are considered as minority schools, as are the black schools in the South. From the Federal standpoint, this is all the bill attempts to do and all it could do.

I read further from page 14 of the bill:

(d) A just and equitable apportionment, allotment, or distribution of the funds provided under this Act for the benefit of a minority racial group in a State which maintains by law separate educational facilities for such minority racial group, means any plan of apportionment, allotment, or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group, of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that once the Federal Government goes into the question of white and colored schools, we shall never stop. We shall go on until we require every State to permit colored and white children to go to the same schools, as we do in Ohio. If a bill of that sort is proposed, we shall have exactly the same problem presented that we had in connection with the poll-tax bill and other measures. I think it is a subject on which the Federal Government should not begin to legislate. That is only an example. In my opinion, once we start, we shall never stop until the Federal Government is regulating every detail of the education of our children throughout the 48 States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has made the best argument for the bill that we have yet heard. That question is left entirely in the hands of the States. It is a State matter. If, for example, in the State of Georgia, a bill were introduced into the Georgia legislature to equalize—as has already been done in the State of Ohio, according to the Senator—that would be none of the Federal Government's business. That question should be handled in Georgia, in the way in which the Georgia legislature wishes to handle it. That is the scheme of this bill. The bill would not attempt to dictate in any way to any legislature or to any State official. The line is drawn absolutely, and it is adamant. There is no Federal control. There is no Federal supervision. There is no Federal attempt to change any State law. However, there is a Federal attempt to help to make things easier for those who are not getting along very well in an educational way.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was called from the Chamber several times during the course of the Senator's remarks. I have not had the privilege of hearing all he has said. As I understand, his last statement is to the effect that if the bill should become a law the money which would be appropriated to the various States would be appropriated unconditionally so far as the use of the funds by the States is concerned. Am I correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The money would not be appropriated unconditionally. The funds would have to be used for the purposes defined in the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps my question was not clear. The bill designates the purposes for which the funds may be used.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. But when the funds are used for a certain purpose, is it the contention of the Senator that there is nothing in the bill which would in anywise give the Federal Government authority or power to determine or regulate any of the educational processes of the States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The Federal Government could not dictate any rules concerning the standards of teachers, the employment of teachers, the curriculum, the building of schoolhouses, or anything of that type.

Mr. WILEY. In order to complete the record, can the Senator state very succinctly the purposes for which the money would be appropriated?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The answer to the question is set forth in the bill better than I myself can give it. It is section 5 (a) under the heading of "Availability of appropriations" on page 6 of the bill, and reads as follows:

SEC. 5. (A) The funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated under section 2 (A) of this act shall be available for disbursement by that State to local public-school jurisdictions or other State public-education agencies for the payment of salaries of teachers in public elementary schools (which may include kindergartens and nursery schools) and public secondary schools (which may include through the fourteenth grade) for any or all of the following purposes: (1) To keep public schools open for a term of not less than 160 days or to make suitable provisions for the education of the pupils affected by closed schools; (2) to raise substandard salaries; (3) to reduce overcrowded classes by the employment of additional teachers; (4) to adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living during the emergency.

Mr. WILEY. So far as those purposes are concerned, they simply channel the direction in which the funds must go, but there is no control otherwise in the bill, as I understand it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WILEY. And there is no designation of what proportion of the fund to be assigned to any State shall be used for any one of the purposes mentioned in the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct. That is left entirely to the local State jurisdictions.

Mr. WILEY. Then, it is the Senator's conclusion that the power which is vested within the State to regulate its own educational system is not in anywise impinged upon or interfered with.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not in any way whatsoever. That is the fundamental theory on which the bill rests. The bill rests on the fundamental theory in regard to education in America that the State, the home, and the church shall always and forever have an opportunity to take part in educational work. That is all. We do not allow one jurisdiction to interfere with another. Just as the State of Colorado could not dictate to the State of Utah what it should do in

regard to its educational policy, the Federal Government, under the pending bill, could not dictate to Colorado.

Mr. WILEY. Then may it be stated from the Senator's viewpoint that the only activity the Federal Government would have in connection with the bill would simply be to apportion the funds to the various States according to the methods set forth in the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is substantially true, is it not, that so far as the $200,000,000 is concerned it must be used to increase the salaries of teachers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That is the purpose of the bill, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Four uses are provided to be made of the funds.

Mr. TAFT. It is a subsidy. All the uses set forth in the bill relate to salaries of teachers, and the $200,000,000 would be a subsidy for the salaries of teachers, would it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the $100,000,000 may be spent for any school purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Perhaps we should read from the bill so that we will know exactly what we are talking about. I read the provision of the bill concerning the subject to which the Senator from Ohio refers:

(B) In order more nearly to equalize educational opportunities, the funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated under section 2 (B)—

That is the equalization section—

of this act shall be available for disbursement by that State to local public-school jurisdictions, or other State public-education agencies, for all types of expenditures for public elementary schools (which may include kindergartens and nursery schools) and public secondary schools (which may include through the fourteenth grade).

That is, any purpose.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. So far as increasing the salaries of teachers is concerned, under the provisions of the bill the money might be used to pay all the higher-paid teachers, might it not, and not the lower-paid teachers? I am following up the question of the Senator from Wisconsin. Let us put it this way: There is no requirement that the money shall be used to equalize inequalities within a State. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, that cannot be correct because the use of the money would be limited entirely to the secondary and elementary schools where the salaries of teachers are the lowest in all the school systems. But under the bill a State could—I know a State would not and everyone knows that it would not—use all its money to pay its principals. Senators know it would not be done. It cannot be done under our system of local control. If a State should attempt to be unfair in the distribution of the money to its teachers, there would be no doubt in the mind of anyone here that the State would not continue to be unfair very long.

Mr. TAFT. Why would that be? I do not understand why it would not continue to be unfair very long. Does the Senator mean that the Federal Government would step in and say, "You must change your method of administration of the funds?"

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, the Federal Government would not step in. It would point out what was being done and the people of the individual communities would bring about a change, as they have brought about many other changes in this democracy. The force of public opinion constantly and forever would maintain a decent and fair administration.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. In his prefatory remarks I assume that the Senator has covered what he claims are the needs of certain areas of this country for the Federal aid proposed in the bill. Has he covered that subject?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have not covered that subject as yet. I have not gone into it because the questions asked have not dealt with it.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator expect to cover that field?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I can, but I have assumed so far that there is a great inequality of educational opportunity in our country and we have handled it only in that way. The bill itself assumes that fact. I have not tried to prove it.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to say to the Senator, if he will yield further to me, that I have received letters from my own State for and against the bill. Some of the writers have expressed fear, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, that the proposed legislation would be an entering wedge whereby the Federal Government would put its "clutching hands," as the writer of one letter said, upon the educational system of the States. The Senator has replied to my question indicating that there is no clutching hand; that in fact the hand of the Federal Government will not be involved at all after the funds have been distributed to the State. I understand that to be his conclusion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WILEY. In this period of change in this country in many sections the white-collar workers, such as school teachers, are almost "the forgotten men," and I presume the opportunity provided by this bill to enable school teachers to get an increase in their salaries or wages would, in the judgment of the distinguished Senator, be applying not only the rule of equity to a situation which merits it but would make possible the continuance of the school system, because teachers are leaving their jobs for more remunerative positions in war industries. While the national income has greatly increased, perhaps to one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty billion dollars, the school teachers' incomes have decreased because of the increased cost of living. Is that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is very true. We can furnish statistics on that matter, but I should like to say in answer to the Senator's question as positively as I can that any Senator who votes against this bill in essence votes against giving to the public school teachers of the United States an increase of $100 a year; that is all. That probably makes it a little too simple, but when I give the statistics it will be seen that, even with such an increase, the teachers are not being adequately taken care of.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. BROOKS addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I promised to yield to the Senator from Colorado. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am willing to defer to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I notice that the title of the bill is "to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency," and so forth. Can the Senator suggest that this emergency will ever end so far as this kind of an appropriation is concerned? Is there any thought in the mind of any member of the committee that when the war is over this will be discontinued?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is, so far as the bill is concerned; and, in my mind, judging from the experience of the last war, I am sure that the condition will not continue. There are two aspects of the bill: One, the first appropriation is entirely of an emergency character; the other is permanent. The emergency feature can come to an end as soon as the State's ability to take care of its teachers becomes apparent.

Mr. BROOKS. Which part of the bill is the emergency part? The $200,000,000 provision?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, the $200,000,000 provision is the emergency feature; the $100,000,000 provision is permanent.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There have been a number of questions which have circled around what I am about to ask, and I think they probably had the same intent; but the answers have always gone off on statistical matters. So I should like to frame the question in this way: Assuming that a State has a budget surplus which could be available for educational purposes, on what theory should we put Federal money into that State?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the question, of course, is a difficult one to answer. In theory we have attempted our very best to make it impossible for a State that can take care of its educational facilities to receive

more than a State that cannot take care of them. The working out of the idea is quite another task. In the equalization part we can provide for the difference, and we do so, to the extent that some States will receive nothing; but, on the other hand, there is not a single State or Territory in the United States that does not need some adjustment to take care of illiteracy or to take care of failure on the part of their educational systems to educate persons at least to the point where they could properly serve their country at this time. For example, we have recently discussed the so-called fathers' draft bill, or an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would exempt fathers from the draft. I doubt very much whether Senators of the United States realize that nearly a million men, most of them able-bodied, have been rejected because of their lack of educational qualifications to serve under the draft, and I doubt very much whether the Senators present realize the fact that if all the people of the fourteen Western States were removed, those States could be repopulated in the numbers they now have by locating in them persons in the United States who have not completed the fourth grade in school. It is necessary to have about an eighth-grade education in order to pass the simplest demands made by the Selective Service System for taking men into the armed forces.

They must have sufficient education to be able to read orders and understand what is meant. Our loss of manpower as a result of the fact that certain segments of our population have been neglected is a deadly and costly loss to our people. The sad part of it is that we knew of such a condition in the last war, and did nothing to rectify it. I hope the war will end long before we can increase in sufficient measure the educational qualifications of our selective-service men; but we are today, Mr. President, detailing majors and captains of the Army to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic; we are spending more money in teaching the 10 percent of illiterates which the Army is willing to receive than it would cost to enable such persons to complete elementary- and high-school education.

Mr. President, from the economic standpoint we are so penny-wise and pound-foolish that anyone who understands the simplest aspects of the economic life of our country cannot help but be ashamed. I think it is a disgrace to this country to call a man to the service and give him the bars of a captain or the oak leaf of a major, and call upon him to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic to boys who have been deprived of the first four grades of school.

I am probably a little worked up over this matter because in the last war I saw it on all sides; I know about it, and for a whole generation have understood it; but we have not been able to do anything about it until we find ourselves in a crisis such as we now face. And now we are going to draft fathers, many of whom have several children, because we have failed to make it possible for nearly a million boys to meet the A, B, C requirements, the lowest requirements of the Army of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I make an observation in connection with the Senator's remarks?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Excuse me. I apologize; I must admit I am a bit enthusiastic for this bill. Of course, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Utah, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, will recall that that committee in its very extensive hearings on the anti-drafting-of-fathers bill heard considerable testimony on the illiteracy situation in the United States. Personally I thought that a very large number of men could be combed out of those who had been rejected for illiteracy. However, after we had detailed to us at that committee hearing the Army tests which are given to men, it became apparent, at least to me, that the eight or nine hundred thousand remaining illiterates who have been rejected are not illiterates, but for the most part are morons who are uneducatable.

For example, one test was one of the more or less conclusive tests. They would show a man three circles and a square and ask him if he could see any difference in them. Those who were rejected were those who could not see any difference between three circles and a square. So I do not believe we can charge that part of the problem to any lack of education. I respectfully suggest that most of those men—not all of them, but most of them—are uneducatable, if there is such a word.

Following the question I first propounded to the Senator, I asked our Legislative Reference Service to give me some statistics on the surpluses in State treasuries. There is some confusion in the figures, but I have here a list of all the States, with their treasury positions as of the present time, there being some confusion, as I have said, as to just exactly what the figures mean, whether they cover general surpluses available for any expenditure which the State might care to make, or whether they are funds already committed to educational or other specific purposes. There is some little confusion in the classifications. But out of the whole list it is apparent, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah, that almost all our States have some surplus in what might be called their general funds, available for educational purposes within those States.

The summary of the data furnished me says:

> Bearing in mind the above qualifications, the total surplus in the States derived by adding the data below—
>
> The data below being the itemized surpluses of the States, and deficits in a few cases—
>
> amounts to approximately $1,000,000,000.

Without being overpersistent, I must say to the distinguished Senator from Utah—and I have been following him very closely—I at least am not satisfied with the answer to the question as to how we can put Federal funds into any State, under proper principles, for educational purposes, when the State itself has a surplus available for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado should not use his last three words "for that purpose," because of course if there were a surplus in any State used for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities, for raising teachers' salaries, for example, there would be no need for our acting.

The argument which the Senator has put forth is very much like the argument which one might use in the Army appropriations subcommittee, when the Army comes in and asks for several million dollars more for next year, and we say, "Have you spent all you have?" They reply, "No; there are several million dollars which have not even been allotted." Then we say, "There is such a large surplus there that you should use that up first." I am sure the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will bear me out in the statement that such testimony has been given in the Committee on Appropriations many times.

States are as complex as the Nation, and to get a State to take care of its teachers in the proper way would require 48 different endeavors. They have not done it. They should do it, I know.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah that the surplus point which has been made bears with especial relevancy on the emergency features of the bill. It seems to me difficult to explain how a State can have a surplus in its general funds, available, under its laws, to meet these emergencies, and then to say, "Take Federal money from us before you have applied your own funds to your own emergency."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is very easy to answer that. Let us take my own State, for instance. The only State funds which can be used at all for any of the elemental schools come from a 5-mill tax. It would not make any difference if there were $100,000,000 of surplus in Utah, until the legislature acted and did something about it, it would be improper to use that in increasing the salary of a teacher in one of our poorer counties.

I hope the Senator will realize that most of these surpluses have been brought about by the extraordinary taxes we impose upon the people of our country for special benefits, for roads, social security, and other things. In some of the States all those funds go into the general fund. In some they are kept separate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I make just one more observation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The list I have shows that the State of Colorado has a general fund surplus of $4,800,000, and we have an institutions-building-fund surplus of $1,500,000. That, it is stated, is on hand to meet post-war needs. I do not recall whether it has been especially committed to that purpose by legislation, or whether

that has been an executive or an administrative decision. My State has $4,800,000 in its general surplus, and if we have any educational emergencies in my State, that surplus will have to be fairly apportioned to that emergency before I vote to put any Federal money into Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether under his State law any money could be used, for example, to increase the salaries of teachers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Every dollar of that general surplus could be used for that purpose. We also have special mill commitments for other educational purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Insofar as the existence of surpluses in the State treasuries at this time may have any bearing upon the merits of the pending bill, I think it should be stated for the consideration of us all that many of these surpluses have been created because of the inability of the States to carry on many of their functions, for instance, improving and enlarging their charitable and eleemosynary and penal institutions because of the lack of critical materials, and because of their inability to obtain certain materials for the construction of highways. In my own State the road program has been very greatly curtailed because of the inability of the State to get certain critical materials necessary in the construction of highways, especially Federal-aid highways.

My State has a surplus of $10,000,000 in its treasury, which has grown out of the fact that it imposed certain taxes for the purpose of paying off an existing debt, and because it has not been able to get critical material for the construction of highways and for the enlargement of penal and eleemosynary institutions. The surplus has been created, in part—I would not say altogether—because of that situation. That surplus will undoubtedly be dissipated when the post-war period comes, and the State proceeds with its normal activities. I think all States, as well as all communities and cities, must cooperate with the Federal Government in public improvements in order that the whole burden may not fall upon the National Government, and every political subdivision in America must cooperate with the Federal Government in trying to find employment for men coming back from the armies. That covers, of course, insofar as the States and Nation and the counties and cities are concerned, the public improvements, the roads, and the institutions which are supported by the States. The surpluses which are in existence now do not indicate any permanent condition on the part of the State treasuries. They are temporary, growing out of the situations to which I have referred, and the surpluses will be largely dissipated when we get into the post-war period and the States and counties begin to discharge their part of the public duty in regard to the post-war situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My only suggestion, I say to the distinguished majority leader, was that on any theory of emergency within the States we cannot allow to remain undisturbed a general surplus available for the purpose of meeting the emergency. That, I may state, is one of the reasons why we have State governments and State revenue systems.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly a legitimate argument, I may say to the Senator from Colorado. It probably is likewise true that in some States the surpluses cannot be used for educational purposes because the taxes have been levied for some special purpose. They could not be transferred from that purpose to the general education fund without legislative enactments on the part of the legislatures, and in some States it may even require constitutional amendments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I recognized those distinctions in my questions as originally asked.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have been loath to turn to States and give State statistics concerning teachers, and I will not do so if the Senator does not want me to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I was going to suggest that the Senator might desire to rest a few moments, and that a suggestion of the absence of a quorum might be in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President; I love the discussion in which we are engaged.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two before he concludes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his suggestion. As the Senator knows, I have lived with this subject for 10 years, and between us, as he also knows, I am rather full of the subject, so I am having a good time.

Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything about Colorado if the Senator from Colorado does not want me to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am delighted, Mr. President, to have the distinguished Senator from Utah bring to the special attention of the Senate anything he has to present with respect to Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The point is that if Colorado has this great surplus I simply do not believe the State could leave conditions as they are, because slightly over 60 percent of all the school teachers in Colorado receive less than $1,200 a year. I repeat that to the teachers in Colorado the practical aspect of voting the bill down is simply this: It will result in denying to underpaid teachers of Colorado an increase of between $100 and $200 a year. Sixty percent of them are now being paid less than $1,200 a year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My point is that the State of Colorado, through its legislature, and through its school districts, in my judgment, is able to do justice in any situation where injustice prevails; and that I do not feel that it is my function as a Federal legislator to pass judgment on those school districts or on the conduct of my State government as a whole.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are several questions I should like to ask the Senator from Utah. One relates to the matter of Federal contribution to increase in salaries of teachers throughout the country. That is a very laudable purpose. The Senator from Utah knows that in some of the earlier bills there was embodied the proposal to place teachers under civil service, or at least there has been some agitation to put all the teachers of the country under civil service, the same as postal employees, clerks, and letter carriers. I ask the Senator if he does not feel that the commencement of a contribution of $100, more or less, from the Public Treasury to each of these teachers, is ultimately going to lead to a demand for a uniformity of salaries all over the country the same as exists with respect to postal employees?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, of course I cannot project myself into the future, and I can only answer for myself, but no educational bill with which I have had anything to do since the first Harrison-Black bill contained a provision of that sort. Under the pending bill there is simply no way by which these funds would cause the development of that sort of proposition. It simply would not happen. It simply cannot happen. There would have to be an entirely different sort of bill passed, a bill built up on an entirely different theory.

There is no change proposed in the status of the teachers. The grant is to the State, and the teacher is paid by the State. The teacher is not paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt in my mind, as I recall the evidence and agitation on this subject, that there has been a feeling and a movement which has not as yet crystallized to have a uniformity of salaries throughout the whole country with respect to teachers. But let us pass that for the moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In relation to that subject, let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that grants have been made to land-grant colleges for nearly 100 years. There has never been an attempt made to equalize salaries between the professors in one land-grant college and the professors in another land-grant college. We have had the Smith-Hughes Act and we have had the Smith-Lever Act, and we have had other acts making grants which have been given to the colleges and the universities by the Federal Government. There has never yet been an attempt made to equalize in any way the pay of teachers in various States.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the legislation to which the Senator refers was not so broad in its scope as is the proposed legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the previous legislation is broader in its scope. I think the land-grant-college legislation is even broader than the pending legislation.

Mr. WALSH. It is limited to only a few colleges.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. One in every State and Territory of the Nation.

Mr. WALSH. Does it apply to every college in every State?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; not to every college in every State, but land-grant colleges exist in every State.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; there are land-grant colleges in every State. This bill applies to every teacher in every State.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is no State which is delimited.

Mr. WALSH. No; but the legislation to which the Senator referred does not apply to every college.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it does not apply to every college, and the pending legislation does not include every school in the country. It applies merely to public schools.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to ask another question with respect to increase in salaries. Many of the municipalities of my State during the depression felt obliged to reduce the salaries of policemen, firemen, and school teachers. Later the reductions were restored. Would not the pending bill, if enacted, prevent first of all the municipal authorities or the State authorities from reducing salaries which they themselves pay to teachers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Would it not prevent them from reducing salaries?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the provisions of the bill have nothing to do with that. If the State authorities accept a grant from the Federal Government they must, under the provisions of the bill, use the fund toward payment of the teachers, in addition to what is paid them in 1943.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The States cannot receive the Federal money if they reduce the salaries lower than those the teachers received in 1943.

Mr. WALSH. If there develops in this country such a situation as to cause a severe financial depression, and the municipalities which raise their revenues for educational purposes feel they are unable to pay the present salaries, they would lose this contribution from the Federal Government if they reduced the salaries; is that not a fact?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If they reduced the teachers' salaries for the purpose of substituting the Federal fund for the amount of the reduction, that would be the case, because the purpose of the bill is an attempt to increase salaries and an attempt to equalize them.

Mr. WALSH. So it amounts to this, that a State or a municipality cannot in the future, no matter what the emergency may be, reduce the salaries it pays without losing the Federal funds?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I think that is not so at all.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No.

Mr. WALSH. I understood that the contribution was based upon retaining the present salaries of 1943.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If a State accepts this money to increase teachers' salaries it would be wrong for the State to substitute this money and not increase teachers' salaries. If the State is not going to increase teachers' salaries it should not take this money, because the purpose for which the money is given is to increase teachers' salaries. If a State decides, for example, that it shall no longer have any schools, and do away with teachers entirely, it cannot receive any money with which to increase teachers' salaries. If a State decides to reduce teachers' salaries of course it cannot receive any of this money.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator contend that the States or municipalities must retain the present scale of wages to their teachers in order to receive any of this fund?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; they would have to retain the present scale.

Mr. WALSH. That is the point I make. That means that if such a situation develops that the taxpayers do not feel they can pay the salaries which they have been paying to teachers, as it developed in my State in the case of firemen and policemen and others, if the State attempted to reduce the salaries it would lose this contribution from the Federal Government?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, but the prevention is provided for the purpose of——

Mr. WALSH. I understand.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator understands the purpose; does he not?

Mr. WALSH. I understand that. I am talking about the future.

Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Let me ask the Senator a further question: Suppose the municipalities and States decide they must economize and must reduce salaries; does not the Senator think there would be a movement in the Congress—and probably a successful one—to appropriate larger sums of money so as to offset such reduction?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There might be. Our appropriations have increased for everything I can think of, in our country.

Mr. WALSH. I greatly fear that the bill will result at least in a retention of the salaries that will be fixed by the localities at present levels, plus the amount of money given out of the Federal Treasury and increases through Federal aid in the future. Those are some of the objections I have to that feature of the bill. The bill appears to me to be transferring to the Federal Government the fixing of teachers' salaries through its contributions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Those objections are mere assumptions, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. That is true, they indicate a plan of future decisions upon the Public Treasury because of the new policy we propose to inaugurate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They are not based upon facts.

Mr. WALSH. It is a fear of the problems which may arise in the future to embarrass us if once we enter into this field of Federal contributions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator fears a problem of that kind more than he fears a complete breakdown of our public educational system, which may occur because of other factors——

Mr. WALSH. I do not consider there is any complete break-down of our educational system. I think my State has an excellent educational system. I think nearly every other State in the Union has, insofar as it is able within its available means to educate its youth.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But the Senator knows that many thousands of teachers are leaving their jobs because of the salaries paid, and are going into defense plants. The Senator knows there is the greatest turn-over of teachers that has ever occurred in our history, and that that situation is threatening nearly all the schools of the country.

Mr. WALSH. That is also true; but firemen, policemen, letter carriers, and all other public servants who are essential to the preservation of order, as well as to the education of youth——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in that connection I should like to state that as a result of the shortage of essential employees we have increased the salaries of essential Federal employees. The salaries of school teachers have been increased merely a few dollars, while the salaries of factory workers have increased from an average of $1,200 to nearly $2,100 a year. The salaries of Federal employees have increased from an average of a little more than $1,800 to an average of considerably over $1,900. Those are the ordinary computations which enter into the matter.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator does not contend that uniform salaries should be paid teachers everywhere in the United States; does he?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly not.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator would agree that the teachers in the city of Washington, where the cost of living is exceedingly high, should be paid more than teachers in many rural communities should be paid; would he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The theory of the bill is to attempt to equalize such injustices.

Mr. WALSH. There is another feature of the bill about which I should like to inquire. I call attention to the report of the committee which summarizes what the language of the bill undertakes to provide. It is the matter of apportionment——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. To what page does the Senator refer?

Mr. WALSH. I read from page 15 of the report:

From not less than 98 percent of the $100,000,000 made available under section 2 (B), apportionments will be made to the respective States by the United States Commissioner of Education according to an objective formula for finding the financial need of the respective States. Financial need is determined statistically by two factors: (1) The number of inhabitants from 5 to 17 years of age in the respective States—

I think I understand that formula. The other is the one about which I have difficulty—

and (2) the financial ability of the respective States as measured by the total estimated income payments in each of the States.

Will the Senator explain that, please?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator understands the factor relative to the number of children; does he not?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I understand the first one.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The second is an attempt to get at the usable wealth of a State.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator please give us an illustration?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Bureau of the Census gathers, every year, figures on the amount of income taxes paid by the various States. The second factor is based on that amount; so that if in one State there is $1,000,000 worth of tax receipts, but only a few pupils, and if in another State there are many pupils, but only half a million dollars of tax receipts——

Mr. WALSH. Is the formula based only on the income-tax revenues? Is that the formula?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On the reports by our Department of Commerce of taxes collected.

Mr. WALSH. As reported by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. There are Federal statistics. This seemed to be the best of all possible ways to work out the distribution on the basis of need.

Mr. WALSH. Is the net result to grant to States with small incomes more of the money than States with large incomes would be given?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The States with small incomes and with many children would receive more of the money than would States with great incomes and few children.

Mr. WALSH. The first part of the formula in the bill is new, I believe—the one which attempts to fix the number of inhabitants between the ages of 5 and 17. I do not think that has been contained in previous bills, has it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the whole formula is new, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. However, I think the second formula is somewhat of a repetition and is along the lines of other bills. At any rate, it works out so as to provide more money from the fund for the so-called poor States than for the so-called rich States. We agree about that, do we?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Now, I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks it fair and equitable for the National Government to give funds to certain States which have, for reasons of their own—and I am not criticizing—given a small percentage of their revenues for educational purposes as compared to their total revenues.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if it were true that the States which have trouble in obtaining sufficient money for their educational systems have allotted to education smaller sums as compared to their total wealth, then the proposition the Senator from Massachusetts lays down is a proper one. However, it happens that the States which are doing the most in comparison with their wealth are providing the least for the number of children.

Mr. WALSH. Providing the least?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Providing the least; yes.

Mr. WALSH. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There are States whose resources are such that the amount of money they use on education is actually less than the amount of money other States, whose resources are little, use on education as compared with the total money received.

Mr. WALSH. The statistics do not show it. I have an incomplete table which I received a few years ago. It shows the educational expenses of States. The State of New York pays for education 27 percent of its total revenues. My own State pays 21 percent. Another State which is named in the table pays 24 percent; another State pays 25 percent; another State—the small State of Nevada, incidentally—pays 30 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. But other States pay 10 percent or less. How can the Senator justify compelling States which are contributing to education 27 percent, 25 percent, and 30 percent of all they collect in taxes to pay more in the way of taxation, and to permit the taking from the Federal Treasury, out of the funds they pay, sums of money to increase the percentage of education in the other States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sure that if the Senator will study further, he will discover that that rule does not follow at all. There are States with certain taxable values and certain taxable income which are actually doing more, when we consider the wealth of the States, than States with much greater wealth, in comparison with other expenditures.

Mr. WALSH. I do not follow the Senator; but I know that the proposed legislation is for the purpose of giving funds to those States which give the least of their income toward education. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not the least of their income.

Mr. WALSH. The smallest proportion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is the point I am urging.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The children are simply not in those places where the States can afford to take care of them. Where we find poor States, we find a great number of children; and where we find rich States, we find fewer children.

Mr. WALSH. I challenge the statement of the Senator when he uses the word "afford." I have contended for a long time that we cannot tell whether one State needs Federal aid, as compared with another State, unless we make two surveys; first, a survey of the system of valuing assets; and second, a survey of the rates of taxation. If a so-called poor State valued its property at 100 percent, and had a tax rate such as we have in the city of Boston, of over $40 per thousand, and then were not able to educate its children, it ought to have Federal aid. But taxation values and rates vary in the several States. In some cases the valuation is on the basis of 40 or 50 percent of the real valuation, and the tax rate on that valuation is very small as compared with $40 or $50.

I cannot see the justification of compelling those States whose citizens make great sacrifices by permitting large valuations of property and imposing high rates of taxation to give aid to those States which value their property at a low percentage of its real value, and which have low rates of taxation.

Of course, we cannot equalize taxation. It would be abhorrent for the Federal Government to undertake to equalize taxation. It would be a violation of the most fundamental principle of local government. It cannot be done. We are confronted with the situation that some States and some communities are taxing themselves to the limit to give every possible benefit for the education of their youth, while other communities, lackadaisically, indifferently, or negligently, are resisting the burden which would be involved if they were to impose taxes on an equality with other States, or if they were to spend the same percentage of income for the education of their children.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. In connection with the idea developed by the Senator from Massachusetts, is it a fact that some States actually have higher assessments on taxable property than have other States?

Mr. WALSH. There is no doubt about it. No two States and no two communities value their property on the same basis, or have the same rate of taxation.

Mr. STEWART. Has that question been explored? Do we have information upon it?

Mr. WALSH. It is a matter of rather common knowledge that the taxing authorities in the various communities and States have fixed values according to the judgment of their assessors. The assessed value may be 40, 50, 60, or 100 percent of the real value. In the city of Boston and other large cities, in some cases the valuation for tax purposes has been found to be 400 or 500 percent above the real value.

Mr. STEWART. That question might be open to debate. Take my own State of Tennessee as an example. In assessing real property in the various counties, the idea of valuation in one county might differ somewhat from that in another county.

Mr. WALSH. I am not objecting to it. I think it is a local right. I am citing it simply as an argument that we should not ask a county or State which assesses to the limit to contribute to another county or State which does not do the same thing.

Mr. STEWART. Is it correct to say that such a condition actually exists? Is there such a wide variation, for example, that the State of Massachusetts actually assesses property for taxation at 100 cents on the dollar, while the State of Texas, the State of Tennessee, or the State of Nevada assesses property at only 50 percent of its actual cash value? Is that a correct statement? Does the Senator have facts to bear that out?

Mr. WALSH. In my opinion it can be easily borne out. There is no doubt about it. The Senator himself cites the example of two counties in his own State which assess on a different basis.

Mr. STEWART. That condition might exist within the borders of one State.

Mr. WALSH. I do not raise the question for the purpose of requiring the States or communities to fix a common level for valuing property for I believe in local self-government. I raise the question to define what is a poor State, from the standpoint of needing Federal aid for educational purposes.

Mr. STEWART. My question is, has that point actually been explored by the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It has been explored, and the bill is based on precisely the theory which the Senator from Massachusetts presents. If he will study the statistics and the reports, he will find that, taking all the factors into consideration, the States which need this aid are doing their level best. They are doing even better than the rich States. The very thing for which the Senator contends is the purpose of the bill.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the Senator to say that the apportionment in the second bracket in the bill is based upon the incomes of the several States, as shown by the income-tax returns.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; but, Mr. President, we must not lose sight of the factor of children.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that. I am speaking of the second bracket, not the first.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If there are few children in Boston and many children in Salt Lake City, for example, and both cities have exactly the same tax rate, and assess on exactly the same basis, Salt Lake City has a greater task than has Boston.

Mr. WALSH. Undoubtedly that is true. The same situation is true in my own State. In the mill towns there are large populations of foreign-born people who have large families and the tax bills in such towns are very much heavier than in suburban cities that are merely residential cities.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the States had not done their level best, I would not be interested in this bill.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Utah has said, and that is that the States which are making the smallest expenditures are making the greatest efforts in behalf of their schools. The hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor are full of testimony showing clearly and conclusively that the States which are making the smallest expenditures are making the greatest efforts. I could spend a long time calling attention to charts, figures, and statements by various witnesses to this effect. However, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the statement of one witness. I choose him especially because he is not an educator. He is one of the greatest businessmen in America. I refer to Mr. Henry I. Harriman. Mr. Harriman was formerly chairman of the board of the New England Power Association. As I understand, he is a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He was vice chairman of the American Youth Commission.

As a member of the American Youth Commission, Mr. Harriman offered to testify before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor as to the findings of the commission, and to testify in favor of Federal aid for education, speaking, as I understand, for the American Youth Commission, which was presided over by none other than a distinguished citizen of New York State, Mr. Owen D. Young, the chairman of the General Electric Co.

Mr. Harriman stated:

> It cannot be said of the States that support their schools meagerly that they do so from lack of effort. Almost without exception these States are making a greater effort than the States whose educational expenditures are highest. They are devoting a large part of their resources to educating their children, but these resources are much less than those enjoyed by our more fortunate States

Mr. Harriman continued:

> In 1934 the wealthiest State had more than six times the economic resources, based on wealth per child 5 to 17 years old, than the poorest State had. Lack of resources available for school support is a handicap affecting large areas of the country—areas which have the task of educating a very considerable proportion of the Nation's children. In the rural Southeast, in 1930—

I assume he used 1930 because that was a census year—

> the farm population included 13 percent of all the children of the country, but it received only 2 percent of the national income. The nonfarm population of the Northeast—

That is Mr. Harriman's own section of the country—

> which had only twice the child population of the Southwest farm area, received 21 times as much income, or 42 percent of all that received by the whole Nation.

Mr. Harriman continued:

> In my opinion, perhaps the most telling argument for Federal aid to the States for educational purposes is the fact, now well established by authoritative research, that a substantial number of the States simply cannot, from their own resources alone, support a minimum defensible program of public education. They could not do so even if all the available tax moneys they might raise were applied to that purpose. You are doubtless acquainted with the estimates of Dr. Paul R. Mort, of Columbia University, which indicate that this situation would have been true of nine States even in the prosperous year of 1930. Assuming the application of a model uniform tax system in all States, Dr. Mort finds that in these nine States 100 percent of the general-purpose taxes that would have resulted from the operation of the model law—

He was referring to the model tax law—

> would have been insufficient to maintain the schools at an acceptable minimum of efficiency. Even in about two-thirds of the States—

"Even in about two-thirds of the States," Mr. Harriman says—

> the minimum program could not have been supported from the estimated yield of this tax plan without seriously encroaching upon the amount needed for other governmental services.
>
> The present situation clearly calls for action, and I see no way to remedy the evils I have pointed out other than assistance from the Federal Government. The need has now become unmistakably apparent. We cannot afford to delay action longer.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Alabama state when that statement was made?

Mr. HILL. It was made in 1941 before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. It did not relate to the $200,000,000 provided for teachers, did it?

Mr. HILL. It related to equalization.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the attention of the Senator from Utah to the words used in line 17 of section 5 on page 6 of the bill, which read as follows:

> To adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living during the emergency.

We all recognize that there is a need for increasing salaries of teachers, but I invite the Senator's attention to the words "during the emergency". That is a very indefinite expression. The members of the Appropriations Committee have to watch these matters in order to comply with the authorizations contained in any bill such as that now pending. I hope the Senator will feel agreeable to amending that part of the bill by inserting some such language as "6 months after the war is closed," or say "after the signing of the armistice."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Does the Senator wish to have inserted in the bill an amendment similar to that which we have put in nearly all the war bills?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I think it would have to be a little longer in this

instance, because it ought to go through the school term for the particular year. However, I think it should be made definite, because otherwise we would have to pass on the question when it comes before the Appropriations Committee, and it might well be made definite here at this time. I merely call it to the attention of the Senator, and I hope that he will make the language more definite.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, most of the military bills have carried some such formula, limiting the application of the act to 6 months after the peace, or 6 months after the end of the war, or 6 months after Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have declared the emergency over.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have no objection to such a provision being inserted in the pending bill, because the bill has been drawn to take care of the need which has been brought about as a result of the war.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator really think that if Congress pays $200 of every teacher's salary in the United States—and that would be the effect of the provision in the bill for the use of the $200,000,000—we will ever stop paying the $200, and that the States will ever assume the burden of paying the $200 or that we will undertake to reduce the salaries of teachers once having undertaken to pay $200 to each of the teachers in the United States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I answer the question of the Senator from Ohio by asking another question: If the Congress of the United States pays $50 a month to 10,000,000 or 13,000,000 soldiers, which is probably more than some of them have ever received, will Congress ever cease to do so? Of course it will, and it will continue to refrain from doing so. The Senator fought the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. They had a great many more employees, and a great many more persons were employed by those agencies, but under the Senate's direction we stopped paying them.

Mr. TAFT. I think the case is different. We will have to stop paying soldiers the salaries we now pay them. We will have fewer soldiers after the close of the war. That is the only difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I say to the Senator from Ohio that whatever may be the result of the bill, it seems to me that we ought to have a definite time fixed in it as to when the pay will no longer apply.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is hardly in order at the present time, but when the Senator wishes to offer the amendment to which he has referred, I should like to have him do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will prepare an amendment in accordance with the one covering the subject which we have put in other bills. That will be satisfactory so far as I am concerned.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact, which he already knows better than I do, that during the dark days of the depression we paid out of Federal funds the salaries of many hundred thousands of teachers in this country. The truth is that through the use of Federal funds we kept open and operated schools attended by one-eighth of all the children in the United States attending school. We faced a great emergency, and we met it. When the emergency ended, we no longer appropriated money for it. I submit to the Senator that the same situation would result with respect to the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I probably cannot deal with probabilities with exactness, but, like the Senator from Alabama, I could cite instances in which we have changed our minds and have done things differently.

Mr. TAFT. The difference in these cases, for one thing, is that the pending bill involves a million people, compared with the staff of about a thousand or possibly 2,000 in the N. Y. A. This would be a larger subsidy to more people than we have ever granted. Funds appropriated for the W. P. A. could hardly be called a subsidy. That was for the purpose of employing persons.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I sometimes wonder if the Senator from Ohio is afraid of the people back home? Whom do we represent here? Who, in the final analysis, sit here? The people of the United States. Therefore, if the people want to cut this off at any time they can cut it off; the Senate can cut it off. The Senator from Ohio is not afraid of the people whom he represents, is he?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all.

Mr. HILL. Yet the Senator talks as if we are something different from the people, and as if the people were trying to make a raid on us. We represent the people; we are the people. Certainly, that is the way I conceive my representation here.

Mr. TAFT. However, it is very much more difficult, once having increased a man's salary, to take it away from him than it is not to give it to him at all.

Mr. HILL. When it is provided that it is for a particular purpose, when that purpose ceases to exist, it may be taken away.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the people of this country are not asking for this bill. There never has been any demand from any State for it. The governor of no State has come here, and said, "My State cannot afford to pay the salaries of its teachers." The demand comes entirely from the National Education Association and the Office of Education. There is no public demand for Federal aid to education. If the people of Ohio were asked about the bill, I venture to say that 9 out of every 10 would say "No, we have a good educational system, and the State of Ohio is perfectly able to take care of it." I have faith in the people, and that is why I am quite confident that this bill is not going to pass; but, after all, at best, the argument should be fully presented.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me further? I do not desire to trespass on his time unduly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I deny the statement that it is only the National Education Association and the teachers who are supporting this bill. The mothers and the fathers of this country, speaking in large measure through their parent-teacher organizations, the mothers and fathers who have children in school, the mothers and fathers of the boys and girls who are going to be the citizens of tomorrow, are demanding the passage of this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to read where the support for this bill comes from. The organizations supporting it are as follows:

American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

American Association of University Women.

Those women are not teachers and they are not members of the National Education Association.

American Home Economics Association.

American Teachers Association.

That association is not a part of the National Education Association.

American Vocational Association.

Association for Childhood Education.

Association for Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes.

Board of Superintendents of New York City.

Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

The Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen does not belong to the National Education Association.

Civitan International, Alabama, Mississippi District Convention.

Delta Kappa Gamma Sorority.

Department of Adult Education, National Education Association.

Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association.

Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association.

Department of Supervisors and Curriculum Development, National Education Association.

General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Would it be possible to find a cross section of the country representing the women of the United States in a broader way than the combination of the American Association of University Women and the General Federation of Women's Clubs?

Great Lakes Education Conference.

Music Educators National Conference.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

That association has nothing to do with the National Education Association.

National Association of Secondary School Principals.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Which represents the parents of every school child in the United States.

National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.
National Council of Chief State School Officers.
National Council of Executive Secretaries of State Education Associations.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Social Studies.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

That organization is not connected with the National Education Association.

National Kindegarten Association.
National Negro Council.
National Society of College Teachers of Education.
National Women's Trade Union League.
New York City Bakers and Confectioners Union (American Federation of Labor).
New York State Industrial Council (Congress of Industrial Organizations).
New York Teachers Union.
Public Education Association, New York.
Quota Club International.
Railway Executives' Association.
Service Star Legion.
Southern Conference on Teacher Education.
United Government Employees.
United Stone and Allied Products Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations).
Young Women's Christian Association, national board.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Then there are listed other organizations that are supporting Federal aid for education:

American Association of School Administrators.
American Association of Teachers Colleges.
American Farm Bureau Federation.

In every State in the Union there is a chapter of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

American Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Teachers.
Associated Women of the Farm Bureau Federation.
Committee for the Care of Young Children in Wartime.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Every one of the three major labor organizations of the United States has supported this bill from the beginning.

Department of Rural Education, National Education Association.
Executive Committee of the Federation of the Churches of Christ in America.
Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America.
Farmers Union.
National Child Labor Committee.
National School Service Institute.
Phi Delta Kappa Educational Fraternity.
Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

The pending bill is actively supported by the education associations, or State teachers' associations, of the following States, Territories, and outlying possessions—the associations may or may not be affiliated with the National Education Association, but for the most part I think they are not—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, in view of the recital I have just made, I think it is somewhat unfair, to say the least, to charge that this great Nation-wide bill is supported by only one organization.

I should like, if I may, Mr. President, to finish my formal statement, and then I shall be glad to yield the floor.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator a table indicating the percentage that each State pays of the Federal tax dollar? The reason I ask the question is that, as I see it, in many States there is levied on the citizens of the States a tax which, substantially speaking, is equivalent to the sum that is paid back to those States. In other words, the Federal Government really operates as a collecting agent for the so-called school fund that goes back to the States. What I am asking is, has the Senator such a table?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator will look at page 17 of the report he will find listed by States the income payments of 1941. Each State is listed, with the amount it pays. Then there is shown the proportion it might get back. The Senator could use a little arithmetic and obtain the answer.

Mr. WILEY. Is it on page 17?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; of the committee report.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that all can be worked out with a pencil, without much trouble.

Mr. President, the Morrill-Nelson Act, 1862 and 1890, appropriating funds for land-grant colleges and universities; the Hatch Act, 1887, appropriating money for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in connection with land-grant colleges; the Smith-Lever Act, 1914, and the Capper-Ketcham Act, 1928, providing for agricultural extension work through land-grant colleges; and the Smith-Hughes Act, 1917, and subsequent similar acts for vocational education in agriculture, trades, and industries, and home economics, all illustrate a fundamental interest of the Federal Government in the fostering of public education.

I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Massachusetts, with respect to whether States take what is offered them, that I know nothing about any experience outside my own State, but the institution with which I was connected was permitted to share appropriations under the Smith-Hughes Act, and it gave up the privilege, it did not take the funds, because it would have been inconsistent with the type of thing it was doing. When we are dealing with the educational institutions of our country, we are dealing with people who are rational, who are intelligent, who understand needs, and who are interested in developing the country.

Mr. President, since 1921 a number of authoritative and scientific studies have been made on the question of Federal aid to education. All of them have arrived at the same conclusion, namely, that Federal aid to education is absolutely essential to the attainment of a fair degree of educational opportunity among and within the States. That is, all the studies, whether made by teachers' associations or nonteachers' associations, have all favored Federal aid to education.

In 1929 President Hoover appointed the National Advisory Council on Education, composed of a number of outstanding laymen and educators. The conclusions of that council were wholly favorable to Federal aid to education.

In 1938 the Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Roosevelt "to study the whole question of Federal relations to State and local conduct of education," after extensive study and research, made the strongest possible case for Federal aid to education.

The American Youth Commission, working under the auspices of the American Council on Education, gave extensive consideration to this subject, and on May 10, 1938, voted unanimously that Federal aid to education is necessary and desirable. The American Youth Commission was composed of such persons as Owen D. Young, chairman; Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher; Chester Rowell, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle; and H. A. Harriman, former chairman of the United States Chamber of Commerce. These persons are patriotic American citizens, who desire to build up their country

In the early part of 1942 a report entitled "After the War Full Employment," by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, special economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was issued as an official report of the Board. This report laid down a six-point program essential to the economic stability of the Nation in the post-war period. One of these points called for Federal aid to the States in financing public education.

From the Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations, appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, came a report released on April 5, 1943, in which the committee presented extensive data on educational problems, and concluded and recommended that the Federal Government should aid the States in financing public schools. Said the committee report:

Much weight needs to be given to the view held by many people that education is a part of their way of life and that national participation means regimentation and loss of important minority rights and interests. Concessions can and should be made to this feeling, but in recognition of the overwhelming national interest in the maintenance of minimum standards of educational opportunity, the concessions should not extend to a vote of Federal aid for general education with equalization features. Nor should it block a control program necessary to secure

the Federal objectives. It is not an acceptable feature of our way of life to keep a large section of our population in ignorance. * * * Wise Federal leadership with regard to educational development in the United States can make an impressive contribution to the economic, political, and cultural life of the country.

Senate bill 637, the Educational Finance Act of 1943, is a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know whether it is the pleasure of our able chairman that he be not interrupted during his discourse. If he is disinclined, I certainly should not care to ask him to stop the splendid statement he is now making.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator will permit me to finish the statement, then I shall be glad to yield the floor to him, or be happy to answer any question he may propound.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the bill provides Federal funds with which to make possible assistance to the States, at the same time guaranteeing State and local control of education. This bill unequivocably safeguards State and local control of public schools. In section 1 it declares:

No department, agency, or officer of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school or State educational agency with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this act relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school or State educational agency authorize any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction.

Senate bill 637 reaffirms faith in the people back home by writing into the law the principle of Federal aid to public education without impairing State and local control. For more than a century the principle of Federal aid without Federal control has been successfully embodied in American educational practice. Land-grant aids, beginning with Ohio in 1803 and the two Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, prove that important Federal assistance without Federal encroachment upon State and local governments is an arrangement which on the basis of our national experience can be and should be continued.

Opposition, based on the claim that S. 637 gives the Federal Government control of public education, fails to apprehend one of the chief objectives sought by this bill—the nonfederalization of our public-school system. The way to prevent that development is to prohibit its occurrence through law. If our national experience proves anything at all, it is that Federal control follows Federal aid when the law is written that way, and that Federal control does not thus follow when the law forbids. The issue is just as clear as that, and Congress, not a bureau in Washington, will determine what the policy shall be.

The enactment of Senate bill 637 will accomplish two great objectives—it will extend aid to meet existing emergencies in public education, and it will go a long way toward equalizing educational opportunities among the States by making a minimum acceptable school program possible in every section of the country.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to enable States and their local public school jurisdictions to meet emergencies in financing their public elementary and public secondary schools by providing funds for the payment of the salaries of teachers to keep schools open, to employ additional teachers to relieve overcrowded classes, to raise substandard salaries of teachers, and to adjust the salaries of teachers to meet the increased cost of living. For this purpose the bill authorizes to be appropriated for each fiscal year in which Congress shall find a need therefor $200,000,000 to be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average daily attendance of pupils attending all types of public elementary and public secondary schools. The amount apportioned to each State from the funds appropriated will be an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount made available that the average daily attendance of pupils attending public elementary and public secondary schools in that State bears to the total of such average daily attendance for all the States.

For the purpose of more nearly equalizing public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States, the bill authorizes to be appropriated $100,000,000 to be apportioned to the States on the basis of two factors—first, the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 years to be educated, and, second, the financial resources within the State adequately to educate those children. The formula is so written that the lower the income of a State the greater the amount of money that State will receive in proportion to the number of children to be educated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am at the great disadvantage of not having heard all the able addresses made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I know it was as thorough a job as the able Senator from Utah always does. But since in the part of the address which I heard, the able Senator was referring to the Federal interest in education, as it were, I was wondering if the Senator had gone into the matter of the number of rejects from selective service on account of educational deficiency in this war so far.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Only informally. It has been stated that nearly a million men have been rejected as a result of educational deficiency. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I may say, made the statement that he was sure many men out of that million were noneducationable, if there is such a word.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator now speaking is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I believe the ranking Democratic member, and I am sure he knows better than I that the Army is taking in a considerable number of illiterate men and running them through a short course of 6 weeks trying to teach them enough to be able to read simple signs that might make it possible even for them to observe road directions and a few of the essentials that would be necessary to their Government. It seems to me that no one would question the fact that it is the province of the Federal Government to provide the soldiery with which to defend the country, and that in modern warfare it has been determined to be necessary in order for a soldier to be an effective soldier to be an intelligent soldier, at least a literate soldier. If the States are permitted to determine the educational qualifications of their people it would be within the power of the States, by neglect, to keep the country from being capable of defending itself. That is aside from the relationship between education and physical qualifications.

I do not at this time, Mr. President, desire to address myself to this subject, although I shall a little later. I merely rose to say that it would seem to me that as vividly as could be shown the present emergency has shown the necessity for the Federal Government interesting itself in the minimum literacy level of its citizenry, if on no other ground, upon the pure ground of national defense.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPERTS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report an original resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred as requested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the committee has already been advised with respect to the resolution, and has passed upon it. I ask that the resolution be read for the information of the Senate, after which the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] proposes to report it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 193), as follows:

Resolved, That for the purpose of obtaining and laying factual data and information before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, for its consideration in the discharge of its functions, the chairman or acting chairman of said committee is hereby authorized and directed to appoint and employ such experts as he may deem necessary to obtain such data and information, and such experts, upon the written authority of the chairman or acting chairman, shall have the right to examine the books, documents, papers, reports, or other records of any department, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government

in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; be it further

Resolved, That the said committee, through its chairman, is hereby authorized to appoint additional clerical help and assistants; be it further

Resolved, That the salaries and expenses of such experts, and of such additional clerical help and assistants, shall be paid out of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations, contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That the total of such salaries and expenses for the remainder of the fiscal year 1944 shall not exceed $30,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to make a report of the resolution from the committee, if he will.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I will say to the Senate that I have conferred with members of that committee on both sides of the aisle and they have agreed that a resolution of this nature should be adopted. It strikes me that it makes provision for something which is very necessary. Therefore, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back, without amendment, Senate Resolution 193, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], I shall have to object.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not object. I spoke to the Senator from Oregon before he left the floor, and told him the purpose of the resolution and what was proposed to be done, and the resolution has his entire approval.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the resolution, as reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not object to immediate consideration of the resolution. I merely wanted to ask the Senator what he thought might be saved by the proposed investigation? How much does the Senator think might be saved?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is very difficult to say. The Committee on Appropriations last year saved up to $200,000,000 and by the adoption of the resolution additional expert help can be secured by reason of which I am quite sure the committee can save a very large sum of money. It is very difficult to say in figures how much can be saved, but I think it will certainly mean hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a step in the right direction and I hope very much the Senator from Ohio and other Senators will not object to adoption of the resolution, because we want to have its provisions in operation by the first of November if possible; and considerable activity, energy, and time will be required to put it into effect.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wondered if the committee's entire work would not be nullified by the passage of the bill providing for the addition of $300,000,000 to the Federal Budget, for the purpose of aiding education. After all, is there any use to investigate and attempt to reduce expenditures, and then turn around and in 1 day add $300,000,000 additional to the expenditures of the Federal Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. If we saved it, and voted $300,000,000 too, we would still be saving money for the Government.

However, regardless of that, that is a matter yet to be passed upon by the Senate. I hope the effort of the committee to lessen the expenditures of the Government may proceed, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to pass upon the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the passage or defeat of the educational bill would be in no way affected by agreeing to the resolution. If the resolution is as effective as we hope it will be, it might result in the saving of sufficient money to pay the cost involved in the educational bill.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has asked the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] about the saving, and he has referred to its being a net saving for the country to save dollars and to gain the illiteracy of the Nation's children. I am sure he will not mind my reminding him that I remember the time when on the floor of the Senate he was personally and to a considerable extent responsible for saving money but losing critical materials which our country later badly needed for its national defense.

Again, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is proposing to save the children of the country, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] speaks of that as he spoke about the laying up of critical materials before the war started—as an extravagance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered and agreed to.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 193) was considered and agreed to.

IDENTIFICATION CARDS FOR SENATORS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may do so, I shall trespass upon the time of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for a moment longer to ask for immediate consideration of a resolution which is lying on the table, and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 86), as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to issue to each Senator an identification card bearing a photograph of such Senator, the signature of such Senator or a facsimile thereof, and the words "the person whose photograph and signature appear hereon is a Member of the United States Senate." Each such identification card shall be signed by the Sergeant at Arms.

SEC. 2. When any identification card issued under the foregoing section is presented or exhibited by the Senator to whom it was issued, such Senator shall be admitted to any building or other property occupied or used by any department or agency of the Government, and shall be so admitted without regard to any rule, regulation, or requirement of such department or agency relating to the admittance or identification of persons entering such building or other property.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before bringing up the resolution I talked to both the majority and the minority leaders. They said they had no objection to it. I simply desire to say that the situation calling for consideration of the resolution largely grows out of conditions at the War Department. Of course, we all recognize that there must be some regulation about entrance to the departments; but for a Senator, a representative of the Government, who goes to one of the departments on official business, to be held and detained for some little time and to be examined as a stranger because, without the fault of anyone, the examining person does not know the Senator, and examines him just as he examines everyone else, means the loss of valuable time. Furthermore, the Department requires that a large, white, saucerlike arrangement be pinned on the coat of each visitor; the visitor has to be very careful not to break it, and the regulations provide that it must be given to a certain officer when the visitor leaves. All that takes a great deal of time.

The resolution, if agreed to, would simplify the situation very much, and would save the time of Senators in performing their official duties. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate situation of the resolution, and ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senate.

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 637) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it had been my desire to speak this afternoon. The hour is rather late. We have had a very able and excellent address on the pending bill by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I doubt if I could

conclude my remarks this afternoon. If agreeable to the majority leader, I shall wait, and shall begin my remarks in the morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is entirely agreeable.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, there was pending before the Senate a bill relating to Federal assistance to the States for the support of public education. On June 13, 1939, in conjunction with the then Senator Donahey of Ohio, I filed minority views. While the bill then under consideration is not comparable in all particulars to the bill presently pending, and in fact is different, I feel it might be a contribution to the discussion to have a portion of the minority views which Mr. Donahey and I submitted at that time printed in the RECORD in connection with the present debate.

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

I cannot give my support to the bill (S. 1305) to promote the general welfare through appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education which has been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, and I am submitting this statement of my views as to this legislation and of the reasons why, in my judgment, it is both unwise and inexpedient and ought not to pass.

Its purpose is stated in the title as—"to promote the general welfare through appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education."

It rests upon the premise that the education of our youth is of the highest importance to our national welfare and the economic and social advancement of society; that, taking the country as a whole, existing educational opportunities and facilities are variable and unequal and deficient in many particulars due to a variety of causes, one of which, without doubt, is an insufficiency of funds; in some cases due to indifference or neglect and undoubtedly, in other cases, to poor economic conditions.

No one who is open-minded and acquainted with the facts will dispute these premises. No one will deny that even though educational opportunities in the United States today are greater and educational facilities are better, and our entire system of education more democratic than anywhere else in the world, nevertheless there is much room for further improvement, and, in my opinion, more money alone will not accomplish all the betterment that is needed.

Educational opportunities are not and never have been uniform except in totalitarian states, and that is so because from the earliest day to the present day, public education has been primarily a local responsibility and largely supported by local taxation. The States have collaborated with the local communities and have supported State institutions for higher learning, but the Federal Government has not heretofore had any direct connection with the public-school system.

No one will deny that present-day concepts of social responsibility and present-day social and economic conditions raise grave and fundamental questions with respect to the scope and efficiency of our educational system. However, I repeat, mere spending of more money will not correct the present defects.

The premises upon which the present bill and its predecessors—which have been before the Congress intermittently for the past 20 years—rest, and its professed objectives, which are stated to be "to assist in equalizing educational opportunities" are widely applauded. Everyone will subscribe to the general proposition that equality of educational opportunity is a desirable objective.

THREE MAJOR QUESTIONS

The bill, however, and all others of its pattern present three other questions of far-reaching import.

The first question is whether the Federal Government, as a matter of sound public policy, ought to assume responsibility for public education throughout the Nation and contribute substantially to the same out of the Federal Treasury and exercise an oversight thereof.

If we answer that question in the negative, we need go no further.

The second question is whether Federal subsidies to the public-school system can be maintained without ultimately bringing about a nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control. This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insist is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided. They contend that by the terms of the present bill that danger is removed.

I seriously question that conclusion.

The third question is whether it is safe and prudent for the Federal Government to embark at this time upon the financial outlays and the future financial commitments comprehended in the program embodied in the present bill.

In my judgment, most emphatically it is imprudent and dangerous to do so at the present time. With the public debt increasing at a tremendous pace, with a long-continuing yearly deficit in income, it is no time, however meritorious the proposal may be, to begin new and far-reaching financial undertakings. With the unemployment problem still far from solved and relief expenditures continuing to be a primary necessity, it is imprudent, as a sound fiscal policy, to plunge into new undertakings.

QUESTIONS AS TO METHOD

There are, in addition, several questions as to method which are of deep concern. One is the question of whether, with respect to the series of subsidies provided in the bill, the method of their allocation to the several States is fair and equitable to all concerned.

I believe that it is not.

Another is the question of the participation, or the exclusion from participation in the grants, of American youths who attend elementary and secondary schools maintained by private rather than by public funds.

The present bill as reported to the Senate operates to exclude the privately supported schools and their pupils from participation in the authorized distribution of the funds, notwithstanding the fact that the States are to receive their grants of Federal funds not on the basis of school attendance but on the basis (at least in part) of all inhabitants from 5 to 19 years of age.

It is to be noted in this connection that there are 2,638,775 American boys and girls today who are receiving their schooling in private, elementary, and secondary schools—nearly all because of a desire upon the part of their parents to have them taught the fundamental principles of Christianity. To require these children to abandon these schools as a condition of their participation in the bounties which it is proposed to distribute out of the Federal Treasury is unconscionable. It is a discrimination which is indefensible and incidentally runs counter to the considered judgment and recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Education, upon which the present bill is predicated.

PREVIOUS BILLS FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The present effort to initiate a program of direct Federal subsidies for education and Federal oversight of our public-school system is not new. It is a revival upon a larger scale of the objectives sought and the program contained in the bill introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress in 1918 by the late Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and in the Sixty-sixth Congress by Senator Smith and Representative Horace Mann Towner, of Iowa, in the House, and then widely publicized as the Smith-Towner education bill.

It undertook to create a Federal Department of Education and to authorize $100,000,000 annually in Federal subsidies to the States for five specified educational purposes. This became the Towner-Sterling bill in the Sixty-seventh Congress and the Sterling-Reed bill in the Sixty-eighth Congress. These bills never came to vote in either branch of the Congress. Then there was a 10-year interval of subsidence so far as Congress was concerned in these demands for Federal subsidies to education.

POLICY OF ASSISTANCE TO YOUTHS RATHER THAN SCHOOLS ADOPTED

Meantime the Federal Government was not showing any disposition to ignore the needs of the youth of our land nor to be ungenerous in financial provisions for their assistance. Two major programs were initiated and are now being maintained on a semipermanent basis, through which the Federal Government is attempting to meet the needs of youth for aid, for work experience and for guidance, and for educational training.

One of these is the Civilian Conservation Corps for unemployed youths of welfare families and for which upward of $300,000,000 is now being appropriated annually; and the other is the National Youth Administration for youths of welfare families at school, which is costing upward of $50,000,000 annually. It is to be noted that in the distribution of these funds no distinction is made against students attending private schools.

* * * * *

CONCLUSION

I do not subscribe to the doctrine that because of public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare that they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the National Government.

Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported.

We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education.

We cannot undertake to subsidize our public schools out of the Federal Treasury and still leave the schools free of the taint of Federal control. Federal domination of education will be the ultimate and, in my opinion, the inevitable consequence. The present bill is the opening wedge—the camel's nose under the tent.

Let it be remembered that the most potent weapon of dictators and revolutionists is the control of the schools and the education of the youth. Let us be on our guard against putting the public schools in our own land under the yoke of a centralized bureaucracy and thereby provide the mechanism for possible abuse in the years to come.

And if these reasons were not enough for the rejection of the present bill and others of its kind, let us give heed to the financial

implications. The appropriations authorized by the present bill over a 6-year period aggregate $900,000,000, an average of $150,000,000 annually.

This is only the beginning. The advocates of this program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States for educational purposes freely concede that very much larger Federal subsidies in years to come will be essential if the objective sought—of equalized educational opportunities—is to be attained.

In my judgment it is utterly unconscionable at this time of dire need and general business depression to superimpose this new and permanent financial load upon the already staggering total of Federal expenditures for relief, better housing, national defense, and the other long list of Federal activities and Federal responsibilities.

Where is this new money to come from? It will come in the first instance from new loans floated by the Treasury to be met in years to come, sometime, somehow, by taxation. The money is not in reality a gift by the Federal Government to the local communities for their schools. It comes in the end out of the pockets of all our citizens in taxes, direct or indirect, drawn into the Federal Treasury and then passed back in the guise of a gift but with strings attached—the strings of Federal control.

If we are to spend increased sums of money for education of our youth it must be provided in the end by the people, out of their earnings and their savings. Let the people determine the amount with their eyes open and let them regulate and oversee the spending of it, in their own way.

I have already said the apportionment of the funds to the several States under the formula contained in the present bill is in my view open to serious criticism and is patently inequitable.

RICH AND POOR STATE

Aside from the underlying implications of nationalization of education, the financial aspects of this Federal subsidy program is in the final analysis a device whereby it is intended that funds shall be siphoned out of the communities and the States that are presumed to be rich and poured into the communities and the States that are presumed to be poor, via the Federal Treasury.

The cost of education is one of the principal expenditures of the State and local governments. It is the chief item in the financial budgets of States and their municipal subdivisions. Tremendous financial sacrifices are made by some States and communities to maintain a reasonably high standard of education. Staggering costs are met by many citizens with meager incomes to provide an education for their children in private educational institutions because of a particular or special training desired which the public schools cannot provide. Upon what principle of justice can the people of such States or communities have to place an additional tax burden on them in order to improve the educational system of some other State, unwilling or disinterested in striving for the best educational facilities?

In many States the principal source of revenue for support of the public educational system is the tax on real estate. In communities where the valuation on real estate for taxation purposes is high and the tax rate is also high, better educational systems exist. In communities where the valuation on real estate for taxation purposes is low and the tax rate is also low, inferior educational facilities prevail. This is true even within the States. We are now attempting to make the first pay more taxes to help the latter group or else lower their standards to help bring up the standards of the latter. They are "bled white," now. Many of our large cities today are in desperate financial circumstances. Why punish them because of their generous financial sacrifices in the past by demanding aid from them for those communities which may have made little or no effort in the past?

Statistics have been compiled by students of taxation which indicate that there is a variation in the various States of the ratio of existing true value of general property from 20 to 125 percent. The same spread also exists between the several States and their subdivisions in the tax rate levied on general property. Some States have income taxes and others have none; some States have sales taxes and others none. Indeed, there are a great variety of taxes that some States have that others do not have, the revenue from which, in many States, goes into the general fund out of which educational systems are maintained. I again inquire, How can you define a "poor" State needing Federal aid for educational purposes unless you take into account the burdens already assumed by some States and communities and the burdens that other States and communities have refused to assume for educational purposes by high assessed values and taxes levied against those values and the many special taxes imposed to maintain, directly or indirectly, the educational system of a particular community or State?

In other words, why should the taxpayers of the communities, who taxed themselves excessively to maintain high standards of education, be further taxed to assist in uplifting the educational systems in the so-called poorer communities—"poorer" because in many instances their tax values and tax rates are low?

It is either the financial limitations which States and communities impose upon themselves—and have a right to do—or actual neglect in some cases, that is responsible in many cases for the so-called substandard school. If property is valued much below its real value for taxation purposes and but a small percentage of the State or community income is expended for educational purposes, how can it be claimed a community or State is poor and needs assistance from another State that is expending generously upon its educational system?

The people of one State have the right to demand, before having additional taxes imposed upon them to help improve such a distinctly local function as education, that the valuation of real estate for taxation purposes and the money raised by taxation for educational purposes be equalized everywhere and operated on pro rata basis.

What this bill is undertaking to do is to actually punish by further taxation the States, communities, and citizens who have sacrificed most in the past to improve the educational opportunities for their children. This means that to apply this plan of national aid to education, we must enter into the field of interference with what has been the most basic and fundamental of all local rights—the right of allowing people to levy taxes according to their own needs and desires.

For all of the above reasons, I dissent from this bill and urge its rejection.

DAVID I. WALSH.

I concur in general with the views set forth in this minority report.

VIC DONAHEY.

TABLE SHOWING RANGE IN EXPENDITURES OF CITIES

I submit some illustrations of the extensive range in expenditures by different cities, for public-school education. These figures were taken from a publication entitled "Per Capita Costs in City Schools, 1936–37," published by the Office of Education, Department of the Interior.

Educational expenses per pupil

Of 68 cities over 100,000 population:	
High: Yonkers, N. Y.	$155.17
Low: Norfolk, Va.	51.32
Average	112.08
Of 82 cities, 30,000 to 99,999 population:	
High: New Rochelle, N. Y.	198.09
Low: Gadsden, Ala.	28.62
Average	87.04
Of 79 cities, 10,000 to 29,999 population:	
High: Hempstead, N. Y.	137.86
Low: Waycross, Ga.	27.17
Average	69.37
Of 79 cities, 2,500 to 9,999 population:	
High: Swarthmore, Pa.	166.44
Low: Dublin, Ga.	27.90
Average	73.26
Average of 308 cities	105.60

EDUCATION EXPENSES OF STATES

I submit some figures taken from the financial statistics of State and local governments, published in 1932 by the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Only a few States indicate the percent of education expense and therefore this information is not available.

State	Total revenue	Education expenses	Percent
New York	$1,388,734,000	$381,350,000	27
Georgia	99,829,000	10,637,000	10
Massachusetts	384,019,000	81,008,000	21
Ohio	506,534,000	124,747,000	24
Wisconsin	256,457,000	65,787,000	25
Nevada	12,568,000	3,745,000	30

SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF WORLD PEACE—STATEMENT BY CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT GROUPS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on October 6, 1943, distinguished representatives of the three major religious groups of the country—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—signed an identical statement of seven principles of world peace. Each group has prefaced the statement with a special introduction to indicate its special approach to these seven principles. This is a welcome event in the present war for a peaceful and just world. The statement is as follows:

1. The moral law must govern world order: The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The rights of the individual must be assured: The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected: The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The rights of minorities must be secured: National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and

cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized: An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law, (b) guarantee the faithful fulfilment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary, (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic cooperation must be developed: International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

7. A just social order within each state must be achieved: Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

The Protestant introduction is as follows:

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of good will. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the following proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian Gospel.

It and the statement were signed by the following:

Rt. Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, New York City, president, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church.

Rev. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard, Cleveland, Ohio, moderator, General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches.

Rev. P. O. Bersell, Minneapolis, Minn., president Lutheran Augustana Synod and National Lutheran Council.

Bishop A. R. Clippinger, Dayton, Ohio, president, Board of Administration of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ.

Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, New York City, moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp, Bethlehem, Pa., president, Provincial Elders' Conference of the Moravian Church.

Rev. L. W. Goebel, Chicago, president, General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Rev. C. E. Lemmon, Columbia, Mo., president, International Convention of the Disciples of Christ.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Boston, Mass., secretary, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Rev. W. W. Peters, McPherson, Kans., moderator, General Conference of the Church of the Brethren.

Rev. Jacob Prins, Grand Rapids, Mich., president, General Synod of the Reformed Church in America.

Rev. Donald W. Richardson, Richmond, Va., moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South).

Rev. Joseph C. Robbins, Wollaston, Mass., president, Northern Baptist Convention.

Rev. Albert N. Rogers, Yonkers, N. Y., president, General Conference of the Seventh Day Baptist Churches.

Bishop John S. Stamm, Harrisburg, Pa., president, Board of Bishops of the Evangelical Church.

Allen U. Tomlinson, Whittier, Calif., presiding clerk of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends.

Bishop P. A. Wallace, Brooklyn, N. Y., senior bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

Bishop James C. Baker, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman, International Missionary Council.

Frank S. Bayley, Seattle, Wash., president, National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations.

Rev. G. Pitt Beers, New York City, chairman, Christian Commission for Camp and Defense Communities.

Mrs. J. D. Bragg, St. Louis, Mo., president, Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Board of Missions.

Dr. Arlo A. Brown, Madison, N. J., chairman, International Council of Religious Education.

Rev. Rex S. Clements, Bryn Mawr, Pa., president, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rev. Charles E. Diehl, Memphis, Tenn., chairman, National Commission on Church Related Colleges.

Dr. John Foster Dulles, New York City, chairman, Federal Council's Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace.

Rev. Robert M. Hopkins, Indianapolis, Ind., president, United Christian Missionary Society.

Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa., chairman, American Friends Service Committee.

John T. Manson, New Haven, Conn., president, American Bible Society.

Rev. William P. Merrill, New York City, president, Church Peace Union.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta, Ga., president, Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

Dr. John R. Mott, New York City, honorary chairman, International Missionary Council.

Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Albany, N. Y., president, American Council, World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches.

Commissioner Edward J. Parker, New York City, National Commander of the Salvation Army.

Mrs. Norman Vincent Peale, New York City, president, Home Missions Council of North America.

Rev. Charles P. Proudfit, Chicago, president, Council of Church Boards of Education.

Dr. Leland Rex Robinson, Bronxville, N. Y., president, American Committee for Christian Refugees.

Rev. Russell H. Stafford, Boston, Mass., president, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Rev. Henry P. Van Dusen, New York City, president, American Association of Theological Schools.

Rev. A. Livingston Warnshuis, Bronxville, N. Y., chairman, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

Rev. Luther A. Weigle, New Haven, Conn., chairman, World's Sunday School Association.

Miss Amy Ogden Welcher, Hartford, Conn., president, United Council of Church Women.

Rev. Herbert L. Willett, Wilmette, Ill., president, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity.

Also the following representatives of eastern orthodox churches:

Most Rev. Antony Bashir, Brooklyn, N. Y., Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church.

Rt. Rev. Bohdan, New York City, bishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America.

Bishop William Y. Bell, Cordele, Ga., president, Board of Evangelism, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church (after Bishop Tucker).

Rev. Frederick May Eliot, Boston, president, American Unitarian Association (after Dr. Coffin).

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City, chairman, Christian Conference on War and Peace (after John T. Manson).

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, Philadelphia, president, International Society of Christian Endeavor (after Mrs. Peale).

Charles P. Taft II, Cincinnati, Ohio, chairman, Friends of the World Council of Churches (after Dr. Stafford).

The Jewish introduction is as follows:

The American Synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the following principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the Kingdom of God." The Synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

It and the statement were signed by the following:

Dr. Israel Goldstein, New York City, president, Synagogue Council of America.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein, New York City, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Hebrew Union College.

Rabbi Saul Silber, Chicago, Ill., president, Hebrew Theological College.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, New York City, president, Jewish Institute of Religion.

Rabbi William Drazin, Savannah, Ga., president, Rabbinical Council of America.

Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Pittsburgh, Pa., president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Louis M. Levitsky, Newark, N. J., president, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, St. Louis, Mo., chairman, Commission on Justice and Peace of Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Joseph Zeitlin, New York City, chairman, Social Justice Commission of Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Louis J. Moss, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, United Synagogue of America.

Adolph Rosenberg, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mrs. Isidore Freedman, New York City, president, Women's Branch of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Mrs. Hugo Hartmann, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Mrs. Samuel Spiegel, New York City, president, Women's League of United Synagogue of America.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, New York City.

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston, Tex.

Dr. Samuel Nirenstein, New York City, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations (after Louis J. Moss).

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D. C.

Rabbi B. Benedict Glazer, Detroit, Mich.

Rabbi Samuel H. Goldenson, New York City.

Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein, New York City.

Rabbi Morris Goldstein, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Julius Gordon, University City, Mo.

Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi James G. Heller, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rabbi Leo Jung, New York City.

Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan, New York City.

Rabbi C. E. Hillel Kauvar, Denver, Colo.

Rabbi Jacob Kohn, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Isaac Landman, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi B. L. Levinthal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi Felix A. Levy, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, New York City.

Rabbi Edgar Magnin, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Abraham A. Neuman, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, New York City.

Rabbi Irving F. Reichert, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Milton Steinberg, New York City.

Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, New York City.

The Catholic introduction is as follows:

> We present for the consideration of all men of good will the following postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

It and the statement were signed by the following:

Most Reverend Edward Mooney, Archbishop of Detroit, chairman, administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Most Reverend Samuel Alphonsus Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, vice chairman, administrative board, N. C. W. C., chairman, Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Points.

Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo, chairman, social action department, N. C. W. C., honorary president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Most Reverend Edwin Vincent Byrne, Archbishop of Santa Fe.

Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, Archbishop of Los Angeles.

Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, Archbishop of Baltimore and Washington.

Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, Archbishop of Portland, Oreg.

Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, Archbishop of San Antonio.

Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O. P., Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Most Reverend John J. Mitty, Archbishop of San Francisco.

Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans.

Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, Bishop of Ukrainian Greek Catholic Diocese, Philadelphia.

Most Reverend John A. Duffy, Bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.

Most Reverend John M. Gannon, Bishop of Erie, Pa.

Most Reverend Richard O. Gerow, Bishop of Natchez, Miss.

Most Reverend Aloisius J. Muench, Bishop of Fargo, N. Dak.

Most Reverend John F. Noll, Bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind.

Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, Bishop of Kansas City, Mo.

Most Reverend John B. Peterson, Bishop of Manchester, N. H.

Most Reverend Charles Hubert Le Blond, Bishop of St. Joseph, Mo. (after Bishop Gerow).

Most Reverend James H. Ryan, Bishop of Omaha, Nebr.

Most Reverend Basil Takach, Bishop (Greek rite), Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Most Reverend Emmet M. Walsh, Bishop of Charleston, S. C.

Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, Bishop-elect of Grand Rapids, Mich.

Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J., Denver, Colo., Regis College.

Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., Baltimore, Md., St. Mary's Seminary.

Rev. Hugh A. Donohue, San Francisco, Calif.

Rev. Vincent C. Donovan, O. P., New York City.

Rev. Cyprian Emanuel, O. F. M., St. Louis, Mo., Franciscan Monastery.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand, Mundelein, Ill., rector, Mundelein Seminary.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Johnson, Washington, D. C., director, Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rev. John La Farge, S. J., New York City, executive editor, America.

Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., St. Louis, Mo., editor, The Queen's Work.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick J. McCormick, Washington, D. C., rector, Catholic University.

Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., Notre Dame, Ind., president, Notre Dame University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, Washington, D. C., director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Washington, D. C., Catholic University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Matthew Smith, Denver, Colo., editor, Denver Catholic Register.

Rev. Edward V. Stanford, O. S. A., Villanova, Pa., president, Villanova College.

Rev. Paul F. Tanner, Washington, D. C., director, Youth Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mrs. Robert A. Angelo, York, Pa., president, National Council of Catholic Women.

Frederick P. Kenkel, St. Louis, Mo., director, Central Bureau, Catholic Central Verein.

Francis P. Matthews, Omaha, Nebr., Supreme Knight, Knights of Columbus.

Francis E. McMahon, Notre Dame, Ind., president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Charles P. O'Donnell, Washington, D. C., chairman, Post-War World Committee, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Wilbert J. O'Neill, Cleveland, Ohio, president, National Council of Catholic Men.

Harold A. Stevens, New York City, president, Catholic Inter-racial Council.

Let me point out something of the significance of the three separate groups of signers.

The protestant signers lead off with the president of the Federal Council of Churches, himself the Episcopal Bishop of Virginia and head of the federation of the chief Protestant bodies of the United States. The Jewish signers lead off with Rabbi Israel Goldstein, head of the Synagogue Council of America, which is a federation of the chief rabbinical bodies of this country embracing the Jewish religious groups of the United States. The

first Catholic signers are Archbishop Mooney of Detroit, the chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, a central organization of the Catholic Church in the United States; Archbishop Stritch of Chicago, chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Points; and Bishop Altar of Toledo, chairman of the department of the Welfare Conference and honorary president of the unofficial organization that deal with this critical subject.

In examining the statement one notices at once its wide compass. The program begins with a declaration of the sovereignty of God over peoples and over the world. It passes on to treat in three points of the rights of persons, minorities, and subject nations. It goes on to proclaim in two points the necessity of world governmental organization and world economic collaboration for world justice and world peace. It closes with a separate principle on the internal life of each country.

In examining the principles it will be noticed that they are really principles. These religious leaders are not telling the citizens of the country or Congress or the Executive the detatils of world organization or the detailed methods of economic action. They are thus not invading the sphere of either government or the citizen or the economic forces of the country. But they do insist on their prerogative of teaching the law of God to the people of the country and to persons in positions of responsibility in the Government.

It will be noted also that all the three religious groups have agreed on an identical statement. Each would add, no doubt, additional points. Each in its introduction gives a special reason for affirming them. But the seven principles are identical with each group.

The three religions which speak to us have a long record of separate adherence to all of these seven points. They have not signed this identical statement without a record of long and separate thought in their search to state briefly and tellingly basic points of the law of God for the nations.

This statement of seven principles of peace confirms the deepest and best aims of our country in this war. We entered it, and the war itself struck the world, because the nations were not following these principles. We shall have World War No. 3 within another 25 years if the countries again reject these principles. Should only the United States reject them, World War No. 3 will quickly come, so important is the United States in the discordant family of nations.

The first of the prinicples declares the supremacy of God and his law over nations and over the world. Statesmen and whole countries have long led a kind of Dr. Jekyll-and-Mr. Hyde existence. In their personal lives they have believed in one code and in many respects a good code. In the relations among nations and in economic life, they have either believed in or accepted in practice, a code which as Dr. Jekyll they repudiate. This is the poisoned well from which the nations have drawn up wars that in our time have become world wars. Religious leaders of the country call us back to what is basic if we are not to have a succession of devastating wars and famines that will ruin civilization.

Points two, three, and four deal with the rights of individuals, minorities, and subject and oppressed peoples. These are fundamental in any moral code of the nations.

The Nazis deny human rights. They deny the dignity of man; the internment camps are proof of that. They deny the rights of minorities; their treatment of the Jews is proof of that. They deny the fundamental rights of subject and oppressed peoples; the treatment of the Poles is proof of that.

Yet the non-Nazi world, ourselves included, have not observed the rights of persons, minorities, and subject and colonial peoples. We have been in no way so cruel or so consistently cruel; but we have not always done right, and in not doing right have inflicted not only injustice, but paved the way for war.

There follow two principles or means of assuring the supremacy of the moral law and establishing the rights of man and peoples. One is the principle that international institutions must be established to develop international law, to guarantee treaties and revise them, and to assure collective security. The other is the principle that international economic collaboration must be set up to assist all peoples to obtain an adequate standard of living.

Some, even among those who adhere to international economic collaboration and world organization, might question that these are moral principles. Yet, in fact, they fall into the same class as the moral principle that a country must have a political government. For the necessary means of obtaining an obligatory purpose is itself obligatory under the law of God. An anarchic world is at least as evil as an anarchic country.

This statement of the religious leaders comes at a propitious time. We are still debating what forms of world governmental organization and economic collaboration we shall help to set up after this war so as to prevent the recurrence of World War No. 3. This statement should end any surviving debate among us that world governmental organization and world economic collaboration are not themselves necessary and obligatory and that the United States should not shirk its duty. It should center the debate upon what form of world organization and collaboration is best.

The final point of the seven deals with equilibrium, harmony, and justice within each country for the security of the family, for national collaboration in behalf of the common good, for a decent standard of living for all, and decent conditions of work, and for participation by labor in all decisions affecting labor.

One of the deeper causes of war has been that governments and economic organizations have not succeeded in securing, and sometimes have not even tried to secure, the welfare of the people of their own country. It sometimes happens that governments and peoples, in order to satisfy needs at home which could have been met but were not realized, wage wars of conquest abroad rather than do justice at home. These religious leaders know that injustice at home ends with injustice abroad. They tell us a principle of peace as well as a principle of national decency.

In the past religious leaders and organizations have often joined together upon internal economic life. They have done much to help the people of the country change their minds upon the moral bases of our economic thinking and practice. This is the first time that they have signed their names to an identical statement on the moral bases of peace and world justice. They do so at a most propitious time.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the preambles to the Declaration on World Peace, by the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders whose names are signed to the statement I have just read into the RECORD, namely, the statement setting forth the seven points subscribed to by the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders of our country.

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

PREAMBLES TO THE DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

PROTESTANT

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of good will. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the following proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian gospel.

CATHOLIC

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the following postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

JEWISH

The American synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the following principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the Kingdom of God." The synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish

religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

1. The moral law must govern world order: The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The rights of the individual must be assured: The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected: The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The rights of minorities must be secured: National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized: An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law (b) guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic cooperation must be developed: International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

7. A just social order within each state must be achieved: Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

REEMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, recent newspaper articles on the problems of reemployment and rehabilitation of veterans of World War No. 2, while giving a good general picture of the procedures set up for handling that important question, have inadvertently conveyed the impression that it is only recently that the Government agencies charged with responsibilities in this matter have started their operations.

I believe it is advisable, therefore, to have printed in the RECORD, for the information of the Congress, a synopsis of the manner in which the Government has prepared to fulfill its obligations to the members of the armed forces. The plans for doing so were actually prepared in October 1940, and organization for carrying them out was started in November and December 1940.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a synopsis of the plans, showing what has been done by the Government of the United States looking to the reemployment and rehabilitation of veterans of World War No. 2. The synopsis was prepared by Col. Lewis Sanders, Chief of the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System, under the War Manpower Commission.

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

THE OPERATIONS FOR REEMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

By act of Congress three organizations have been created, each of which is concerned solely with the interests of veterans and are without conflicting obligations. These are:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: Responsible for hospitalization, providing prosthetic appliances, pensions, and for service-connected disabilities vocational rehabilitation.

(b) The Veterans Employment Service: Charged with providing a special employment service for veterans by operating within the United States Employment Service.

(c) The Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System: Established by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and by that act charged with general responsibility for reinstating veterans in their former jobs or assisting them to new jobs.

The Veterans' Administration and the Veterans Employment Service are permanent organizations with many years' experience, and staffed by professionals. They are organized essentially to function under "between wars" conditions and with staffs adequate to meet such conditions.

The Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System is a temporary emergency organization created for war-time conditions only and it will go out of existence after the emergency has ceased, leaving the normal load to be carried by the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans' Employment Service.

All the other agencies dealing with veterans are primarily permanent Government organizations created for the benefit of the entire population and the service they render is on the same basis for veterans and nonveterans alike. Examples are the United States Employment Service and the State vocational rehabilitation agencies.

The Selective Training and Service Act in establishing the Personnel Division (which was renamed the Reemployment Division to avoid confusion with the personnel section existing in all Government departments), gave the Director of Selective Service the option of establishing a division with adequate facilities to accomplish the task, or of utilizing the services of existing Government agencies and of accepting the services of State and private agencies. The latter policy was adopted.

The Reemployment Division has therefore been constituted primarily as a planning, liaison, and inspection organization and has confined its operating sections to a volunteer system adapted to supplement and support the existing Government agencies without duplicating or rivaling them.

The two volunteer groups of the Reemployment Division are:

(a) The reemployment committeemen; a minimum of two per local board with others added as the volume of work requires: At this date there are over 15,000 reemployment committeemen engaged in supervising the interests of the returning veterans.

The function of the reemployment committeeman is to act as the personal friend and adviser and liaison agent for the returning veteran in the latter's home community. He is not an employment interviewer. He sees that the veteran's records are complete and puts him in touch with the proper Government agency to look after his needs.

He is the direct agent for reinstatement in a former job.

He refers the veteran to the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service, if a new job is wanted, and then follows them up to see that prompt action ensues. If they are unable to place the veteran, then he calls in other resources, which do not conflict with the job-placement work of these two, in order to secure employment. He refers suitable cases to the Veterans' Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, the Red Cross, as the case indicates, and follows them up.

(b) The clearing house committees consist of representatives of every organized civic group in a community which it is thought can contribute to the task of reintegrating the veteran into the civic life of the community. The organization is described more in detail in the attached copy of Reemployment Bulletin No. 1.

The purpose of these committees is to place the organized resources of each community behind the efforts of the reemployment committeemen, the Veterans' Employment Service, and the United States Employment Service in their task of reinstating the veteran in civil life with a satisfactory job.

For details of operation, see attached copy of Reemployment Bulletin No. 1 and reprint of article from Yank, the Army paper.

CHRONOLOGY

Veterans' Administration (formerly Veterans' Bureau) established in 1921.

Veterans' Employment Service established in 1933.

Reemployment Division of Selective Service System: Planning started September 1940, plans approved by the Director of Selective Service November 1940.

Liaison and operating arrangements established with the Army November 1940.

Liaison and permanent working arrangements established with United States Employment Service and Veterans' Employment Service November 1940.

Liaison and working arrangements established with the Red Cross December 1940.

First operation, December 1940: Instructions sent to all State directors of selective service as to plans for handling reemployment problems.

Second operation, January 1941: Special registration offered men called by Selective Service at United States employment offices.

Third operation, March 1941: Circularizing of the Army for the Federal Security Agency to secure information protecting the men's unemployment insurance.

Fourth operation: About April 1941 for the Department of Agriculture regarding farm loans; later abandoned by the Department of Agriculture.

Fifth operation: Completion of appointments for minimum number of reemployment committeemen with each local board and issuance of detailed instruction to committeemen as to performance of their duties.

Sixth operation, September to December 1941, discharge of more than 100,000 men from the Army because over 28 years of age. At the request of the Reemployment Division the Veterans Employment Service together with the United States Employment

Service opened interviewing offices in more than 50 camps and traveling offices to all other camps, to interview and refer to jobs the men being discharged. (These offices were established and operating within 16 days after the first conference on the subject.) The Reemployment Division supplied the Army with forms for recording the discharged man's education, job experience, job preference. It also furnished each man (through the Army distribution system) with a letter advising him of his reemployment rights and the facilities set up for his use by the Government. After Pearl Harbor, the number of discharges from the armed forces dropped abruptly, and at the same time, due to the rapid expansion of war industries, work opportunities increased rapidly Hence those who were discharged found employment without difficulty and the reemployment load was correspondingly light for several months.

Seventh operation, establishment of National Clearing House Committee, October 1942.

Eighth operation, October 1942, set up a system of interviewing men before their discharge from Army or Navy hospitals. Interviews conducted by Red Cross, diagnosis supplied by Army and Navy medical authorities, forms supplied by Reemployment Division which then transmitted the information to the proper reemployment committeemen, the Veterans Employment Service or the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Administration, etc.

Ninth operation, May 1943 and continuing, Veterans Employment Service asked to take over the pre-discharge interviews in the hospitals with interviewers trained especially for this purpose. The Reemployment Division agreed to turn this work over to them as fast as they had trained personnel available to take over each hospital. They are likewise supporting them before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in requests for additional funds for this work.

Tenth operation, September 1943, in cooperation with the Adjutant General's Department and with the concurrence of all other agencies interested have developed a new report of discharge which will shortly go into effect. One of the new forms takes the place of 12 forms and letters now having to be made out with each discharge.

VOLUME OF WORK

An average of 6,500 discharges per week are now being handled through the Reemployment Division in cooperation with the various operating agencies previously mentioned. Copy of report attached. The number of cases is steadily increasing and is expected to reach 10,000 per week by the end of the year.

COORDINATION

As a result of planning and close coordination, during the past 3 years, the Army and Navy, the Reemployment Division, Veterans' Employment Service, United States Employment Service, Veterans' Administration, State vocational rehabilitation systems, the Red Cross, Army Emergency Relief and the newly formed Clearing House Committee are working together under a closely integrated program. While there are many details still to be perfected they are only those that always require time and experience and no defects have developed in the basic features of the plan.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Seventy-eighth Congress, by Public Law 16, enacted March 24, 1943, charged the Veterans' Administration with vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disabilities. They have been rapidly organizing their facilities for this since passage of this act and are also speeding up their procedures as much as possible under existing law for rapid action on claims presented by World War No. 2 veterans.

For many years the Veterans' Administration has cooperated with the Red Cross, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled Veterans' Association in providing facilities for them to prosecute pension and disability claims for veterans. This service has been rendered by the veterans' organizations and the Red Cross to servicemen free of charge.

The Veterans' Administration is cooperating with the other agencies concerned to integrate procedures so as to eliminate loss of time to the maximum possible extent.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Established in 1933 as a Federal agency, operating within the United States Employment Service, but with its own special staff, having representatives in each State, for the purpose of insuring that veterans receive adequate and prompt attention from the Federally financed State employment offices.

This service is now expanding its aid to veterans through placing especially trained interviewers in the Army and Navy hospitals as rapidly as personnel can be obtained, for the purpose of giving preexit interviews in order that the man discharged for physical disabilities may have full advantage of occupational advice and guidance prior to discharge, and that he may be placed at as early a date as possible in contact with a job, or the proper rehabilitation agency.

The results of these interviews are fully coordinated with the United States Employment Service and with the reemployment committeemen, making their joint service available to the veteran. The service is being established with the approval and cooperation of the Reemployment Division.

THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Originally this was under the Department of Labor, then transferred to the Federal Security Agency. It comprised a national organization which planned, supervised, and set standards, and through which State-operated employment agencies received the bulk of their financing. In December 1941, the employment system was federalized, and all the employees of the State agencies went directly on the Federal pay roll, but with salaries limited to the State level. The return of the agencies to the several States is required by the Congress after the termination of the emergency.

The United States Employment Service was set up to afford a Nation-wide cost-free employment service to all citizens alike, without discrimination or special favors.

As the emergency has increased, the United States Employment Service has steadily become more and more an agency for supplying the industrial war effort with manpower.

In December 1942, the Veterans' Employment Service, United States Employment Service, and the Selective Service System, with its Reemployment Division, were all transferred to the War Manpower Commission under its Chairman, Gov. Paul V. McNutt, and since then the U. S. E. S. has become the direct war agency for handling the supply of manpower to war industries, and the load on it has increased to many times its normal peacetime load.

THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The War Manpower Commission continued the working arrangements and the division of the fields of activity already existing between the Veterans' Employment Service, the United States Employment Service, and the Reemployment Division as they existed before they were all brought under the authority of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. This re-grouping of the agencies, has, therefore, not in any way interfered with the coordinated teamwork already established between them. As experience has been gained through actual operations in the field, the liaison and teamwork between these agencies has been steadily improved as defects have been discovered and eliminated.

OPERATING RESULTS

Since June 1940 to date, approximately 700,000 men have been released from the armed services.

Up to September 1941, the number of discharges was small, and the men released were absorbed by industry almost without effort on their part.

Commencing in September, owing to the change in the Selective Training and Service Act by Congress, as of July 1, 1941, the Army transferred to the Reserve over 100,000 men over 28 years of age. The referral offices established by the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service for the convenience of these men have been previously described. The bulk of these men proved to have already been contacted by employers, mainly their old employers, and had jobs before discharge. Only about 10 percent of them actually sought assistance through the reemployment committeemen. Men seeking return to their old jobs were assisted, when they desired, by their reemployment committeemen, and those seeking new jobs were placed through the United States Employment Service, where the application is followed through by the reemployment committeeman.

Then came Pearl Harbor, after which the flow of men from the armed forces materially decreased, while the pace of industry was stepped up tremendously, and men were literally "sucked up" into war jobs as fast as they were released from the Army, with the result that very few cases came before the reemployment committeemen.

In the fall of 1942, the rate of discharge from the armed forces began to mount, as the strain of intensive training for war produced its inevitable results, in minor physical breakdowns which, while rendering men unfit for full military service, in the main did not incapacitate them for full industrial service.

At this time, the hospital interviewing service was inaugurated, as previously described, and out of 125,000 reported discharged, nearly 60 percent have responded to the inquiries of the reemployment committeemen, as against only some 10 percent in the fall of 1941.

The same procedure as was applied to the original discharges is continued; namely, the reemployment committeemen handling directly the placement of veterans in their old jobs and referring applications for new jobs to the United States Employment Service, and backing up and assisting that service in the placement of these veterans, as well as keeping track of the veterans' interests to insure that their needs receive prompt attention.

The new clearing house committees which will comprise representatives of every suitable civic organization in each community will support the work of the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service, and the reemployment committeemen by placing behind them the organized resources of each community. These clearing house committees will be particularly charged with straightening out local disputes involving reemployment rights in accordance with principles established by the national headquarters in Washington, in creating job opportunities for handicapped men, both veterans and civilians, and making these available through the Employment Service, and of distributing the employment load throughout the community when jobs become scarce.

These committees will also be closely integrated with such bodies as the committee for

economic development and other groups engaged in the creation of jobs.

A leading example of the teamwork spirit animating all of the agencies involved in servicing the veterans in their reintegration into civil life is that in New York City, where all conditions are extreme, including the fact that until very recently the city has been a surplus labor market with several hundred thousands unemployed, making veteran placement the most difficult in the country.

The New York City director of selective service has established a reemployment advisory office which is staffed by volunteers under a paid director. This is closely integrated with the veterans' employment representative and the United States employment office, the latter sending over their experts to train the volunteers and the volunteers being furnished United States Employment Service offices to assist in their operations. The reemployment advisory office has a volunteer staff of physicians and psychiatrists and occupational guidance experts who carry on work which relieves the United States employment office of a considerable load and facilitates its operations. The employment services send their interviewers over to conduct employment interviews of veterans at the reemployment advisory office.

The regional director of the War Manpower Commission for New York State has established a permanent rehabilitation committee to promote rehabilitation of both military and nonmilitary handicapped people. On this committee are representatives of the principal welfare agencies and foundations of New York City and representatives of selective service, including a representative from national headquarters of the Reemployment Division. The War Department has cooperated with this committee in the matter of a test to determine what can be done in the case of a man rejected at the induction station for physical or mental disabilities.

ENFORCEMENT OF VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

A coordinated team has been created to service this field consisting of the Department of Justice, which is represented in the field by the local United States attorneys, the reemployment committeemen, the officer at each State headquarters charged with reemployment problems, and the Reemployment Division at the national headquarters of Selective Service in the War Manpower Commission.

Decisions as to interpretations of the act in regard to cases presenting special problems are made in Washington to insure uniformity of decisions and avoid the confusion that would inevitably ensue from having 48 interpretations of the same problem which would be the case if decisions were made at the State level. Aside from this matter of interpretation of the act, its operation is completely decentralized to the local level.

The fullest cooperation has been afforded by both employers and organized labor in carrying out the intent of Congress as covered by the reemployment provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Both the responsible heads of the national labor unions and the rank and file of the locals have cooperated in the return of veterans to their old job; even in cases where they did not feel that the veteran was actually entitled to reinstatement under strict interpretation of the law and where they have waived their own interest in so doing.

Employers have met the act in the same liberal spirit and have tended to perform more than their own legal obligations rather than to attempt to construe the act in a narrow and limited spirit.

Where opposition has been encountered with either employers or organized labor it has always been in subordinate levels where men were not in a position to have a broad view and a sense of perspective and they have been invariably reversed by their superiors when the problem was taken to the top men.

In only one case has it been necessary to place the matter in the hands of United States Attorney for prosecution and that case was merely filed and without going to trial the employer reinstated the man with $648 back pay for the time he had been kept out of his job.

In all other cases except the 10 or 15 current cases, which are in process of adjustment, the man has been reinstated in his job with the full cooperation of the employer or labor union in every case where the Reemployment Division has felt that the man was entitled to his job, an amicable discussion of the case having been all that was necessary in order to insure reinstatement, except some three or four cases in which it seemed helpful to mention the legal powers available to enforce the provisions of the act.

This does not mean that every veteran desirous of returning to his old job has been reinstated by his employer, since not all men refused their old jobs have reported their cases to their reemployment committeeman.

The principal difficulty in serving the veterans is their habit of not making contact with the established Government agencies when they need assistance, particularly in this critical labor market where there are several jobs open to each man able to work. Many of them if refused their old job simply get a new job in preference to presenting their case. Others have reported their cases to us only after they had given up their old jobs and obtained a new job.

Through the clearing house committees with the aid of the veterans' associations it is expected to close this gap through arranging a personal interview with each returned veteran to insure that he is fully aware of all the services provided for his benefit by the Government and to place him in contact with them if he is in any need of assistance in solving his problems.

REHABILITATION

The vocational rehabilitation of the veteran with a service-connected disability is now provided for by the authority recently conferred on the Veterans' Administration. There remains the need for a wartime procedure which will eliminate the time now required for the Veterans' Administration to legally assume the expense of treatment. Some enabling legislation may be needed to permit them to accomplish this.

The Labor Federal Security Appropriations Act (Public, 135, 78th Cong.) has now provided funds for the various State vocational rehabilitation agencies through the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency so that they can provide rehabilitation for nonservice-connected disabilities.

The coordinated plans already in operation provide for channeling the cases of veterans requiring rehabilitation to the proper one of these two agencies. After rehabilitation has been accomplished the same teamwork is available for securing a suitable job for the rehabilitated veteran.

As the size of the organizations and the scope of their operations have been steadily increased in the past to meet an increasing load so it is expected to increase the voluntary personnel and add additional functions as the need arises in connection with still larger numbers of veterans to serve. All of this was provided for in the original plans adopted in October 1940.

Mr. HILL. The following is the latest Instructions to Reemployment Committeemen, numbered Bulletin No. 1, which brings up to date instructions issued to them in memorandum form more than 2 years ago. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1943.

To State Directors, Local Boards, Reemployment Committeemen:

From inquiries received from a number of State headquarters, some of which have forwarded questions from reemployment committeemen, it seems advisable to issue a new bulletin on the work of the Reemployment Division.

A new procedure covering discharges from the Army will go into effect about the first of January, which is expected to be followed shortly by adoption of a somewhat similar procedure by the Navy and Marine Corps. Accordingly, a new Reemployment Bulletin No. 1 has been prepared covering the work of the Reemployment Division under the new procedure. Sufficient copies are being forwarded to you to furnish one for each local board in your State and one for each reemployment committeeman and a reserve stock for future uses.

In addition to the new procedure covered in the Reemployment Bulletin No. 1, the War Department has under consideration, and has given tentative approval to, a policy under which it will in the future refuse to furnish medical records of veterans to prospective employers, even though accompanied by a waiver from the veteran. Since the military exit examinations are far more thorough than those given by any employer, access by employers to these records is tantamount to saying that the veteran must pass a far more thorough physical examination than the nonveteran. The cases in which employers are demanding Army or Navy medical records of veterans should be reported to this headquarters.

It would be appreciated if you would forward this bulletin to each newly appointed reemployment committeeman at the time of his appointment.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

REEMPLOYMENT BULLETIN NO. 1 ISSUED SEPTEMBER 29, 1943—SUBJECT: REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

I. REEMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATION

1. Statutory authority: Paragraph (g) of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, directs that a Personnel Division[1] be established to protect the reemployment rights of veterans, and pursuant to that mandate, the Director of Selective Service established the Reemployment Division. This Division is charged with the responsibility of replacing in former positions, or aiding in securing new positions for, those persons satisfactorily completing service in the armed forces. In fulfilling its functions, the Reemployment Division is authorized to utilize the services of any or all departments and any or all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the States and Territories. Reemployment rights apply to all honorably discharged veterans, male and female, whether inducted,

[1] Called "Personnel Division" in the act; name changed to "Reemployment Division" to avoid confusion with the personnel division existing in all Government departments, including the Selective Service System itself.

enlisted, or commissioned, subsequent to May 1, 1940.

2. War Shipping Administration included: At the request of the War Shipping Administration, the Reemployment Division of Selective Service will handle all the reemployment benefits accorded men discharged from the Merchant Marine pursuant to Public Law 87 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

3. Reemployment program decentralized: The Reemployment Division has been and is operating under a decentralized plan, in which operations are at the local level, supervision is at the State level, and planning and interpretations of the act are at the national level. At the local level, reemployment committeemen attached to each local board serve as the agents and counselors of the veterans with direct responsibility to restore them to their old jobs and serve as liaison agents and contact men with other Government agencies which provides specific services for the veterans. Clearing house committees are being formed in each community to make available the organized resources of the community in reintegrating veterans into civilian life.

4. National headquarters: National headquarters of the Selective Service System prepares the general plans and makes all decisions in interpreting the application of the act. This is necessary in order to secure uniformity of interpretation, since many organizations affected are interstate and a lack of uniformity in the application of the act would make it unworkable. National headquarters maintains liaison with all the national bodies interested in employment. National headquarters under the new separation procedure, when in effect, will furnish the State headquarters with classified tallies of its reemployment committeemen's reports.

5. State headquarters: State headquarters of the Selective Service System selects and recommends the appointment of the reemployment committeemen, inspects their activities, sees that those not functioning are replaced, and arranges for the appointment of additional committeemen in any locality where the reemployment load necessitates it, the object being to have sufficient committeemen in each locality so that every veteran receives immediate and personal attention to his needs. It transmits the reemployment committeemen's reports to national headquarters. The State clearing house committee, when formed, will maintain liaison with the State director in handling State-wide problems. The service of one officer, in whole or in part, and one full-time secretary should be adequate to handle the reemployment problems at the State level.

6. Local boards: Local boards are the mailing addresses of the reemployment committeemen attached to them, and local boards should refer only honorably discharged veterans who report to them to their reemployment committeemen. The reemployment committeemen should turn over to the local boards their records after final disposition of the cases. In case a reemployment committeeman resigns, all his records should be turned over to the local board for transfer to his successor. Reemployment committeemen are entitled to local board stationery and have the franked mailing privileges of the Selective Service System.

7. Reemployment committeemen: The reemployment committeemen attached to each local board are the veterans' personal representatives, agents, and advisors. They have direct responsibility to return veterans to old jobs, see that they are properly serviced by the Government agencies set up to help them, and report to their State headquarters the disposition of all such cases. They should be informed of the veterans' reemployment rights as specified in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. They should report all reemployment cases with controversies that they cannot adjust to the clearing house committees, when formed, in their respective communities; maintain close liaison with them, and, until these committees are formed, report all such cases to their State headquarters as at present. They should refer all new placement cases to the veterans' employment representatives of the United States Employment Service and follow up each case until satisfactory placement is accomplished. They should, through their community contacts, especially through the clearing house committee, make the organized resources of the communities available in replacing the veterans in civil life, particularly in creating preferential employment opportunities for veterans and occupational opportunities for the disabled.

8. Cooperating agencies: Reemployment committeemen must maintain personal contact with the local representatives of the several governmental agencies which are established to serve the returning veterans and be familiar with their functions. These agencies and their functions are as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: This agency adjudicates pension claims of all honorably discharged persons who served in the active military or naval service after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war. It provides, in service-connected cases, hospitalization, if necessary, and domiciliary care, disability pensions, and vocational rehabilitation of all types, such as shop, commerce, university, etc., and cooperates in eventual placement with the United States Employment Service.

(b) The United States Employment Service: This agency operates under the War Manpower Commission and carries out the policies of the Commission in channeling employment to essential occupations and handles the releases of those transferring from one occupation to another, with the exception of honorably discharged veterans who have the right to reemployment in their old jobs.

(c) The Veterans' Employment Service: This agency has a State employment representative appointed to supervise the veterans' employment representatives attached to each local office of the United States Employment Service, through which the actual placements are made. They are responsible for the employment interests of all veterans registered with the United States Employment Service, except those veterans who desire reemployment in their old jobs.

(d) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency: This agency, in connection with the State department of education in each State, operates vocational training in nonservice-connected cases. It will assist in the training and education of those men who must learn a new trade or profession before returning to a civilian occupation and who do not come under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

(e) Red Cross: The home service of the American Red Cross in every community will assist veterans and their families in solving their personal problems. It is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved with the Veterans' Administration, if this has not been done at the discharging point.

(f) Civil Service Commission: The reemployment committeemen should inform any veteran who is seeking a Federal Civil Service position that he may obtain information regarding such positions at any post office or civil-service office.

(g) Army emergency relief: This agency will extend temporary financial relief to soldiers and their dependents, including veterans discharged since September 16, 1940, in cases that cannot be taken care of by the Red Cross. They can be contacted through each Service Command.

(h) United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis.: This agency will undertake to provide records of courses taken by military personnel while in service, for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies, and will, on application, give to military personnel and those recently discharged special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges.

9. Clearing House Committees.—

(a) Formation and organization: The National Clearing House Committee has been formed and is now organizing State and local clearing house committees. Fifteen National organizations constitute the National Clearing House Committee. In most instances, State clearing house committees will contain most of the organizations represented on the National committee. The clearing house committees are autonomous, and no Government official is eligible for membership, except in ex officio or liaison capacity as may be desired under certain local conditions.

(b) National Clearing House Committee: The National Clearing House Committee consists of representatives from each of the following organizations: American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Disabled American Veterans, Kiwanis International, Lions International, National Association of Manufacturers, National Exchange Club, National Grange, Railway Labor Executive Association—(Invited—acceptance pending). Rotary International, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

(c) State clearing house committees: State clearing house committees, now being formed, will consist initially of representatives from the organizations of the National committee. After the State clearing house committees are formed, they will establish liaison with State headquarters of Selective Service and will organize the local clearing house committees, which in turn will establish liaison with all Government agencies at the local level.

(d) Local clearing house committees: Local clearing house committees are to be organized in all the cities and towns of the Nation. These will consist of representatives of the National Clearing House Committee organizations and such other groups as are available and in position to render assistance in the local communities.

(e) Function of clearing house committees. The functions of the clearing house committees will be to handle, as community problems, all reemployment cases that cannot be adjusted by the reemployment committeemen and to make available the combined resources of the community in supporting the efforts of the reemployment committeemen and the United States Employment Service.

II. REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS AND BENEFITS OF THE DISCHARGED MEN

1. Application may be made at any local board: The discharged man may, at his own option, have his employment problems handled by a reemployment committeeman attached to the local board at which he is registered (if he is a registrant) or by a reemployment committeeman attached to any other local board, if reference to the local board at which he is registered would be inconvenient.

2. Assistance of reemployment committeemen: The veteran with an honorable discharge has the right to the services of his reemployment committeemen in securing re-

instatement in his old job or in assistance in securing a new job through placing him in liaison with the Veterans' Employment Service and United States Employment Service, and for assistance with the Veterans' Administration.

3. Veterans' Administration vocational rehabilitation: Those persons who served in the active military or naval service on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war and are honorably discharged therefrom, have the right to file an application with the Veterans' Administration and are entitled to the following benefits, provided the requirements of the law and regulations issued thereunder are met; (1) Hospitalization and Domiciliary Care. [2](2) Disability pension. [2](3) Vocational rehabilitation. The reemployment committeemen will place such veterans in contact with the Veterans' Administration. The Home Service of the American Red Cross is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved.

III. NEW PROCEDURE AND REPORT OF SEPARATION W. D. A. G. O. FORM 53

(This new form should be in the field by January 1, 1944, and should eliminate duplication of efforts now occurring.)

1. W. D. A. G. O. Form 53.—The Adjutant General, working in conjunction with Selective Service, has developed and adopted a new report of separation officially identified as W. D. A. G. O. Form 53. The servicing of seven forms and five letters has been eliminated and consolidated into the writing of this one simplified form by the discharging authority, six copies being required, which will be a part of the Army's basic discharge procedure.

2. Disposition of W. D. A. G. O. Form 53.—

(a) Insurance notice: To Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. (To be accompanied by soldier's qualification card, W. D. A. G. O. Form 20, when pension claim is made.)

(b) Posting copy: To The Adjutant General's Office, Washington, D. C. (Then to be transmitted to National Headquarters, Selective Service System.)

(c) Board of registration copy: To State director of Selective Service for the State of registration; to be transmitted to the local board of registration.

(d) Reemployment committeeman copy: To the proper State director of Selective Service for transmittal to the reemployment committeeman at the address of employment. (To be accompanied by soldier's qualification card, W. D. A. G. O. 20, when no pension claim is made.)

(e) Veterans' employment representative copy: To the State veterans' employment representative of the War Manpower Commission through the State director of Selective Service for the State shown in item (d) above.

(f) Soldier's copy: Copy to be handed to the discharged soldier. This copy has the soldier's duties, rights, and benefits printed on the back, and will serve as a certificate to identify the soldier with his reemployment committeeman, his veterans' employment representative (whether or not they have received their respective copies); also with the United States Civil Service Commission, and shows that he is entitled to a veteran rights, such as registering as a veteran with the United States Employment Service.

3. Medical information: Diagnosis is on copy for local board of registration. (This is confidential.) Statement of employment handicap is on the forms for the reemployment committeeman and veterans' employment representative. This information is not on the veteran's copy.

[2] In service-connected cases only.

IV. DISPOSITION AND USE OF REEMPLOYMENT COMMITTEEMAN'S COPY OF REPORT OF SEPARATION (W. D. A. G. O. FORM 53)

1. Reemployment committeeman's use of W. D. A. G. O. Form 53: The Report of Separation, W. D. A. G. O. Form 53, and soldier's qualification card, W. D. A. G. O. Form 20, should be retained by the reemployment committeeman for future reference in the event the veteran concerned requires further assistance. The disposition of the case should be noted on the form, including referrals made, together with dates and other pertinent information. Every effort should be made by the reemployment committeeman to make personal contact with the veteran for the purpose of determining whether assistance of any kind is required. Information will be forwarded later regarding special contact service that will be made available through the clearinghouse committees as they are formed. In cases where the veteran reports to a reemployment committeeman before the report of separation on the man concerned is received the reemployment committeeman will accept the soldier's copy as evidence of the veteran's rights to consideration.

2. Reports by reemployment committeeman.—The reemployment committeeman will forward all reports on disposition of cases through State headquarters to national headquarters. These reports on disposition of cases will be made as at present, pending the issuance of a new form to be used for this purpose. Reports should be made as soon as possible, and in no case should they be delayed beyond 30 days from receipt of report of separation.

3. Final disposition of records.—In all closed cases, W. D. A. G. O. Forms 53 and 20 should be deposited with the local boards to be held separately by them.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

Mr. HILL. The following is the current weekly report covering men discharged from the Army and Navy on disability grounds. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEN DISCHARGED FROM ARMY AND NAVY HOSPITALS UNDER C. D. D.'S, WEEK ENDING OCTOBER 9, 1943

Total number of cases: October 1, 1942, through October 9, 1943, 132,606; last week, 125,366.

Number of cases for week: October 4 to October 10, 7,240; last week, 6,011.

Number of cases employed or rehabilitated or did not require assistance: To date, 78,981 (59.5 percent of total); last week, 74,612 (59.9 percent); for week, 4,369; last week, 4,451.

Number of hospitals reporting, 277; Army, 248; Navy, 29.

Mr. HILL. The following is the latest edition of the letter furnished the armed forces to give to each member about to return to civil life. Such a letter has been furnished for distribution ever since September 1941. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

To Each Member of the Armed Forces About To Return to Civil Life:

For your benefit the Government is glad to give you the following information. Section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, provides that the Government will render aid in the replacement in their former positions, or in securing positions for, men who have satisfactorily completed their military or naval service. The carrying out of these provisions of the act is made a part of the responsibility of the Director of Selective Service, and a Reemployment Division in the Selective Service System has been set up to make this part of the act effective. If desiring your former employment and entitled to it, you should apply to former employer within 40 days after discharge.

Attached to each local board in the United States are one or more reemployment committeemen who are to act as your personal representatives in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself upon discharge whether you entered the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as a volunteer or selected man.

There are several Government agencies also involved in aiding you, and the reemployment committeeman cooperates with them all and will act with them on your behalf when you report to him through your local board on your return to your home community. These agencies and their functions for your benefit are as follows:

1. The American Red Cross is the official medium of communication between the people of the United States and the Army and Navy. Field directors at Army and Navy camps and hospitals, and chapters in each home community assist servicemen and veterans and their families in solving their personal and family problems; arrange temporary financial assistance when required; and help in filing and presenting claims for pensions and other Government benefits.

2. The Federal Security Agency, whose Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Division operated by the State Department of Education, provides for the employment adjustment of physically impaired persons.

3. The Veterans' Administration maintains hospitals for the care of men incapable of being rehabilitated to reenter civil life, and provides them with artificial limbs or other appliances, if needed, and handles their pension claims.

4. The United States Employment Service has special veteran placement representatives at all offices and maintains contact with employers and their specific needs.

Your agents then for information and help are:

(a) The Red Cross. While in the hospital, maintain contact with their representative or their camp representative if you are returned to your unit for discharge.

(b) The local reemployment committeeman. Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go, you should establish communication with the reemployment committeeman attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter.

Keep your contacts with them and let them know where you are.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the men in the armed forces are kept informed of reemployment provisions made for their benefit by the Government as far as is practicable during active operations.

Following is a reprint of an article appearing in Yank, which is estimated to have some 3,000,000 readers among the armed forces. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER YOU'RE DISCHARGED?—IF THE ARMY HANDS YOU A C. D. D. TOMORROW, THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM, WHICH PUT YOU IN UNIFORM, WILL SEND YOU BACK TO A GOOD JOB IN CIVILIAN CLOTHES. HERE'S HOW THEY WORK IT

(By Corp. H. N. Oliphant)

Less than 3 months ago on a makeshift cot of planks and dry grass in an improvised field hospital somewhere in the south Pacific, a young corporal from Illinois lay critically wounded.

Although he knew he eventually would recover, the future looked pretty black. An Army doctor had told him that as soon as his condition permitted he would be shipped back to the States for further hospitalization. Then, upon his recovery, he would get a Certificate of Disability Discharge—the same C. D. D. any G. I. might get at any time, whether he's taking an azimuth on a Jap in New Guinea, strafing Nazis in North Africa, or dodging jeeps in a United States replacement center.

The soldier looked down at his right hand. It had got in the way of a Jap slug and two fingers and a thumb had been lopped off. As a former skilled instrument maker, he knew he would never work again at the only trade he knew.

"I got a great future," he said, staring at the three scarred stumps. "With a mitt like that, I'll never be able to make a living."

The doctor tried to reassure him: "It's tough, I know. But you'll make it all right. I'll bet you have a good job lined up before you're even discharged."

"Yeah? Who's gonna toss off that little miracle?"

"The Selective Service System."

"The Selective Service System? Are you kiddin'?"

The doctor wasn't kidding. Today, scarcely 3 months after he was wounded, the ex-corporal is back in civvies, plying a newly mastered trade in an essential industry, living in circumstances better than those he left to don the olive drab.

The Selective Service System, the organization which took him out of civilian life, had put him securely back into it.

The story is being repeated every day as wounded men return to civil life.

Inasmuch as the same machinery ultimately will operate to reestablish all returning Yanks in the Nation's economic and social life, it is a story which specifically affects every one of us—soldier, sailor, marine, and coast guardsman. To get this story, Yank went to the top of the Selective Service System. The doors were thrown wide open. The result is the first inside picture of the unprecedented Reemployment Division, which, under Federal law, has been established to make sure every man honorably discharged from the service either

1. Gets his old job back and keeps it;
2. Gets one just as good and keeps it;
3. Gets a better one after special training at Government expense; or
4. Is properly cared for if unemployable in competitive work.

WHEELS OF THE DRAFT IN REVERSE

Visualize the wheels of selective service turning backward, selectively withdrawing men from service instead of putting them into it. At the war's end, that's what will happen. The entire mechanism of the draft will function in reverse.

Here's how the set-up works.

First of all, to each man, well in advance of his discharge from service, goes an Army occupational and educational record. You are required to fill out this questionnaire, giving the complete dope on your background, training, and experience, to show what kind of work you can do.

In addition, you indicate your preference both as to the type of work you'd like to do and where you'd like to do it. For example, if you were a farmer before the war but have lost interest in milking cows and planting corn, you write down that fact, and it will be seriously considered when your record is acted on.

The form, of course, also includes your military record. In case of casualties, a statement describing any handicap is appended, but this will be confidential and will not be shown to anyone without your O. K. The Reemployment Division then indicates to potential employers whether you can do heavy, medium, or light work.

The next step is a letter from the Selective Service System to all men about to be discharged. This letter points out that the Reemployment Division is no political football to be kicked back and forth by vote-hungry politicians. It is firmly set in Federal law (sec. 8, Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended) and has only one reason for being—to see that you either get your old job back or one just as good or better. To accomplish this, the letter explains, special reemployment committeemen have been appointed to serve on the 6,450 local draft boards in the United States. One of these men—there will be 1 to about every 20 servicemen—will act as your personal representative and will help you get a new start as a civilian. Several other agencies will cooperate with the reemployment committeemen—the American Red Cross, the Federal Security Agency, the Veterans' Administration, and the United States Employment Service. The letter concludes:

"Your agents, then, for information and help are (a) the Red Cross. Maintain contact with their hospital representative or their camp representative. (b) The local reemployment committeeman. Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go, you should establish communication with the reemployment committeeman attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter. Keep your contacts with them, and let them know where you are."

Meanwhile, the information obtained on the Army occupational and educational record is carefully analyzed at national headquarters in Washington and each man is classified according to—

1. His background, training, and experience;
2. His job preference, whether he wants his old job back or wants a new one;
3. His availability for vocational training and rehabilitation;
4. His preferred location;
5. His physical limitations, temporary and permanent.

The original of this form is kept in Washington, and as you return to civilian life every step is recorded so that your progress will be rapid and sensible. A copy of the record is sent to one of the reemployment committeemen of your home-town draft board, and he acts as your adviser and friend, sticking by you until you are satisfactorily reestablished in the community. If you decide to live in another community, you will get the same friendly assistance from local offices of the agencies mentioned above.

On the other hand, if you have a business, profession, or special job waiting for you after your discharge, or if you just want to loaf around for a while, you're completely free to go right to it. There won't be any annoying reports to make, and no officials will bother you in any way. Filling out the Army Occupational and Educational Record is the only thing you're required to do. After that, it's up to you to decide whether you want Federal help in getting a job.

Broadly, according to the Reemployment Division, returning soldiers fit into one of four categories.

First, there are those who want their old jobs back. In most of these cases so far there has been no trouble. Nor is much serious trouble anticipated. If, however, a hitch should develop, say by a former employer's blunt refusal to rehire a veteran, the national headquarters is prepared to step in and use Federal laws to protect the discharged soldier's rights. In cases of this sort they are backed up solidly by the Department of Justice, which, through the United States Attorney General, recently assured Yank that the United States courts and district attorneys will "do everything in their power fully to protect the serviceman's rights."

Here is a recent case to prove this point. A private from Cleveland, Ohio, was given a certificate of disability discharge. He had been an operator in a movie theater. As soon as he got home he reported for work. The employer, either unaware of the law or believing he could violate it, said he was sorry but no go. In the soldier's absence another operator had been broken in, and the employer didn't want to make a change. The ex-private reported this to his reemployment committeeman who in turn reported it to national headquarters. On the following day, the employer received a little note from the Government. In its way it was very charming and—persuasive. Substantially, the meaning of the letter was this: "We have heard that ex-Private G—— applied to you without success for the position he held with your firm before he entered the armed forces to defend his and your country. It is reported that you positively refused to rehire him. We hope, of course, that this report is erroneous, because we're sure you wouldn't want us to turn the matter over to the law-enforcement authorities in the Department of Justice." The ex-private was back in his old booth in less than a week, grinding out the latest Abbott and Costello comedy.

Actually the division has encountered very few uncooperative employers. An official says, "Almost without exception we have found an amazing willingness on the part of employers to cooperate. Large and small, in city and town, these people are playing the game."

Some discharged men want the same kind of jobs they had before their induction but want to work in new and different localities. These cases are all handled by the United States Employment Service, which is in constant touch with all employers and is regularly informed of the specific labor needs in any given region. So far it has been highly successful in placing honorably discharged soldiers.

Some men want to better themselves by further training before going back to work. Others have physical handicaps that require them to learn a new trade or profession. These men are directed to the Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, where at Government expense they are taught the skills of the jobs they want and are best adapted to learn. After their training, the Federal Security Agency with the U. S. E. S. accepts the responsibility of getting them jobs.

Explaining this procedure, one of the district supervisors of the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Frederic G. Elton, told Yank:

"The selection of the type of work is made on the basis of a careful analysis of individual qualifications. It follows, therefore, that these types of jobs are extremely varied and the kind of training equally varied.

"Having determined upon the job the man can do best, the bureau then contracts for the training with the agency best prepared to give that training. It finances the course and supervises the man's progress. It accepts

the responsibility for seeing that he is placed in a job when his training is completed."

Mr. Elton cited a couple of recent cases:

A 20-year-old private was discharged from the Army because of a head injury. His only previous work experience had been as a soda clerk. Aptitude tests were given to find out the kind of a job he was best fitted for. On his record he had written that he wanted to learn a craft of some sort. On the basis of his tests, he was trained in aircraft instrument work. Today he is a production control man with a company manufacturing recording instruments.

Another man, aged 26, was discharged from the Marines because of stomach ulcers incurred in service. Before his induction he had been doing clerical work. He wrote on his record that he wanted to learn precision tool making. Today he is learning the trade, and the Government is footing the bill for his training. A good job awaits him when he finishes the course.

Finally there are those who because of wounds, injuries or illness are incapable of working. These men are expertly cared for by the Veterans' Administration. The facilities for that care are the best that science has developed.

CLEARINGHOUSE COMMITTEES

To complete the structure of rehabilitation are national, state, and local clearinghouse committees composed of representatives from civic and national organizations, including labor unions, the American Legion, Chambers of Commerce, clubs, etc. These committees cooperate with all of the other agencies to solve each soldier's problem as a personal, individual, and community matter.

As one reemployment committeeman, a lawyer in Pennsylvania, told Yank: "There will be none of this case-number-so-and-so business, as if a discharged soldier were nothing but an ex-serial number. No, sir. It will be Joe Smith, American, getting a good job because he wants, deserves, and can handle it."

Another committeeman, a doctor in the Middle West, interviewed by Yank, voiced similar feelings: "I went through the first one back in '18, and I've got three boys in this one. I think I know a little bit about what they're going through, and I certainly know what they've got a right to expect when they come home. Each returning veteran in our community is going to be an integral part of our life, and he's going to be made to feel that he shares its benefits and problems to the same degree that his fellows share them."

These expressions are typical of the men, from the top officials at national headquarters down to the reemployment committeemen in the smallest communities, who are shaping the reemployment division for the time when, after the war, the plan of systematic and selective demobilization will be put to its big test.

To head such an organization someone had to be found who was more than a dreamer. He had to be a soldier with a lot of down-to-earth experience in social work.

The chief of the reemployment division was with the famous Seventy-seventh Division in France during the last war. After the war he helped his buddies get back into civilian life. In fact, the reemployment division as it stands today is built largely on the lessons he learned with the old Seventy-seventh. Ten days after the armistice in 1918 a reemployment and rehabilitation plan for the outfit was in effect.

A voluntary subscription among the officers and enlisted men raised $23,000, and an officer was sent back to the United States ahead of the division to set up an employment office. As a result, 3,000 jobs were promised for the Seventy-seventh before the men landed on American soil. In a matter of weeks all but 50 of the 27,000 men were employed. For 1 guy, obviously the restless type, they got 22 different jobs in as many weeks.

The chief's aide served with the One Hundred and Fifth Machine Gun Battalion in the First World War. Shortly before being called to active duty on the Reemployment Division he helped to reorganize the local draft boards of New York City. Speaking of the reemployment committeemen, he told Yank: "All of these men have been chosen with extreme care. They have been selected only after their personal integrity and responsibility as citizens have been established beyond all doubt."

GOAL OF 50,000,000 JOBS

The fanciest reemployment plan wouldn't get far if there were no jobs for discharged soldiers to come back to. So the problems of creating such jobs and insuring full postwar employment are part of the Selective Service System's problem. The Reemployment Division cooperates with several postwar planning organizations.

The most imposing of these is the Committee for Economic Development. Composed of the country's leading businessmen, industrialists, and economists, and functioning with the active support of several Federal agencies, the committee's goal is 50,000,000 jobs for post-war America.

Many of the world's top-flight scientists are at work finding the best means of converting the Nation from war back to peace. This does not mean these men are not helping now to win the war. Paul G. Hoffman, the committee's chairman, made this clear. "The war," he said, "has had and will continue to get triple A priorities, but the job of winning the peace need not be neglected, and, for business, that means planning to create jobs for returning soldiers, sailors, and war workers."

Most economists agree that jobs will be plentiful. They see a post-war America hard at work forging the tools of a new civilization; developing new techniques of production, distribution and transportation; building new cities, clearing slums, erecting power projects, carrying out programs to conserve the land and forests and control floods. There will be plenty to do.

The Reemployment Division reveals that so far 111,000 copies of the Army occupational and educational record have been filled out by soldiers and returned to the headquarters at Washington. Some were from men who have since received C. D. D.'s or whose releases are imminent. The rest were from men still in the service, for it is the Division's intention to secure as much information as possible on each man long before his discharge.

QUESTIONS GET SERIOUS ANSWERS

It is interesting to observe that of all the 111,000 records submitted, not one evoked phony or wise-guy responses. They were uniformly serious and proved that the men were willing to cooperate.

Officials expected at least a few wags to try for a laugh or two, especially on the question asking what sort of a job they would like upon return to civil life. But in the whole lot there wasn't a single "I wanna be a bank president" or "I wanna work nights for Hedy Lamar."

There was, however, a temporary flurry of suspicion at national headquarters the other day when the record of a New Orleans private was examined. His questionnaire showed he had been a fisherman, but after the question, "What is your preferred occupation?" he had written, "To be a big retail merchant like Napoleon."

This looked like a gag, so a man went to interview the ex-fisherman in an Army hospital. It seems that before he got in the Army he had been fishing 12 to 15 hours a day in the Gulf of Mexico. He had sold his daily catch to a certain retailer for 2 cents per fish. The day before his induction he had gone in to bid good-bye to the first retailer, one L. Napoleon, and he saw a price sign in the market's window which he had never seen before. The fish he had been selling at 2 cents each were being sold, by Mr. Napoleon at 18 cents.

"Well, I got to thinking," he said, "if that feller was gettin' 18 cents for the same fish he gave me 2 cents for, and me doin' all the work, that, I says to myself, is the job for me."

HERE'S HOW YOU MAKE AN EXIT TO CIVILIAN LIFE

If you're about to get a C. D. D. or another kind of honorable discharge, here's what you should do at once:

1. Contact a representative of the American Red Cross. There are accredited representatives at all camps, posts, and hospitals. They'll advise you at all times.

2. Study carefully and answer the questions on the Army occupational and educational record, which you will be required to fill out before your discharge. This record is vitally important and may decide your future status as a civilian. If you're in doubt or puzzled by any of the questions or the form in which to put your answers, see your C. O., your chaplain, or a Red Cross representative.

3. After you get your discharge get in touch as soon as possible with your local reemployment committeeman. He is attached to the local draft board in your home town. He knows all the benefits you're entitled to, and he knows the quickest way for you to get them. If for any reason you do not return to your home community, you should establish contact with the nearest agency of one of the following: The American Red Cross, the United States Employment Service, the Federal Security Agency, the Veterans' Administration, or the local draft board of the community where you are staying. Any one of them can set the right wheels in motion for your readjustment.

BRITISH COMMENT ON AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am hopefull that our British friends are not abandoning judgment altogether. I read in this morning's newspapers accounts of developments in Britain which are disturbing, to say the least. A United Press story appearing this morning under the heading "Churchill Aims Barb at Political Disputes in United States," dated "London, October 13," declares:

Prime Minister Winston Churchill today by inference rebuked the United States for its political squabbles in the first official British statement bearing on the controversy touched off by five American Senators on their return from a tour of the battle fronts.

Speaking to the House of Commons in connection with the British coal crisis and its threat of a Labor Party revolt against the Government, Churchill said:

"As soon as the war is ended, the soldiers will leave off fighting and the politicians will begin. Perhaps that is rather a pity. But, at any rate, it isn't as bad as what goes on in some countries, which I shouldn't venture to name, where the soldiers are fighting abroad and the politicians are fighting at home with equal vigor and ferocity."

Churchill's sally was accepted as veiled criticism of the reports made public by the American Senators.

In the same newspaper, under date of October 14, is another United Press dispatch from London, reading as follows:

BRITISH PAPER REBUKES AMERICAN SENATORS

LONDON, October 14.—As a follow-up to Prime Minister Winston Churchill's implied rebuke to American politicians in the House of Commons yesterday, the Daily Mail today published an editorial cartoon parodying the three "no evil" monkeys.

The drawing showed five sad-faced, monkey-posed Senators squatting on a log with the legends: "I saw no good; I heard no good; I said no good; I want no good; I'm up to no good."

Mr. President, I am sure I am not the only Member of the Senate who is thoroughly resentful because of British insults thrown at our colleagues who spent the weeks of the past summer visiting the various theaters of war. I am doubly resentful, in view of my conviction of the objective manner in which those five colleagues approach their duties. It seems to me that our British allies are losing, if they have not completely abandoned, their good judgment, in more ways than that to which I have just referred. I cannot be other than resentful when I find the British nosing into American politics at this time, to the extent of urging what the American people should do in the next Presidential campaign. There was a time when Americans stood up and fought back against action of that kind.

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

Mr. NYE. I shall be glad to yield when I finish my statement, which will be very brief.

Mr. President, there was a time when Americans stood up in their places and freely expressed resentment of the action of those of other lands who would come meddling into American politics. Back in 1888, while Grover Cleveland was President of the United States, a Lord Sackville was British Minister to the United States. In 1888 Lord Sackville wrote a letter to an American urging that American by all means to get behind and encourage the reelection of President Grover Cleveland. That incident occasioned the American Government's asking the British Government to recall their Minister to the United States. The British made representation that since this minister had been so long in the service it would be doubly embarrassing to him and embarrassing to the British Government to have to recall him, but there would not be any incident in the event the United States Government dismissed him and sent him out of the country. Whereupon the then President of the United States, Grover Cleveland himself, insisted upon the Minister's departure from the United States and sent him his passport, a rather forceful way of dealing with an incident of that kind at that time.

A splendid account of this incident is recorded in a volume entitled "A Guide to Diplomatic Practice," the author of which is the Right Honorable Sir Ernest Satow, formerly envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in His Britannic Majesty's diplomatic service. The chapter is found in volume 1, pages 336 to 338 of the volume, and I ask unanimous consent to have an extract from it printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The extract is as follows:

SEC. 428. In 1888, Lord Sackville, the British Minister at Washington, received a letter purporting to come from a naturalized citizen of English birth, named Murchison, asking for advice as to the way he, and many other individuals in his position, should vote in the pending election of the President. The writer said they believed the Republican candidate to be a high-tariff man and an enemy to British interests, while Mr. Cleveland's policy had been favorable and friendly toward England. To his letter Lord Sackville at once replied that "any political party which openly favored the mother country at the present moment would lose popularity, and that the party in power was fully aware of the fact"; that with respect to the "questions with Canada, which have been unfortunately reopened since the rejection of the (fisheries) treaty by the Republican majority in the Senate, and by the President's message alluded to (by the writer of the letter), allowance must be made for the political situation as regarded the Presidential election," and he enclosed an extract from a newspaper in which electors were distinctly advised to vote for Mr. Cleveland.

The letter of Lord Sackville found its way into the newspapers, and caused a lively discussion in the press. The New York Tribune published a report of an interview with him, in which he was represented to have said that "both the action of the Senate and the President's letter of retaliation were for political effect," but in a private note to Mr. Bayard he said that his words were so turned as to impugn the action of the Executive, and added: "I beg to emphasize that I had no thought or intention of doing so, and I most emphatically deny the language which is attributed to me by other papers of 'claptrap' and 'trickery' as applied to the Government to which I am accredited."

Apart from the question whether the reply to "Murchison" was being made use of by the other party to influence the pending election, the President, it must be admitted, was entitled to regard the assumption by a foreign diplomatist of the function of influencing elections as improper, and in Mr. Bayard's despatch of January 30, 1889, to Mr. Phelps, the American Minister in London, it is qualified as an "intolerable offense."

On October 25 and 26, 1888, Mr. Bayard telegraphed to Mr. Phelps, complaining of the letter and of the language used at interviews with newspaper reporters. He suggested that Her Majesty's Government should take appropriate action without delay. Lord Salisbury declined to act until he should be in receipt of the precise language of Lord Sackville and his explanation. Lord Salisbury appears to have said also that the Minister's recall would end his diplomatic career, which would not necessarily be the case if he were dismissed by the United States, for which there were precedents. This reply was telegraphed back to Washington, and 2 days later Mr. Bayard addressed a note to Lord Sackville, informing him, by the instructions of the President, that he is convinced that "it would be incompatible with the best interests and detrimental to the good relations of both governments that you should any longer hold your present official position in the United States," and enclosing a passport.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, my occasion for reciting this incident grows out of the alleged representation by Winston Churchill when he was last in the United States to the effect that it would be a tragic catastrophe if the American people failed to elect President Roosevelt next year for a fourth term and that it would be even worse if he should be reelected with a Republican Congress.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, as one, I completely resent the insistent manner in which those of other lands who are so resentful about what some Americans are saying about their countries are nosing into American politics; I resent their seeming determination to influence, so far as they can, the election of public officials in the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, by a strange coincidence, before the Senator from North Dakota began his remarks, I had been reading an article in the American press. I desire to read that article to the Senate at this particular point, and I ask the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. The article appears in the Washington Evening Star of today, and is entitled "I'd Rather Be Right," by Samuel Grafton. This is what the article says:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT

(By Samuel Grafton)

I suggest that a wide search is under way in this country to find an anti-English issue. A number of antiadministration forces are probing in this field with their long, delicate fingers, looking for a weak spot.

We hear, suddenly, that the English are burning up our oil in the war, but hoarding their own. (We are not reminded that the English burnt up their foreign investments long ago to fight this war while some of us view this war as a chance to acquire new foreign investments.)

We hear that the English resell our lease-lend goods, in private channels, at a profit. We hear that English diplomats are "smarter" than ours, and that they "work themselves" into occupied territories better than we do. These critics seem to think that a display of competence in this field is a foul.

SOME SECRET CASABLANCA?

We hear that the British ought to give us, forever, the island bases which they have turned over to us for a mere 100 years. We hear that the British are only half-hearted about the Burma offensive, because they don't really want to fight in Asia. We hear that they are hoarding millions of idle armed men in England, because they don't really want to fight in Europe.

There is a flood of this stuff now. I do not suggest that some secret grand council of isolation has met at its own Casablanca and decided on an anti-English offensive. Yet the attack is insistent. It has a nervous, questing character, as if many approaches were being tried out, studied, then discarded for others. The anti-English trend runs through them all, and unifies them all.

Why England? The attack on England has been so consistent that it has forced one antiadministration commentator, Mr. Arthur Krock, to write two articles proving that there is no attack on England under way in antiadministration circles. If there were really no attack on England under way, one should judge that a single article would have been enough to cover the subject, or that even no article at all would have covered it quite adequately.

Again, why England? Can it be that the isolationist press, which has made such extravagant use of the famous five traveling Senators and their farmer's daughter stories about lease-lend, really wants to disrupt our relations with an ally?

But, come, that can't be true. That's not subtle enough. It's too ornery. It's unbelievable. It's too raw, coarse and brutal.

WE'VE BEEN HAD

But, once more, why England? The English can't seem to understand why they have

so abruptly been picked out for attack; they appear dazed. All of a sudden, the American press is full of the sins of England, just as if England had never been around before.

At this point several strange thoughts occur to me. That the attack on England, which seems so irrelevant, really is irrelevant. That the motive behind it isn't even anti-English. That it is anti-Roosevelt. That England is merely the John Bovingdon of the moment. That the search for spectacular antiadministration issues has moved over, temporarily, into this area. That we have all been misled into accepting as a serious debate on foreign policy, and as a serious American flare-up of anti-English feeling, something that is only a cynical chapter in domestic politics.

Look at that man, he hires a dancer as an economist. Look at that man, he lets England get fat on our lease-lend. And the most profoundly isolationist aspect of the current debate about England is that it really isn't about England; those fomenting it haven't even been thinking about England. They have been looking inside, not outside. They know what they have been thinking about.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to ask if the able Senator from North Dakota in the concluding portion of his remarks quoted what purported to be some remark of Prime Minister Churchill in this country relative to the election of a President of this Nation next year, and, if so, what is the source of that quotation?

Mr. NYE. Yes, Mr. President; I was quoting a radio broadcast of Drew Pearson, and since that time I have learned what his authority was, and I am ready to abide by that authority as being quite accurate and as of some consequence.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have the same right totally and wholly to disbelieve that the Prime Minister of Great Britain ever made such a statement and the same right to assert in the Senate that he never made such a statement as the able Senator from North Dakota has to believe that he made it or to assert that he did make it. I am sorry the able Senator, in his first remark, did not qualify the source of the quotation and indicate that it was a hearsay report from a radio commentator upon which, by implication, he based the assertion that the Prime Minister of Great Britain was trying to influence the election of a President of the United States in 1944. In fact, that is no greater perversion of the responsible facts than the able Senator deduced from the newspaper report from which he read. The able Senator purported to find authority in the United Press article for the statement by Prime Minister Churchill of something that reflected improperly upon politics in the United States; yet, in reading the article itself and noting the quotation of the Prime Minister one finds—and I am reading from the article which the able Senator handed up to the desk—

As soon as the war is ended, the soldiers will leave off fighting and the politicians will begin. Perhaps that is rather a pity. But, at any rate it isn't as bad as what goes on in some countries which I shouldn't venture to name, where the soldiers are fighting abroad and the politicians are fighting at home with equal vigor and ferocity.

It is my opinion that the remark the able Senator from North Dakota made was a political corroboration of what the Prime Minister said. It was intended as a jab in the side of our British ally, a blow at the President of the United States and the present administration in the conduct of the war, and a further revelation of the consistent anti-British policy which the able Senator from North Dakota has maintained since long before the present contest was ever inaugurated.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any call for me to go any further than what the record itself will reveal as the basis of my information. The fact remains that here is this quotation of Winston Churchill, from his address in Parliament yesterday, representing him as having been very unhappy, and labeling as politicians those who brought back reports which have found their way to the public, and we have these accounts which at one and the same time reveal the British press making the nastiest kind of references to the five honorable colleagues of ours who returned here from an objective visit, and made objective reports to the Senate, the accounts seeking now to make monkeys of them and belittling men who have stood staunchly in support of the British-American cause all the way through these years of controversy. Yet today they are made the targets of the ridicule of people who evidently, I repeat, have lost all judgment, in an hour when judgment would be of such extreme value to our United Nations front.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to say just one word, I should like to make the commentary that the Daily Mail, which I believe the able Senator from North Dakota quoted in commenting about what the Senators said, never in all its long history, never in all its most sinister moments, never in any diabolical attitude it ever conceived of, was able to say or infer as much against the United States as the Chicago Tribune for more than a decade has constantly and vitriolically poured out against the personality of the leaders of Great Britain.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it regrettable that on any pretext it is found expedient in the Senate to magnify either statements or cartoons which may appear in foreign journals regarding ourselves as a body, or as individuals. I presume that there are irresponsible journals in England, as there are in the United States. We should not allow such circumstances to cloud our own judgment with regard to the propriety of our actions in conjunction with our allies in this great crisis of human history.

I have seen Mr. Churchill on every occasion when he has been in Washington, and I have no knowledge, and never even heard, that he ever expressed any opinion, either public or private, regarding the next presidential election or any presidential election in the United States.

Regarding the so-called injection of the English people into a United States presidential election, my recollection is that 3 or 4 days ago there appeared in the newspapers an account of a Gallup poll which had been taken in England with reference to some phase of the political situation in this country. I do not know by what right a Gallup poll is taken in England on a presidential election in the United States. I suppose it is like all other Gallup polls; they are looking for means of taking a census among some people about something. Certainly we should not take the result of any such poll, gratuitously taken by any poll taker, as evidence of the desire of the people of any other country to inject themselves into a presidential election in this country.

As to Mr. Churchill's remarks in the House of Commons a few days ago, I read them. Of course, the United Press, which carried them, puts the interpretation upon them that he was referring to the United States, or to what had happened in the United States Senate. As I gather from the news article, he was debating with his colleagues in the House of Commons a question which pertained to English unity in regard to some legislation, or some action, or some investigation, or some criticism that was being indulged in by the people of England, or by the Members of Parliament, regarding English activities in the war, and it was in connection with that that Mr. Churchill made a remark in such a way as to deprecate the fact that either in his country or in any other country, while the soldiers were fighting at the front, politicians were fighting at home.

I do not take what happened here as any justification for any insinuations or innuendos or allusions, not by name, but by interpretation, in the British Parliament or in any other parliament, but if in the House of Commons, in the House of Lords, or in any other parliamentary body anywhere in the world, the United States had been attacked or its good faith questioned by a member, because of its war activities or its contribution to the war, or if any question had been raised in debate, however, irrelevant it may have been, as to our contribution or our activities or our all-out effort in behalf of winning the war and the peace, I can very well imagine that what would have happened here on the floor of the Senate would have made Mr. Churchill's remarks in the debate about the home situation a few days ago look exceedingly mild.

I hope we will not become excited over the ebullitions of politicians or statesmen of any country involved in the present great war, or in this great crisis, and I do not think we should magnify beyond their real implications, and out of proportion, remarks made in any legislative body, in the heat of debate, regarding the conduct of any of our associates in this great conflict. I hope we will keep our feet on the ground and our heads erect, and recognize the fact that in all countries and in all legislative bodies we must display a tolerance which may not

always be wanted, but which is so essential in the great enterprise in which we are all engaged.

THE LATE REV. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, last Sunday a former chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, passed away suddenly while serving as the pastor of the All Souls Unitarian Church, in Washington. This afternoon a memorial service is being held in that church in memory of his long and inspirational service to his church and to his Nation.

Dr. Pierce was born in Providence, R. I., in 1865, and ever since his ordination to the Unitarian ministry in 1891, he has devoted himself to his profession and to public service in its broadest sense. He filled a pastorate in Pomona, Calif., from 1893 to 1896, and in Ithaca, N. Y., from 1897 to 1901. However, since 1901—42 years ago—he has been the pastor of the All Souls Unitarian Church, in Washington, D. C., where he has inspired not only the members of his congregation residing in this city, but also countless people coming to the church from all over the Nation.

The former President and Chief Justice of the United States, William Howard Taft, was a member of Dr. Pierce's church, and a great admirer of him. In appreciation of President Taft's high regard for Dr. Pierce, and in recognition of the general high regard in which Dr. Pierce was held in the Nation, he was selected as chaplain of the United States Senate. He served with distinction in that capacity from 1909 through 1913.

His prayers were marked with deep religious feeling, coupled with the broadest tolerance and understanding of religion in its deepest and most inclusive sense. Both in his prayers and in his sermons, he always has contributed to the clear thinking of those who have listened to him and to their faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is therefore fitting that there be recorded in the proceedings of the Senate today an expression of appreciation of his contribution to the proceedings of this body and to the uplifting of the ideals of all who have had the privilege of knowing him or of listening to his interpretation of God to man.

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. MAYBANK 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. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1948, vice M. Roland Reed.

By Mr. WHEELER (for Mr. TOBEY), from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Nelson Lee Smith, of New Hampshire, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1945 (vice Seavey).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of JAMES PATRICK MCGRANERY to be Assistant to the Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther M. Swygert to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be president and member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

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 be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CREAL, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 322) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
October 13, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before I send to the desk a resolution following the message from the House of Representatives, I wish simply to say that I regret exceedingly to learn of the death of Representative CREAL, who has for many years represented the Fourth District of Kentucky in the House of Representatives. Mr. CREAL was a very able, very conscientious, and very industrious representative of the people who had honored him. Before he came to the House of Representatives he had been prominent in the political, legal, and social history of his district and of his State. I do not recall any Representative from any district in my State who worked more arduously for the welfare of the people whom he represented than did Representative CREAL. His background, his association, his history, and his life were all such as to qualify him admirably for the public service, and he measured up to the highest standards of that service.

Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. EDWARD W. CREAL, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed, under the second resolution, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, October 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 14 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Thomas M. Carey, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Clarence Poe, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the unexpired term of 3 years ending July 17, 1946.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Lucy H. Contreras, Bellemont, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Nellie Moss, Marana, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lenore Hoopes, Sacatan, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

C. Herrold Higgins, San Carlos, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CALIFORNIA

Edwin B. Morrell, Arlington, Calif., in place of W. E. Robb, removed.

Loie M. Ford, Calipatria, Calif., in place of J. H. Moore, resigned.

Felix G. Young, Desert Center, Calif. Office became Presidential January 1, 1943.

Norma H. Wilson, Keene, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret O. Quandt, McKittrick, Calif., in place of C. D. Myers, resigned.

Genevieve Frahm, Palmdale, Calif., in place of Genevieve Frahm. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

James W. Wilson, Planada, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Winnie Hasty Maclin, Hasty, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Esta M. Fuson, Saguache, Colo., in place of L. C. Marold, deceased.

DELAWARE

Lena C. Poore, Hartly, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Pauline M. Hamp, Hollyoak, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mattie J. Greenly, Lincoln, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

Julia C. Casey, Kingsland, Ga., in place of C. G. Russell, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Vernon F. Jones, Thawville, Ill., in place of W. W. Jones, transferred.

INDIANA

J. Custer Loveless, Clarks Hill, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leland C. Swinford, Clermont, Ind. Office became Presidential January 1, 1943.

Ilena M. Lawyer, Oolitic, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edward O. Elrod, Pekin, Ind., in place of E. R. Rickard, transferred.

Rose K. Hubers, St. Meinrad, Ind., in place of R. K. Hubers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary A. Kaiser, Schererville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Martin Brink, Wanamaker, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Shirley A. Williams, Westport, Ind., in place of N. R. Billieu, transferred.

Frank Donaldson, Wheatland, Ind., in place of L. L. Langdon, resigned.

IOWA

Leslie Fahrner, Keosauqua, Iowa, in place of C. B. Richardson, transferred.

Edith M. Wehrle, Middletown, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kathleen A. Elbert, Whittemore, Iowa, in place of J. S. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

KANSAS

William E. Thornhill, Cunningham, Kans., in place of R. E. Wetherall, removed.

Ray K. Hockaday, Hutchinson, Kans., in place of R. L. Russell, resigned.

Richard S. Ikenberry, Quinter, Kans., in place of R. S. Ikenberry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George L. Baker, Tonganoxie, Kans., in place of G. P. Allan, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Kate S. Keesee, Belfry, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bernice C. Tully, Big Clifty, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Nellie Spalding, Bradfordsville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clarence F. Nordwick, California, Ky. Office become Presidential July 1, 1943.

Golda Martin, Drift, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Dee Diuguid, Ghent, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George W. Bleidt, Golden Pond, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eunice Vincent, Hitchins, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mike Staley, Lackey, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John A. Vaughan, Majestic, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Corinne Owen, Mount Washington, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

T. Harold Skaggs, Prospect, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Grant B. Smith, Verda, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Conley Johnson, Virgie, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Fred Elsmore Glew, Fort Fairfield, Maine, in place of W. G. Chamberlain, deceased.

Merle R. Pitman, Lovell, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Milton Edes, Sangerville, Maine, in place of Milton Edes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MARYLAND

Orlando E. Corsa, Henryton, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Anna R. Rogers, Riderwood, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Norman W. Clark, Severn, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Brennan, North Attleboro, Mass., in place of T. F. Coady, retired.

Edward C. Harney, Pepperell, Mass., in place of G. A. Rice, resigned.

MINNESOTA

George Zahn, Bellingham, Minn., in place of W. F. Priem, transferred.

Oscar T. Lokensgard, Boyd, Minn., in place of H. H. Lukken, transferred.

Gertrude C. Thompson, Cyrus, Minn., in place of A. W. Danielson, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Shelby O. Taylor, Union, Miss., in place of W. L. Collins, removed.

MISSOURI

Kathryn Q. Brown, Hallsville, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEBRASKA

Lulu M. Kennedy, Bradshaw, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hjalmar A Swanson, Clay Center, Nebr., in place of H. A. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances C. Rotherham, Ewing, Nebr., in place of L. P. Dierks, resigned.

Thomas A. Siefken, Harvard, Nebr., in place of T. A. Siefken. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ray M. Guilford, Marquette, Nebr., in place of M. P. Hemmingsen, transferred.

Minnie M. Mason, Salem, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elta Evans, Shubert, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NEVADA

Doris E. Larson, Stewart, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Anna T. Heus, Demarest, N. J., in place of A. T. Heus. Incumbent's commission expired April 22, 1941.

Rose F. Ricci, Murray Hill, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Karl H. Schlupp, Westwood, N. J., in place of T. J. Lyons, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

James Henry Hill, Hickory, N. C., in place of G. F. Bost, removed.

Pearl E. Linville, Oak Ridge, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur E. Briscoe, Union Mills, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur E. Bean, Donnybrook, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Max A. Wipperman, Hankinson, N. Dak., in place of M. A. Wipperman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OHIO

Ella M. Manson, Apple Creek, Ohio, in place of E. M. Manson. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Edgar K. Brown, Arcanum, Ohio, in place of Edward Wild, resigned.

Jesse H. O'Roark, Covington, Ohio, in place of J. B. Neth. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fred L. Diffenderfer, Greentown, Ohio, in place of R. K. Myers, resigned.

Howard J. Swearingen, Kensington, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

O. Pauline Myers, Long Bottom, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Doman, Lyndhurst, Ohio, in place of J. A. Drew. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1942.

Joann E. Johnston, Macedonia, Ohio, in place of E. L. Griswold, resigned.

Frank W. White, Milford, Ohio, in place of R. R. Riehle, transferred.

Mary C. Melody, New Paris, Ohio, in place of W. F. Engle, resigned.

Emma Duff, South Solon, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert S. McKelvey, Toronto, Ohio, in place of James Connor, deceased.

Elinor E. Arick, Valley City, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

William T. Barnes, Mountain Park, Okla., in place of L. L. Bennett, resigned.

Ella Miller, Ramona, Okla., in place of A. A. Powell, removed.

OREGON

Eugene E. Mulcare, Canyon City, Oreg., in place of E. M. Hoare, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marjorie Lowery, Boston, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amidee T. Seese, Markleysburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emma J. Roof, Monroeton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry C. Mickle, New Paris, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Esther Smith, Renton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dennis A. Phelan, St. Marys, Pa., in place of Frank O'Neill, deceased.

Alice B. Smith, Shawnee on Delaware, Pa., in place of C. W. Callaway, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Hilda J. Gross, Doland, S. Dak., in place of A. E. Paine, retired.

Iva M. Bowen, Egan, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gustave I. Honsey, Hecla, S. Dak., in place of G. I. Honsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TEXAS

David F. Stamps, Dime Box, Tex., in place of D. F. Stamps. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1942.

Gorden S Barker, Sulphur Bluff Tex Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Vaughn M. Price, Three Rivers, Tex., in place of H. D. House, transferred.

UTAH

Edna F. Nicholls, Farmington, Utah., in place of M. J. M. Smith, resigned.

Reuben J. Peterson, Santaquin, Utah, in place of R. J. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

VERMONT

Mabel M. Hemenway, Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of M. M. Hemenway. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rosa M. Stewart, Tunbridge, Vt., in place of R. M. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Timothy J. Murphy, Windsor, Vt., in place of T. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Louis C. Dawson, Afton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mabel C. Harris, Gladstone, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elza S. Cave, Madison, Va., in place of A. H. Cave, deceased.

Charles G. Arey, Mount Solon, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gilbert T. Allen, Wakefield, Va., in place of L. E. Stephenson, retired.

Annie R. B. Knight, Whaleyville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Willene M. Ratliff, Electric City, Wash., in place of O. N. Handel, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Harry E. Riddleberger, St. Albans, W. Va., in place of H. E. Riddleberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WYOMING

John W. Powell, Superior, Wyo., in place of John Barwick, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 14 (legislative day of October 12), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James Patrick McGranery to be The Assistant to the Attorney General.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Luther M. Swygert to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be president and a member of the California Debris Commission.

Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Herbert F. Leary to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 1, 1943, and to continue during his assignment as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

RETIRED LIST

Rear Admiral Adolphus Andrews, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral when retired on November 1, 1943.

Rear Admiral Roland M. Brainard, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral when retired on November 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Stanley V. Buss, Vero Beach.

HAWAII

Francis Hughes, Lanikai.

LOUISIANA

Girtherine Evans Lloyd, Grambling.

MISSOURI

W. Lloyd Wiley, Crane.
Parks Bacon, El Dorado Springs.
Lewis A. Newkirk, Everton.
Cecil E. Schwartz, Hannibal.
James R. Daily, Schell City.
Ernest C. Buehler, South St. Joseph.

OKLAHOMA

Maude A. Cumming, Adair.

WASHINGTON

Jehu O Patterson, Pullman.
John O. Mills, Woodland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou eternal Father, from whom all blessings flow, who breathes hope into hopeless hearts and unto whom little children may come and the patriot with his victory, consider and hear us. Reassure us that the paths we are passing are starlit and the days which sweep our country onward are true and safe. Grant that we may meet the soul of the world without blot or shame, prophesying the coming of Thy kingdom and the parliament of man.

O wondrous Saviour, whose holy feet touched the scarred earth at Bethlehem and whose spiritual impulse lives, cross the hearts of men like the shaft of a great light. Let us beware of the atrophy of victory and understand that liberty of speech, thought, and act is our eternal possession and stamped with the blood of our fathers and not to be pierced by any weapon nor withstood by any barrier. Blessed Lord, lead us to be grateful for the great mass of laboring people who are reaching the high note of patriotic devotion and service. Our privileges and opportunities are countless and we pray that Thy benefactions may be upon all like the good river of water of life whose streams are for the healing of the nations. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

OCTOBER 11, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees and ask that the same be accepted: Territories, and the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. BENNETT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Cordially yours,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 102, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority,

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 323) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN B. BENNETT, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

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

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial concerning our former Postmaster General.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar, which is brief, and then the further consideration, under the 5-minute rule, of the bill which will come up today.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and there will also be considered the Bulwinkle resolution giving to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce power to investigate certain aspects of air transportation.

On Wednesday the Chinese Exclusion Act will be brought up.

On Friday—I see the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs here; if I make any observation about this which he feels should be corrected I hope he will do so—the fathers' draft bill will be brought up. I understand the report on this bill will soon be completed and filed, and if a rule is granted for the consideration of this bill, which I hope it will be, it is my intention to bring it up on Friday next.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Does not the gentleman mean Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am sorry, but a change has been made in the program since I conferred with my distinguished friend.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. When will the bill S. 1279 be called up?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill comes up today.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, which will be brief, and then, if general debate on this bill has not been concluded today, that will be finished Monday, and the bill will then be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill that is being called up today will be the order of the day until its consideration is concluded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered in Brooklyn, N. Y., by the Reverend Joseph R. N. Maxwell.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT MEDICAL CORPS IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 I introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 2820) to create a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration. That bill has been before the Veterans' Committee. It has not yet been reported, because we have been waiting for a report from General Hines and the Bureau of the Budget. We are short 258 doctors in the veterans' hospitals, and 500 nurses. General Hines says they are trying to get help from the Army and the Navy from time to time, but nothing has been done. In the meantime men disabled in the First World War and men disabled in the present World War are not receiving adequate attention. There is no excuse for it. I believe the committee will soon act if the Administration does not. It is an inexcusable situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWARD W. CREAL

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks by the inclusion of a resolution passed in respect to the Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, of Kentucky, by the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of EDWARD W. CREAL the House Committee on Agriculture has suffered an irreparable loss. This is no idle statement. His gentle nature, his innate sense of justice, his detestation for sham and pretext, and his ability to think clearly and express himself concisely, were the outstanding attributes of this great American. On more than one occasion I have witnessed his clear thinking and concise expression bring to our committee order out of confusion. I do not think I ever came in contact with a mind that could detect error more quickly or pierce it more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I incorporate at this point in my remarks the resolutions passed by our committee on yesterday in tribute to our former friend and colleague:

Whereas the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives have learned with profound sorrow and regret of the untimely death of the Honorable EDWARD W. CREAL, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky, and

Whereas the said EDWARD W. CREAL was for several years a distinguished member of this committee and by his great fidelity to duty, the calm dignity of his presence, the courtliness of his manner, the courage and impartiality of his judgment, his lovable personality and capacity for friendship, his forceful, logical, and persuasive manner of expression, his integrity and sterling traits of character,

endeared himself to every member of this committee; now, Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the death of our late and beloved colleague, our committee has lost one of its most valuable members, the country an outstanding statesmen, one who was at all times inspired by a superiority of purpose and a supreme devotion to the ideals of this democracy, and each of us has suffered a deep personal sorrow; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased and the original resolution made a part of the permanent records of this committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD regarding the splendid work done by Brig. Gen. Joseph Barzynski, commander of the United States Army Quartermaster Depot at Chicago, Ill., in his effort to secure cooperation of our American womanhood for service in the WAC, WAVES, SPARS, and Marines, and to include therein a letter he received from the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, D. D., archbishop of Chicago, in support of his work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAFOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include three speeches, one delivered by Governor Dewey of New York, one by Mayor LaGuardia, and one by Mr. G. Pope, of New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on the subject of free speech and the radio industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions adopted by the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the acting dean of Cornell University, Mr. Myers, on the subject of the food shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STAFF OF EXPERTS TO FOLLOW UP APPROPRIATIONS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Senate has become very much interested in the appointment of a staff of experts as agents and representatives of that body to follow up appropriations and see how the money is expended.

In February of last year I introduced a similar bill for the establishment of an office of fiscal investigators as agents of the House of Representatives to follow up expenditures that are made under appropriations. I think we could save a great deal of waste, extravagance, and duplication and relieve the burden on the taxpayers of this country by the adoption of such a policy.

Several conferences were held last year, and I have the assurance of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that hearings will shortly be held upon the measure which I introduced last year and have reintroduced in this Congress.

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

DECENTRALIZING OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement on post-war planning by Mr. Carl Swisher, of Jacksonville, Fla., and also a press release thereon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, after the disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the special order granted me for today, and I renew my request to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DR. RUHLAND

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, you will have noticed in this morning's paper that the Senate committee is suggesting that Dr. Ruhland, Health Officer of the District of Columbia, should be disposed of. Possible as it may be that unfortunate situations exist, I would like to suggest to the House that before we dispose of men who have a reputation throughout the country as being among the first in their profession, we take some of the responsibility for inadequate service. We have not given to the District sufficient funds to have an adequate service either in Gallinger Hospital or throughout the city.

I would like very much to recommend to the House a more thoughtful study of the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Omaha Stock Journal on Hog Ceilings Bog Down.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 162 and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Education. I have conferred with the chairmen of both committees and they are agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF APPROPRIATE ADDITIONAL NATIONAL MILITARY CEMETERIES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon News.

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

There was no objection.

REALISM VERSUS WILD PROMISES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BREWSTER AERONAUTICAL CORPORATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one ever dreamed of questioning the courage and determination of the men who are in the Navy or who are in the various forces by the hundreds of thousands fighting on every front.

Yesterday before the Committee on Naval Affairs I heard Under Secretary Forrestal tell the committee that because the Navy was in dire need of planes, in spite of the fact that there was but little production at the Brewster plant, the contract was being continued in the hope of something better.

This morning I heard Assistant Secretary Bard make the most humiliating, and to my mind the most discouraging, statement that any one man could make. It was to the effect that the Navy, in spite of the fact that production at that plant is being held up by De Lorenzo and in spite of the fact that they were not getting planes which the fighting men must have, the Navy could not do anything to get production. To state the situation in different language, Assistant Secretary Bard and his political boss have surrendered to a union racketeer. Just read the record yourself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include certain correspondence and editorials.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and to include in each of them an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different subjects and include some articles.

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

There was no objection.

JENNIE I. WESTON

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. I have discussed this matter with the majority and minority leaders. I am making this at the request of the clerk of the Claims Committee.

First, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 3153, for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased, now pending on the Private Calendar, be recommitted to the Commitee on Claims.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN P. VON ROSENBERG

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 533) for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

Pending that request, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the Senate has reduced the amount in the bill that was passed by the House and I am advised by the clerk of the Claims Committee and the author of the bill that the amount is satisfactory to them.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,972.64" and insert "$3,772.64."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "on account of personal injuries and expenses incident thereto and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "expenses incident thereto," and insert "on account of all property damages, medical, funeral, and other expenses incurred by the said John P. von Rosenberg and wife."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and any orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some observations concerning the oil situation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by our former colleague, the Honorable Martin Smith, at the Leif Erickson festival.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DROP IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] extended his remarks on page 8283 of the RECORD in reference to employment in the Federal service and made some statements with reference to the fact that we had extended the working time of Government employees in 1942 and given them extra pay, but we had no decrease in employment on account of the extension of hours. When the Pay Act passed many employees were working 48 hours and most of the remainder were on a 44-hour workweek.

I am putting in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the Civil Service Commission bearing upon that subject which I think is interesting. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Civil Service Committee on yesterday filed an interim report, Report No. 766, indicating that there has been a reduction of 145,000 civilian employees in the War Department. I also call attention to the fact that for the first time in 3 years, in July, we had a net reduction in the number of Federal employees of 29,000; so we have reversed the trend as to civilian employment in the Government. The committee expects to continue its effort further to reduce the total of civilian employees in the Government. We have already saved on an annual basis almost a billion dollars. The House is entitled to the credit for this saving to the taxpayers, since it authorized and directed the investigation.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered in Baltimore last week by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article from the New York World-Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BATTLE OF HASTINGS, OCTOBER 14, 1066

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is one of the most important anniversaries in the history of the English-speaking race. Eight hundred and seventy-seven years ago today, October 14, 1066, the Battle of Hastings took place, at which time the English were conquered by the invading Normans. That was the last time a foreign enemy was ever able to set foot on English soil. Shakespeare says:

This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands,
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England.

Let us hope that after this war, England, which is now our gallant ally, may enjoy those blessings Shakespeare visioned, and that no invading foe may be able to set foot on her soil for another thousand years.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 315.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: On page 1, line 12, after the period, insert the following: "It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs; that such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute bill as an original bill; and on page 2, line 2, after the word 'adopted' insert a comma and the words: 'and any Member may demand a separate vote on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or the committee substitute'; and on page 2, line 3, strike out the word 'and' and insert a period; strike out the word 'the' and insert 'The'."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Ohio has asked me if it will be possible to consider any other amendments in lieu of the committee amendment to the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I will explain that. Under my amendment to the rule the House bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule in lieu of the Senate bill and will give Members the opportunity to offer amendments and to speak to the amendments for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Then it will be possible for the gentleman from Ohio or somebody else to offer an amendment including the Sadowski bill and have that amendment considered.

Mr. SABATH. This amendment will so permit. Now, Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of the proposed amendments to the rule, I wish to say that they are necessary by reason of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs has not fully complied with the Ramseyer Act. There is printed in that committee's report on the bill the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 and the provisions of the Senate bill, all of which has been struck out after the enacting clause by an amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs and in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill have been substituted.

I fully appreciate that it is the desire and purpose of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who is one of the ablest parliamentarians of the House, and who, I recollect, supported the passage of the Ramseyer Act, to give to the membership complete information on any bill proposing to amend any law or Senate bill.

The amendment which I have offered to the pending rule will waive any point of order which, by strict construction, might lie. I feel that the reason for the gentleman's position is to force committees to prepare their reports in compliance with the Ramseyer Act so that the membership might easily understand without undue study and research the changes proposed to existing law.

A further proposed amendment to the rule will give members the privilege to secure a separate vote on any amendment that might be adopted in the Committee of the Whole. This is necessary because the House bill is being substituted for the Senate bill and is really an amendment to the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely broadens the rule so that a separate vote may be had on any amendment to the House bill. It will be observed that instead of a "gag" rule, as so frequently charged, the amendments make it a liberal rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act and provides for 4 hours' general debate and for the consideration of the House bill under the 5-minute rule. I take it that nearly every Member is in favor of the bill.

The principal provisions of the bill are known to the membership, who have evinced great interest in this legislation. Therefore, I shall not go into a detailed explanation of the bill, leaving that to the chairman and subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, both of whom arduously worked in the preparation of the bill and explained the effect of its provisions to the Committee on Rules. They are in better position to more clearly and intelligently explain the various provisions of the bill, and I desire to compliment them on their convincing and able presentation to the Committee on Rules which brought about the prompt reporting of the rule providing for the consideration of the bill by the House.

During all of the years of my service in this House I have never observed such a general demand and plea for legislation as I have for the bill now before us proposing to amend the 1942 act. The House bill increases the allowances to the dependents. It allows:

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

(1) $50, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

(2) $75, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, $95 if a wife and two children, and an additional $15 for each additional child;

(3) $42, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child, and additional $15 for each additional child;

(4) $50, if such enlisted man has one parent dependent upon him for chief support; $68 if such enlisted man has one parent and one brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

(5) $68, if such enlisted man has two parents dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support;

(6) $42, if such enlisted man has no parent but has a brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support, and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister dependent upon him for chief support.

The servicemen who have large families naturally will receive a larger allowance, which I hope will be sufficient to enable them to live without too much sacrifice and deprivation of the ordinary necessities of life.

We all recognize that the cost of living has increased, which makes this legislation necessary. If there ever was a time when the wives and children of our fighting force deserved to be taken care of and properly provided for, this is the time.

The cost of living has gone up and even with the increased allowances provided this bill will not permit the dependents to live in as decent a manner as they deserve and are entitled to.

You gentlemen who have read of the trials and tribulations of these brave and courageous men, I know, feel as I do that we cannot do too much for them and that we should relieve them of the worry as to whether their wives and children will be provided for. This bill will do just that.

There are a few who will claim that the allowances are not large enough, and there will be some who will claim that they are too large. In view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, especially in the large cities, from 40 to 60 percent, it is absolutely necessary that something be done so that the wives and children of servicemen will not be in want.

Feeling that everyone is in favor of this legislation and appreciating that everyone is familiar with the provisions of the 1942 act as well as with the committee bill now before the House, I shall not take up any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us enjoyed and appreciated the remarks of our genial friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] in regard to the many individuals here in Washington who have taken upon themselves the responsibility of feeding, clothing, and housing the world. At this particular time, thank goodness, we have not a bill before us which would take hundreds of millions of dollars to follow out the false theories, principles, and ideals of many men in high places in Washington. I unhesitatingly add, I trust that time never arrives.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has just stated, this bill does not deal with feeding and clothing the world but to take care of men and women who are doing an admirable and splendid job in our armed forces. We all have been home and we know that there have been many hardships placed through no fault of our servicemen upon the wives, children, and parents of those servicemen. It pleases me a great deal that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House has brought forth a bill to take care of and to provide the necessities of life for the wives, children, mothers, and fathers of our servicemen. I cannot think of one thing that would work to the detriment of our Army and Navy personnel, and there are hundreds of thousands of them, than to have their wives and families at home not receiving the necessities of life and I feel that the House of Representatives here today will overwhelmingly adopt a more liberal allowance for the dependents of our servicemen.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, we expect the fathers to go into the service. Now, we must see to it that those fathers do not go into the service with fear and trepidation that their loved ones will not be taken care of properly. That is why this bill has been brought forth?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that the American people want this legislation? The First World War came and there were not so many in it, after all, but today, in this terrible Second World War, almost every home in the country is touched and we realize that we should give adequate care to the dependents of our soldiers and sailors. Not only the Congress thinks that is necessary but the American people feel that way too.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts always speaks wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I make will be directed at the rule and the bill, and not at the merits of the bill.

In the first place, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to just what the procedure will be under the amended rule. Under this rule, the committee amendment, or the committee substitute, which begins on page 11 of the bill (S. 1279) will be read as an original bill. It is an open rule as to that bill or substitute. Any germane amendment will be in order.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When we reach the consideration of the substitute, it will take the place of the original bill?

Mr. MICHENER. When the Clerk begins to read for amendment under the 5-minute rule he will begin on page 11, which is the substitute bill. The substitute bill then will be read as if it were the original bill and perfected. After all amendments offered to the substitute bill have been voted on, there will then be a vote as between the Senate bill and the substitute bill. In other words, the question will be, Shall the committee bill be accepted as a substitute for the Senate bill? If the committee substitute is accepted, then the House is through with the consideration under the 5-minute rule and the Committee rises. If the motion is voted down, then the Senate bill, through which the lines are drawn in the print before us, will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule just the same as if there had been no committee substitute proposed.

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

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

Mr. SABATH. As to the rule, the gentleman is right, and he has explained it thoroughly with this exception. We will consider the committee bill under the 5-minute rule. If any amendments are adopted on the floor and the bill is reported with the amendments to the House bill and a vote is taken and the bill is approved, naturally it will take the place of the Senate bill. Is not that right?

Mr. MICHENER. I think I probably used clumsy language. I am glad the chairman in his usual lucid way has made the matter clear. He is quite right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will yield further, if the House substitute is adopted in Committee, then there will be no consideration of the Senate bill, will there? The Senate bill will not be read and there will be no right to amend it.

Mr. MICHENER. The Senate bill will not be read, provided the committee substitute when perfected is adopted as a substitute for the Senate bill. I cannot make it plainer.

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

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. I propose to offer some amendments to the bill reported by the House committee. Let me get this procedure straight. The gentleman says that under the 5-minute rule, if we move to adopt the House bill as a substitute to the Senate bill, that will not bar me from offering my amendments to the House bill?

Mr. MICHENER. I think I can answer the gentleman's question. As I recall, the gentleman has a bill dealing with the same subject pending in the House.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to have that bill considered in lieu of the committee substitute bill, his procedure would be, upon the completion of the reading of the first section of the committee substitute, to offer his bill as an amendment to the first section and give notice that if his amendment prevails he will move to strike out each subsequent section of the House substitute as they are read.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is not exactly what I wanted to do. I would rather have the provisions of my bill offered as amendments to increase the allowances in the House bill. They will be in the form of three amendments.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman will have the same privilege to amend the committee substitute as he has to amend any bill under the general rules of the House.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That is what I wanted to have understood.

Mr. MICHENER. Now just one other thing. I call the attention of the Military Affairs Committee in particular, and of the House in general, to the manner in which this bill is drafted. I have called attention to this practice on numerous occasions and the condition has been remedied by most committees. To illustrate what I mean, section 2 of the committee substitute reads:

> That section 102 of such act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the words "except as to the initial family allowance provided by section 107 (a) hereof."

Therefore, if this bill is enacted said section 2 will be written in the statute books of the United States as a law.

The reader of the law will be confronted with a formula which he must follow. By the process of elimination and addition of commas, periods, and words to an existing law, he will be able to find out what the Congress intended when it enacted said section 2. In no other way will he be able to know what the law is.

In short, section 2 suggests what should be done to existing law to give expression to the intent of Congress. Each individual seeking to know the law must perform a mechanical operation before he knows. If he makes no mistakes, and eliminates the intended periods and commas and inserts the additional words in the proper places, then he can feel that he knows what the law is. This is ridiculous, is it not? We all know it should not be. I have faith enough in the good sense of this House to believe that it will remedy this situation before a final vote is taken on this bill.

The next section in the substitute reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. That section 103 of such act is amended to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man"—

And so forth. That is as it should be, because anyone reading section 3 of this bill will know exactly how section 103, as amended, will read, and how it will appear in the statute.

Imagine your constituent asking you for a copy of this law after it is enacted. You send over to the Document Room and get a copy of the public law and send it to him. If he happens to be a lawyer and happens to have the United States Statutes handy, he may be able to figure out just what section 2 means. If he were not so qualified and equipped, he would be compelled to seek the advice of a lawyer who has a set of the United States Statutes. Things like this should not happen, and the House is entitled to nothing but censure if it permits such a thing to transpire.

Then again, imagine a judge on the bench trying a case where this law is involved. The judge asks the attorney for a copy of the statute, and the attorney hands him up the law embodying section 2 as above quoted. The judge must then get the original law, superimpose the amendatory statute upon the original statute and, if he makes no mistakes in the process, he will then know what the law is about which he has inquired. Such procedure is inexcusable, if not asinine. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this committee substitute must be amended before it leaves the House.

This strike-out-and-insert practice became prevalent a few years ago when legislation was being drafted in the departments and agencies by inexperienced draftsmen. Possibly they are not to blame, because they drew up in bill form the changes they desired to make in existing law. They wrote the formula and expected the Congress to do the mechanical work before the law reached the books. The Congress in many cases simply approved the bills sent up to it without any changes whatever and, as a result, we find upon the books today some of this type of legislation. Maybe there was some excuse at a time when "must" legislation was the order of the day, and when bills were passed after reading by the clerk, before they were ever presented to the House in print. Whatever the excuse was in the beginning, it does not exist today.

In the first instance, this criticism should be leveled at any committee reporting a bill in this language. In the second place, the House is not only entitled to criticism but condemnation if it passes any such unintelligible statute.

When the substitute bill is read under the 5-minute rule I am going to offer amendments. On page 21 of the committee report you will notice that in one column is printed the law as it now is and in the second column is printed the law as it will read if amended. For instance, when we get to section 2, instead of saying that we strike out a comma, and then hunt up two or three other lines and find a period or something, and then do something more, I am going to move that section 102 of this bill be amended to read as follows, and then include section 102 in full as it appears in the second column of the report.

I shall offer succeeding amendments to every section in the substitute where this improper method of draftsmanship obtains. These remarks may appear rather technical, but I have attempted to point out to the Military Affairs Committee just what we all realize should be done, and I hope that the chairman of the committee will offer these perfecting amendments as committee amendments, and that we may send an understandable and well-drawn bill to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I favor the principle embodied in this bill. I am in sympathy with its objectives, and these remarks are made in a spirit of helpfulness and cooperation. I feel sure that the Military Affairs Committee will so accept them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] have explained this rule so lucidly that I am sure it would be a waste of time to discuss it any further. I am sure everyone is in favor of the adoption of the rule. I shall use this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a matter in connection

with the law concerning our Military Establishment, which is very badly in need of correction. In 1940 before the beginning of the war, when the Army was smaller and we had too many Army officers and that prevented the younger men from coming up through promotion, we enacted a law that required the compulsory retirement of officers at the age of 60 years. That law is still on the statute books, and today in this critical situation with respect to manpower we are retiring some 900 experienced officers, men who have been educated by the Government at great expense, who have gained knowledge and information in the conduct of war through the World War, and through the present war. We are doing the utterly silly thing of retiring those men on three-quarters pay, and bringing back here to desks, men necessarily who are available for the front line. Is not that a condition that this Congress ought to do something about? I have in mind, for instance, an officer at West Point, who is engaged in teaching young men. God knows he must have had experience and knowledge that would make him a useful man at that place, and yet because of the mere fact that he has become 60 years of age this Congress says that he is disqualified, and is officially dead. As I look around me I wonder how many of us are officially dead and thoroughly debilitated under the rule that we have laid down for the Army. I see the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished dean of the House on his feet, and he is an excellent example of what I have in mind.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Only this morning my attention was called to a man who has been in the service for 34 or 35 years, who is a graduate of West Point, but he has been released because of his age, when he looks younger than 50 years, and his father and mother are still living. Yet he has been retired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am very glad to know that the gentleman from Illinois agrees with me on this very obvious situation, and I hope that he will do something to help me get it corrected. I have in my pocket a copy of the order retiring one of these men, a man with a splendid, a distinguished record. What does the order say? That order says that under the mandate of statutory law, "To our deep regret we are required to retire you," so that he may sit on his front porch while men of less ability will fight this war. This situation is properly laid at the door of Congress, because Congress passed the law and has not changed it.

Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am going to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in a moment, but I hope the gentleman does not think that I have reference to him when I referred to the fact that by action of his committee all men over 60 years of age are of no further use to their country, and are officially dead.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Of course the gentleman from Virginia knows that the House Military Affairs Committee is no more responsible for that statute that authorizes the retirement of colonels at the age of 60 years than is the House of Representatives, but I think the gentleman is entitled to an explanation from the committee of what steps we took or what we tried to do to prevent it, when we found that there would be this retirement as of the first day of October, when only 15 days before that time we were assembled here. We found we could not have time to enact an amendment to the retirement law to prohibit their discharge during the emergency, and we had the Chief of the Personnel Section of the Army before the committee and had extended hearings in an effort to prevent this.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Congress did this thing and the Congress can correct it. The reason I have obtained this time is not to hear myself talk, but we have here a bill affecting the military establishment, and I propose under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to suspend the operation of that utterly ridiculous, yes, tragic law, as it now exists. I propose to offer an amendment that will suspend that law and give to the Secretary of War the discretion to keep men in the service who are virile and active and experienced and available for the war effort. I am afraid that somebody may rise and say that it is not in order on this bill but I hope that will not occur, because, as I said before, the War Department says that this is the fault of the Congress.

The Congress has got an opportunity at this time without further delay to change the law and stop this utterly ridiculous situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that I am fully in accord with what the gentleman has just said. In fact, I have gone so far as to prepare and introduce a bill several months ago that would cover that particular subject and give the War Department more discretion in the retirement, waiving the age limit. The War Department has rendered an unfavorable report on that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But they still say the Congress is responsible for it, and of course Congress is responsible.

Mr. BROOKS. If it is ever passed it must be passed in face of the opposition of the War Department.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, why not? The War Department is every day issuing these orders saying that they regret that they have to do this but that Congress makes them do it by statutory law.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we should give a little explanation to show that any statement that the War Department has got to do it, is not accurate, for this reason: This law was passed in 1940. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee that drew up the law. We made it mandatory in peacetime to retire colonels at the age of 60, brigadier generals at the age of 62 and major generals at the age of 64, in order to give an even and steady flow to our officer personnel, and to prevent a recurrence of the hump such as we had following the World War. That applied to peacetime and that remained in effect until we got into war. One of the very first acts that was reported out of our committee and was passed in this House gave to the Secretary of War the right to call in any retired officer that he wanted to or to retain on active duty any officer who had reached the age limit.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To demonstrate the fact that the War Department does not have to retire them under a mandate of Congress but can now exercise its discretion, let me say that out of 900 officers who reached the age limit, the War Department actually kept on active duty 267 of them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know anything about that, but I know that is the official order, and I am going to read from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want the gentleman to understand I was not questioning him at all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand; but I think it should be straightened out in the debate. I will read from this order:

By order of the Secretary of War, and pursuant to the requirements of statutory law, the following-named officers of this command are relieved.

Now, what does the Navy do? The Navy does not do that. The Navy has called back into active service every capable and qualified retired man that they can get. They do not retire them, as I understand, when they are physically and mentally able to perform their duties.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] largely presented the thought I wanted to ask you about. My information was that while they had to retire them, yet they had a right to call them back, and had called them back.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know of instances where they are not doing it. If they do not have to do it, then we ought to pass a law that would compel them to do it at this particular time when we need every man that we can possibly get.

[From the Army and Navy Register of August 21, 1943]

ARMY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Almost simultaneously official releases show that approximately 900 efficient, overage retired officers, actually performing duties of great responsibility, will be placed on inactive duty, while thousands of officers are being promoted, ordered to active duty, and newly appointed, with several hundred more in sight next week.

The economic unsoundness of wholesale retirement and promotion is apparent when it is understood that the 900 officers already are on the retired list because of an average of over 30 years' active service or physical disability, disqualifying them for field duty, though still permitting them to perform limited administrative duty at a desk in an efficient manner because of their long years of technical training. At the outbreak of the war these experienced administrators were recalled to active duty at the relatively small additional cost to the taxpayer of the difference between their active-duty pay and retired pay. When these officers are returned to retired status, they will resume their retired pay and will be replaced by other officers, many years their junior in age and training, who will get the full duty pay of the positions vacated by this retirement.

It requires no imagination to foresee what action would be taken by the directors of a corporation on a proposal to place on one-half-pay pension keymen, shop foremen, and managers of 25–40 years' service solely on the basis of age and replace them with men of 10–75 percent of service at the same active pay in the midst of contracts quadrupling the corporation's business.

The Army policy in regard to utilizing retired officers is radically different from the sound economic position taken by the Navy. The Navy has consistently called to active service every retired officer, without regard to age, who could competently fulfill the duties and responsibilities of an administrative job. Naval officers over 70 years of age are reported performing highly satisfactory duties, so that the retired pay roll in the Navy is confined mostly to the infirm, bedridden, and crippled personnel. The recent Army orders force on to inactive-duty status practically every regular retired officer over 60 years of age in the grade of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, sweeping about 900 officers out of offices and administrative positions they are now handling and placing them again on the retired pay roll. Further, these 900 retired officers represent only that part of the overage retired Regular Army officers able to do limited administrative duty in an efficient manner who were fortunate enough to secure active duty since Pearl Harbor. Many others of overage officers, experts in their line, never succeeded in their ambition to be returned to active duty. Positions these retired officers might have filled successfully were filled by citizen soldiers of much less technical training, who were withdrawn from civilian war effort activities, at considerable cost to business establishments, to add avoidable cost to the Army pay roll.

It would appear an elementary economic principle that every retired officer capable of doing an administrative job efficiently should be detailed on that job instead of making further drain on civilian manpower and adding additional expense to the Army pay roll. In its last analysis this is purely a question of getting a technical job done at the least expense to the taxpayer, since there is no question that these retired officers are handling their administrative jobs in a competent manner, since the positions vacated include scores of post commanders of large posts, staff officers at the heads of important supply branches, commanders of depots handling hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property, and chief of staffs of service commands, all of whom were elected for their positions because of their long training.

At times such as these, it would appear that officers with a background of training, understanding, judgment, and foresight would be more readily found among the older officers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have made and include therein an editorial from the Army and Navy Register.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made previously on the same resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix a very important article entitled "Airways For Peace," written by Mr. Edward Warner, vice chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the current issue of Foreign Affairs. I have a printer's estimate and it is estimated it will require $157.50 to print the article.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the matter may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There was no objection.

ALLOWANCES AND ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no opposition to the rule as amended.

If I understand the rule correctly, we will be given an opportunity to vote for one of three proposals, the House committee bill, the bill that passed the Senate, and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]. It seems to me that the amounts carried in the House bill are inadequate in some parts of the country. I do not think anybody can deny that it costs a great deal more to live in the colder parts of the country than it does in the warm and sunny South. We have recognized that in previous legislation. I had hoped that the committee might recognize that in the bill that they reported out. However, inasmuch as that has not been done, it seems to me that the only way we can adequately provide for the wives and dependents of the men in the Army and the Navy is to vote for the higher amounts in the three proposals that will be before us.

I hope those amounts will be continued for some time after the war, or at least that the men will be kept in the service until such time as they can find employment. That is a problem that this House will have to deal with and should deal with in the very near future. So that these men will know that when they come back here we will not repeat the performance we went through in 1919, and discharge men from the Army and Navy on Thursday and require them to go to work the following Monday if they were going to eat the second week they were home.

We can save millions of dollars that will have to be paid out in future pensions and compensation if we will now take time to provide a reasonable time for the men who come back from the fighting fronts to rehabilitate themselves, to make the very difficult adjustments that are necessary when a man leaves the turmoil and excitement of combat and comes back to the quiet of civilian life, quiet of their own communities. There is hardly a Member of this House but who could testify that they have seen men come back after the last war apparently in good health, but because of the necessity of getting back into the tremendous competition of earning a living for themselves and their families, many men, who otherwise would not have broken down, broke down, suffered mental and nervous disorders, and many of them have been on the pension rolls for the last 25 years who, in the opinion of competent psychiatrists, would not have broken down if they had been given 3 or 4 months in which to make this readjustment.

Mr. Speaker, those who lived through that experience can realize the tremendous nervous strain involved in the adjustments that must be made at the end of the present war.

When we passed the Selective Service Act this House itself included a provision which made it mandatory for the War and Navy Departments to give each of these men at time of discharge who had been hospitalized or wounded while in service a statement showing wounds, of any, and showing all periods of hospitalization. Unfortunately—I say unfortunately advisedly—the Seventy-seventh Congress repealed that provision, so today it is no longer mandatory for the Departments to issue such a statement.

I am convinced that it was a mistake to repeal that provision of the selective-service law. It was a law under which men who came back and who had filed claims for compensation for disabilities incurred in the service only to be confronted by a statement by the Veterans' Administration that the A. G. O. records showed no hospitalization.

I recall the War Department gave as a reason for recommending the repeal of that law the fact that it involved handling a lot of papers; not a very good reason, in my opinion. Another reason given was that in many cases, in the opinion of psychiatrists, it is not wise to tell a patient just what his disability really amounts to or to reveal the diagnosis. There was nothing in the amendment that made it mandatory upon the War Department to make known to the patient his diagnosis. It was merely a statement showing that he had been hospitalized on such and such a date, which would be adequate for the purpose, so that later on the Veterans' Administration or the Adjutant General's Office would not be faced with that certificate given to the man when he was discharged and came back, as they did many times after the last war, and find the man was not hospitalized.

Many cases could be cited to prove that this contention is sound and I hope the Military Affairs Committee, in spite of the fact that the Seventy-seventh Congress repealed that section of the Selective Service Act, will, in the near future, give further consideration to it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] for call-

ing attention to the manner in which section 2 has been drafted. I think the admonition or suggestion or advice he has given to the House is timely. Many committees, not only the Military Affairs Committee, are a little reckless as to complying with the Ramseyer rule. The Ramseyer rule provides that the committee shall set forth, not only the difference between the two bills, but also how the final bill should read.

I realize, and I address myself to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and he realizes that the Military Affairs Committee has been an extremely busy committee. It has had many, many important bills that it was obliged to consider and report, and, therefore, I hope that he will not feel too strongly concerning this omission.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In just a moment. However, I will join with him in the amendment that he states he will offer, because it will make clearer to everyone what the amendment means as it is written instead of the present amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the House will accept the apology from the Military Affairs Committee made by the distinguished dean of the House. I agree with the gentleman that there are splendid lawyers on the Military Affairs Committee, some of them are good draftsmen, and certainly they should not permit a bill to come before the House in the manner in which this bill is drawn.

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

Mr. MICHENER. In just a moment. And furthermore I apologize to the House, as a member of the Rules Committee, for voting for the rule which brings this bill up for consideration in its present form.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Under the Ramseyer rule there are two ways of reporting such a bill: First to set out in parallel columns the sections of the bill and the law it amends; the other is to include the changes in italics. If the gentleman wants to raise a point of order he has the right to.

Mr. SABATH. The only thing that was not printed in the report is the Senate bill; that is the only thing that was omitted.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. My remarks had reference to the draftsmanship of the bill, but so far as the report is concerned it does not comply with the Ramseyer rule, first, because it prints the substitute in parallel columns with the law and not the Senate bill which should have been printed; and in the second place it does not carry out the purpose of the Ramseyer rule which is to present a visual picture by the use of italics, roman letters, and parentheses so that Members may see at a glance what changes are contemplated by the amendments.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I desire to say I am perfectly satisfied that the Committee on Military Affairs has done a splendid job. They naturally did not print the Senate bill, but I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on the able manner in which he presented the matter before the Committee on Rules. He is a man well informed on this as, indeed, he is always on any legislation that is entrusted to him. I hope, therefore, that anything I have said will not be taken by either him or the committee as a criticism; it merely called attention to a slight omission.

I did not explain the bill because I knew the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Alabama could do it so much better, so much clearer, and so much abler than I. I have made my remarks short and not gone into the merits of the bill as I generally do.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House, pursuant to House Resolution 315, resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is nobody on the floor of this House, in fact nobody in Congress, who does not want to do all possible under the circumstances to take care of the dependents of servicemen while these men are fighting the battles of our country. I am certain I do not want to do anything that would in the slightest degree bring hardship or injustice to any dependent of any man in our fighting forces; at the same time in the consideration of legislation of this character under existing circumstances and conditions I think we ought to move with extreme caution, exercise sound discretion, and not allow ourselves to be persuaded into doing something unreasonable on account of our feeling of sympathy for those who are dependent upon our fighting men. I should like briefly to state the parliamentary situation with respect to this legislation. It is this: The Senate of the United States passed this bill originally, S. 1279, and it was sent to the House, I believe, on the day Congress recessed, and therefore the House committee could not reach it until after the recess.

Your committee has given this bill very careful study and in order that there might be no mistakes, immediately after the hearings before the whole committee the matter was referred to a special subcommittee to draft and return to the whole committee a bill they thought would cover the subject and grant adequate compensation to these dependents.

The Senate passed a lower rate of schedules in S. 1279 than the schedule of rates provided by the House amendment to that bill. Since that time the Senate in the consideration of what was called the Bailey-Clark substitute for the Wheeler bill relating to the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers into the Army of the United States attached to that measure a new schedule of rates to be allowed to the dependents of servicemen. That schedule is still considerably higher than the schedule of rates adopted in this House committee amendment. In this House amendment the increases in the amount of the allowances to servicemen's dependents are substantial ones.

It is an increase which I think meets the question of subsistence of these people based upon the latest estimates, the latest figures, and the latest cost of living. It is not of course as much as a good many of us would like to allow, but it is generous when you consider that under the law as it exists today the cost to the Government of the program covered by this legislation is more than a billion dollars a year, in fact around a billion two hundred million, this bill increases that cost, exclusive of what the servicemen provide out of their own pay to their dependents, by $659,752,000. This is a rather substantial increase, and when you take into consideration the fact that they are going to induct fathers perhaps in the upper age bracket where the families are going to be larger than in the younger age brackets, the increase in the amount of the bill will perhaps exceed that by the time we induct them into the armed services.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the allotment made to the wife and the children of a soldier in service based on need? By this I mean such a case as the following: I hold in my hand a letter from the friend of the court in my county of Oakland complaining bitterly about $50 a month being allotted to the wife of a soldier who is either a Government employee or who is working in a defense plant and earning $50 a week or better in addition to that allotment. Is it based on need?

Mr. MAY. As to the class A dependents, which consists of a man's wife and children, it is mandatory, and it is fixed largely on the evidence in reference to not only the cost of living but the average of the conditions existing throughout the country in the various sections.

For instance, the cost of living in Detroit or Chicago or New York would probably be far in excess of what it might be in certain parts of the rural sections.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has misunderstood my question. Is it based on the need of the individual? Suppose she is the wife of a man who has a million dollars in the bank, does the $50 go to her just the same?

Mr. MAY. It certainly does, but I would call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this bill covers only enlisted men and we do not have very many millionaires in that group.

Mr. DONDERO. I have read this bill carefully. Does the bill recognize the decrees of the courts in regard to the welfare of the children of divorced wives of men in the service?

Mr. MAY. It certainly does, but it provides that the allowance shall not exceed the amount of the decree of the court.

Mr. DONDERO. I have a case where children have been allowed $10 a week by the court. That has been found to be a reasonable sum. In this bill the children average about $20 a week. Will the court's decrees supersede and take precedence over the provisions of this bill at the time it becomes law?

Mr. MAY. Not as to the children. The children will be allowed whatever this bill provides for them.

Mr. DONDERO. Regardless of the court order?

Mr. MAY. Yes; even though the court order is less than what the bill provides. As to the wife, she is bound by the court decree.

I might call attention to the fact there are 4,356,350 beneficiaries or dependents now receiving these allotments and allowances from the Treasury of the United States. That is as to both the Army and Navy, as I understand it, and when we increase the Army, as we are planning to do right along month after month, the number of these beneficiaries will increase in proportion to the number of men taken in, based, of course, on the size of their families. So that it may be estimated that by the first of next January there will be at least 5,000,000 people on the pay roll of the Government receiving these allowances. That is, men, women, and children.

In the first instance we allow a wife without a child $50, $22 of that to be paid by the soldier and $28 by the Government. I would like to compare that figure with some of the other governments of the world and see how they match up.

In France a wife is paid $9 a month. A relative, which includes members of the family, as I take it, and parents, $9 per month, and a child $4.05 per month in Paris and $3.30 per month elsewhere. In this country we found that the cost of living was so variable and so different in the various sections of the country that there was nothing we could do except take evidence and determine what the average cost of living is, so far as we could, for the country as a whole.

We could not say with any degree of certainty or propriety that the people in South Carolina, for instance, where the climate is favorable and where the cost of living is far below that of Michigan, should have one sum and those in Michigan should have another sum. So we struck a medium between the two conditions based upon the subsistence idea for the necessary support of these dependents and with that we have this vast increase of $659,752,000 which, to my mind, means that when we come to the reading of this bill under the 5-minute rule and somebody offers an amendment to make the provisions of this bill, which is now $20, $30, we ought to think quite a bit before we vote to raise these rates. I know it is unpopular to argue against raises for these people, and none of us like to do that, but I think we ought to have an adequate and proper regard for the financial condition of the Government.

When these men return from the battle fronts and lay down their guns and when the diplomats and statesmen start to negotiate the terms of peace, unless we have a free country and a Government that is able to protect our citizens in their individual right to freedom, not merely the "four freedoms" but every freedom and any freedom that might be discovered, we will make a tragic mistake if we do not move with caution in these matters and save as far as we can any unnecessary expenditures.

I know that in some sections of my district there will be wives and children receiving money under this bill far in excess of anything that they have ever had before, but I do not think that ought to be a ground for complaint against the committee bill nor do I think that the committee bill ought to be raised $1 in any instance; however, if you can convince me that the bill is wrong in any particular, of course, I will consent to changing it.

I would like to call attention to another country, Great Britain. We think she is a rich country. Perhaps she is rich. She is at least an English-speaking nation and ought to live on the same kind of a standard we live on. What does she pay to these people? To a wife Britain pays $5.60 per month, to the first child $6.80 per month, to the second child $6.40 per month and to each additional child $5.60 per month. That is far less than 50 percent of what we propose in the pending bill.

To my mind the bill ought to be adopted as it is written. It should not be amended except where amendments are necessary to make effective the legislative provisions of the bill. I am speaking only on the question of the amount to be allowed. When the time comes for a vote, I hope the Members will bear in mind that this is a very liberal Government and that these allowances will amount at the end of this year to four times what the Veterans' Administration, that has to do with all compensation, hospitalization, and pensions for the last war, is costing us annually, and that is a huge sum of money.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have two questions. Has the committee any statistics that could be made available to us indicating how the committee arrived at this average?

Mr. MAY. The committee hearings are full of facts we gathered in the subcommittee, which included, I believe, the latest figures of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What figures were used?

Mr. MAY. And all of the information we could get from the Manpower Commission and any other department of the Government that had statistics on that subject. The head of the Children's Bureau testified at length.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Did the committee give any consideration to the formula that was adopted at the time of W. P. A., not as to rates but as to the difference in the cost of living in various parts of the country?

Mr. MAY. I think we searched the situation as to what the cost of living was in the cities, in the urban communities, and in the rural communities very thoroughly. We had three different subjects of inquiry, the cost of living in the larger cities having certain populations, then cities of less population, then the urban communities, and then the rural communities.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish first to compliment the distinguished chairman for this word of caution which he has given us with reference to stepping up these pay rates materially. Second, may I say that I very much want to go along with him on a reasonable proposal such as here submitted, but it seems to me that in addition to what the chairman said about this increasing number that will go on the pay roll, we must bear in mind that perhaps in the near future a material acceleration will occur with reference to the dependents of fathers who will be inducted into the service a little faster than they have heretofore been inducted. On the basis of 5,000,000 payrollees, would it be unfair to assume an average of $75 per enlistee? Is that a little high, would the gentleman say?

Mr. MAY. To include all the dependents, wives, children, parents, and all?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Certainly it would be too high. That would amount to $4,500,000,000 annually.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the estimate? The gentleman may have mentioned it, but what is the estimated average as applied to the 5,000,000 figure the gentleman has used?

Mr. MAY. That is including all the dependents?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; everybody.

Mr. MAY. I do not have the average of that at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was just wondering if any average is available.

Mr. MAY. I doubt if it is available to anybody, because there are so many $20 allowances, so many $15 allowances, and so many $50 allowances that we have no average of it in the testimony, I think.

I hope the bill as reported by your committee may be approved and passed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that our Nation cannot afford to adopt a pinch-penny policy when it comes to providing adequate allowance for the wives and children of men who are being inducted into the military service. At the present time the United States Government, through Selective Service, has enacted a policy which proposes to draft immediately thousands of heads of families. Many of these fathers have a number of dependent children. In view of the Government's determination to call these fathers into the armed service I insist that it is the duty of Congress to see that their dependents do not suffer hardships. It is time that we take immediate action to carry into effect what I believe to be the unanimous opinion of a majority of the Members of this House. The money we invest in the care of these children will pay large returns to our Nation in future years. It is a sound investment. These allowances should be generous enough to provide adequately for the wife and children of the men called into service. A father who must continually worry about the welfare of his family will not make a good soldier. Some will no doubt say that this is a very expensive program and cost a lot of money. That is true, but it must not be the determining factor. When we are giving away money all over the world and when we propose to feed the people of the various nations all over the world by setting up relief agencies for their benefit at a time when we propose the establishment of an international bank which will no doubt cost us billions of dollars, it seems to me we can afford to be more liberal with the wives and children of men who are called into military service.

Recently a mother of two children from my own congressional district wrote me in regard to this problem and enclosed a statement showing the actual cost of maintaining herself and two sons. Her husband expects to be called into the service immediately and she will be left with two boys, one 7 and the other 18 months. I want to call the attention of the House to this proposed budget submitted by this mother. You will find that every item mentioned is essential to the welfare of this family. There are no extravagant items in it and would only furnish the bare necessities of life.

Actual cost of maintaining mother and 2 sons (7 years and 1½ years of age)

		Per year
House (at $25 per month rent)		$300.00
Fuel (coal)		60.00
Utilities (gas, electricity, and water)		60.00
Insurance:		
Mother, $1,000 policy costing (annually)	$26.98	
Son, $500 policy costing (annually)	11.05	
Son, $500 policy costing (annually)	11.05	
		49.08
Food:		Per year
Milk, 2½ quarts a day, at 12 cents (365 days)	$109.50	
Eggs, 2 dozen per week, at 40 cents	41.60	
Butter, 1 pound per week, at 50 cents	26.00	
Meat, $1 worth per week	52.00	
Potatoes, 30 cents worth per week	15.60	
Vegetables, $1.25 worth per week	65.00	
Bread, 4 loaves per week, at 10 cents each	20.80	
Oranges, 2 dozen per week, at 40 cents per dozen	41.60	
Fruit (home canned, 1 quart per day, 365 quarts per year)	107.03	
		$479.13
(Below is listed fruit I canned this summer and actual cost.)		
3 bushels pears (60 quarts), at $4.90 per bushel, $14.70, plus $1.05 sugar	15.75	
3 bushels peaches (60 quarts), at $6.25 per bushel, $18.75, plus $1.05 sugar	19.80	
2 bushels apricots (60 quarts), at $8.50 per bushel, $17, plus $1.05 sugar	18.05	
12 large pineapples (17 quarts), at $5.50 per dozen, $5.50, plus 30 cents sugar	5.80	
60 pounds pitted cherries already sugared (25 quarts)	11.00	
3 bushels plums (90 quarts), at $7.20 per bushel, $21.60, plus $1.58 sugar	23.18	
2½ bushels apples (53 quarts), at $5 per bushel, $12.50, plus 93 cents sugar	13.43	
		107.03
School books and supplies for 7-year-old boy (estimated)		6.00
Cod-liver oil for both boys, per year		6.00
Dentist (twice a year) for all three of us (average)		20.00
Medical attention (low estimate)		10.00
Clothing:		
Son, 7 years old:		
Shoes, 2 pairs, at $3.50 per pair	$7.00	
2 half soles and heels for 2 pairs a year	3.00	
Underwear, 6 pairs	6.00	
Galoshes	2.25	
Winter trousers, 4 pairs, at $2.98 each	12.00	
Summer trousers, 4 pairs, at $1.98 each	8.00	
Jacket, winter	7.00	
Cap	1.00	
Gloves	1.00	
Shirts (4 summer and 4 winter)	8.00	
Sweater	3.00	
		58.25
Son, 1½ years old:		
Shoes, 2 pairs, at $2.50 per pair	5.00	
2 pairs half soles	2.00	
Underwear, 6 pairs	4.00	
Galoshes	1.50	
Winter trousers, 4 pairs, at $1.98 each	8.00	
Sun suits, summer, 6, at $1 each	6.00	
Gloves	1.00	
Snow suit	7.00	
Clothing—Continued.		Per year
Son, 1½ years old—Continued.		
Shirts, winter, 4, at $1 each	$4.00	
Sweater	3.00	
		$41.50
Mother		87.00
(The above estimate for my own clothes includes 2 pairs shoes, half soles, underwear, hose, house dresses, 2 good dresses per year, and a coat and hat.)		
Incidentals (including soap for bath and laundry, flour and other foodstuffs too numerous to mention)		25.00
Total cost of maintaining very moderately a mother and 2 small children for 1 year		1,201.96

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Military Affairs in its work today, like many of the other important committees of the House, is divided into subcommittees. This question, which on the face of it may not seem so involved, is underneath a very complicated one as to administration. I want to pay my compliments to the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs who have devoted themselves so closely to this subject, not only at the present time but during the past year in the development of the original bill, notably on our side the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]; and on the Democratic side the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

I am going to suggest to the Members on this side, at least, that on detailed questions as to specifications you reserve your questions for the members of the subcommittee when they make their explanations to you today. They are better informed than are some of the rest of us, and I know they are in a much better position to give you the exact answers that some of you may require.

Generally speaking, I may say this:

Numerous House bills were considered and public hearings were held with the view to giving thorough consideration to all phases of the question of family allowances which has become of increased importance because of the drafting of fathers. Representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the Federal Security Agency were among those who testified.

Although formal reports on the bill have not been received from the service departments, and its relationship to the program of the President has not been ascertained, the committee understands that the provisions of the bill, except the matter of rates, are favored by the War and Navy Departments as being necessary and desirable on the basis of their year's experience in administering the Family Allowance Act. Such departments, other than confirming a need for

some overhaul and increases in the schedules of payments, do not make specific recommendations as to rates.

The principal changes which the bill, with the amendments recommended by the committee, will effectuate, are as follows:

(a) Increase greatly the family allowance for children.

(b) Increase family allowance for parents, brothers, and sisters who are dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support.

(c) Grant an initial family allowance for the month of entry into service in a pay status to wives, children, and parents, brothers and sisters, who are dependent upon the enlisted man for their chief support without any deduction from the pay of the enlisted man for such initial allowance.

(d) Include female enlisted personnel of all grades and aviation cadets within the provisions of the act.

(e) Make dependents of enlisted personnel of the upper three grades eligible for family allowances and suspend monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents, as authorized by section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, for the period during which such family allowances are paid.

(f) Define the eligible dependents of female enlisted personnel.

(g) Remove limitations as to amounts payable to children where living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order, written agreement, or divorce decree.

(h) Provide for prompt and equitable payment by the Secretary of the department concerned of amounts due on death of a dependent.

(i) Clarify penal and administrative provisions.

AMENDMENTS OF S. 1279

A more extended study by the administering departments has brought to light some necessity for clarification of provisions of the bill as recommended by them to the Senate committee. These matters have been inquired into and have resulted in several amendments of S. 1279 of a clarifying nature. Amendments of sections 6, 7, 7a, and 11 of S. 1279 as received by this committee are of this nature.

Aside from such clarifying amendments, S. 1279 is changed or modified in the following essential particulars:

(a) Rates in section 5 are increased.

(b) In section 6 the limitations upon allowances to children living separate and apart under court orders or written agreements are eliminated.

(c) In section 7 the reduction from pay of enlisted man having separate quarters is reduced and restricted to the upper pay grades.

(d) In section 7 a uniform rule is provided to govern termination of entitlement to family allowances, incident to any change in status of the enlisted man or dependent.

(e) Section 11 has been modified to insure inclusion of dependents of female enlisted persons and aviation cadets as eligible for family allowances.

(f) A new section is added defining the dependents of enlisted females and fixing the allowances for their husbands and children.

(g) A new section has been added to provide an effective date for all provisions of the act with suitable protection to payees and to disbursing agents during the period of transition to new provisions of law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to spend most of my time explaining some of the features of the bill. They are not particularly difficult to understand, if a Member will go over it and relate them to the provisions of the basic law. If each one will get his copy of the bill and go over it with me, I shall explain more in detail some of the provisions that we have changed, and try to tell you as best I can just what the changes are and how they will work out if this bill is enacted into law. Starting on page 11, the very first amendment makes the benefits payable to the dependents of all enlisted grades, whereas the present law restricts it to the four lowest grades. Only the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are entitled to it at the present time. That is, the buck private, the first class private, the corporal, and the line sergeant. All grades above that under the law as it stands now are not entitled to dependent benefits, and the reason for that is that under the law those grades are entitled to commutation of quarters, if there are dependents, and, therefore, they were not included originally. That works a hardship in the case of a person who has as many dependents as a wife and one child, and certainly it becomes more difficult the greater number of children, because, under the law as it stands now, those persons in the first three grades get $37.50 a month as rental allowance. If he were allowed to get the family allowance, he would contribute $22, and the Government would contribute $28 for the wife alone. For a wife and one child under the present law, the Government contributes $12 additional for the child. That puts the Government's contribution up to $40, which is in excess of the rental allowance. Of course, the greater number of children, the greater is that discrepancy, resulting in a manifest inequity. That will become more greatly accentuated, in the case of a man who has incurred heavy family responsibilities, and who may be eligible for the higher grades. This law would make it available to all. We propose to do away with rental allowances for those who take family allowances, but that comes in a later section, and I will explain it more in detail, when we get to it.

We next take section 3, where there is a material change. That divides the dependents into three rather than into two classes. At present we have class A and class B. Class A includes wife and children, and class B includes collateral dependents. The only thing necessary to show now in the case of collateral dependents is that he is dependent on the man for a substantial amount of support, and it has been held by the Office of the Comptroller General that as much as $10 a month would be substantial support.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. What is the basis for the $10?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was not set necessarily as a dividing line, but where a soldier had been contributing $10 to his family, the Comptroller General said that that should be held to be substantial support. We did not set any dividing line or standard.

Mr. CELLER. Is a standard set up whereby a soldier would have to show dependence in any way?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only to a substantial degree. We do this. We still keep that substantial feature. We call that class B, but we provide that no contribution can be made to a class B dependent in the event there are class B-1 dependents. The class B-1 dependents are those collateral dependents who are dependent on the serviceman for chief support. They must show that the man was their chief support. We have liberalized the amount payable under class B-1. We come to that in the next section. I call attention to the fact that under the operation of this particular amendment a good many of these collateral dependents will be dropped from the rolls because if there are class B-1 dependents, there cannot be a class B dependent, and, furthermore, a good many of those now carried as class B dependents will be relegated to this new class B dependent and if there are B-1 dependents, they will not be eligible to draw.

Mr. CELLER. So when it comes to class A dependents there need not be actual proof of dependency or chief support but there will have to be that proof in the case of class B?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There must be proof of substantial support when you come to class B-1. It must be chief support.

Mr. CELLER. Suppose a soldier has a wife?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And no dependents—no proof of dependence—just the record of marriage. I come to that later.

The next provision relates to the change of the rates. As I see it, this is the only controversial section in the whole bill. We have not increased the amount payable to the wife. Rather strange to say, no recommendation came to us except in one or two bills, proposing an increased amount to the wife. It is our theory that the wife need not depend entirely upon the allotment that is made to her, if there is no child. In fact, she should be encouraged in this time of manpower shortage to work and help support herself. So for her this becomes assistance rather than subsistence.

We have changed the amount payable to the wife and one child. Under the law as it stands now the amount payable is $62. We propose under this bill to make it $75. Under the law now there would be $10 additional for each additional child. We provide there shall be $20 for the second child and $15 for each additional child thereafter.

We have increased the amount that is payable to a child living with a divorced wife.

By the way, the definition of "divorced wife," as given in the basic law is a wife who is separated from her husband, living under a divorce decree or order, which allows her alimony, and that she has not remarried. Therefore when we use the term "wife divorced" that is what is meant.

In no event, however, will a wife be allowed to draw more than the amount provided for in a court order or decree or written agreement between her and the serviceman.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I have had my attention called some time ago to a case where a divorce decree was granted and the child was awarded $5 a month.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me come to that a little later. That comes in a later section, and if you will just withhold your question I will take it up then.

Well, I will answer the gentleman now. Regardless of whether the children are living under a court order or not, we propose to treat them all alike and to give the child the full amount to which the child is entitled under the bill, regardless of whether there is a divorce decree setting the amount at $5, or being absolutely silent as to the payment. We propose to treat all children alike and to pay them the full amount regardless of court orders, court decrees, or written agreements. We do not do that with reference to the wife. We take care of the wife who is living under a divorce decree just as I have mentioned.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Is there any over-all sum that will be allowed to a soldier, considering his collateral and direct dependents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No aggregate. The law as it stands now does have an aggregate limit, but we took that out for the simple reason that under the proposed order we are going to take servicemen in without regard to the number of dependents. Therefore we felt that the limitation ought not to apply. Then in the next section are set out the rates for Class B, $37, payable only in the event there are no B-1 dependents. The next section deals with Class B-1. There is a small change there and that is liberalizing the amount that may be due to the dependent parent of a serviceman. We have given to that dependent parent exactly the same amount we have given to the wife. Whereas under the law now that dependent parent should have gotten either $37, or $20 depending upon circumstances. If there are two parents we now propose to give them $68. The payment that may be made to any Class B dependent must be paid all to one person.

The next section has to do with wives who are living under divorce decree. There is a limitation there which I explained a few minutes ago.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. We have a number of complaints where soldiers are a little disturbed that their wives did not receive their allotments until sometimes as much as 2 or 3 months after they enlisted, thereby creating trouble and difficulty. Does this bill remedy that situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it does. That is in a later section that I will come to.

I have explained about a wife living separate and apart from her husband. The next provision is the very one that the gentleman just inquired about, the initial allowance. We provide under this bill that the Government shall pay the initial allowance. It is the intention for it to be paid from the induction center and to be paid probably within 2 or 3 days from the time the man goes into the service.

That goes directly to his dependents and is in the same amount as the schedule that was set out in section 5 that I just explained a few minutes ago. No part of the soldier's pay is taken for that initial payment. The Government assumes the responsibility of making the whole payment without charging anything to the soldier. We felt it was well for the Government to do it. According to Mr. Taft's testimony, it would relieve a great majority of the hardship cases that they are running into. Hereafter there ought not be any great delays.

General Gilbert testified before us when this bill was being considered, and he told us something about the enormous load that had been carried by the Office of Dependency Benefits, the new organization that has been set up within the last year; the new office space which had to be obtained at Newark, N. J., and the whole machinery started out new. There were considerable delays in the beginning, but they have been straightened out now except in a relatively small number of unusual cases where the proof has not been submitted or where some difficulty has come up in getting proper proof. So I think we can expect all of those claims to be handled expeditiously from now on.

Mr. CELLER. You might have a little difficulty later on. With reference to the soldiers who have been heretofore inducted, who did not get this additional allowance, would they have a right to make a claim against the Government because technically they would be discriminated against, would they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, because the act takes effect, these new rates take effect subsequent to the enactment of this bill and, of course, there would be no backtracking. According to your argument men who were in the Army back in the days of the Spanish-American War would have a right to get the benefits of any increased rates subsequently provided, and it just would not work.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to get the benefit of the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Next we get to the question of commutation for quarters; we give it to the three highest grades of enlisted men, and just here let me say that if they are already drawing commutation for quarters, they are given the right to choose whether or not they wish to continue to draw rental allotment or whether they will take the family allowance. And to the explanation I made a few moments ago may I add that there will be an advantage to some of them to choose family allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment when this bill is returned to the floor.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I propose to offer an amendment in connection with this particular feature which would require those men in the first three grades who elect to take rental allowance, rather than the family allowance, to show that they are actually paying under some kind of an allotment scheme an amount equal to the rental allowance to the dependents, the reason being that in the first place the rental allowance is paid on the basis of taking care of dependents, and this allotment bill is being proposed in order to take care of his dependents back home, and it is not right or fair for some man in the upper grades to be able to choose to take the rental allowance, which is being paid for the benefit of his dependents, and simply put that in his pocket.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his proposal to add that amendment to the bill. I think that there is need for such an amendment in order to clarify and eliminate the danger of abuses through a soldier or sailor in the first three classes claiming the allowance, pocketing the money, and not using the funds for the support of his dependents.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the subcommittee would have agreed to adding that amendment had it had time.

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

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman kindly indicate the three grades he refers to?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are seven grades.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will take them in order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In any way the gentleman wishes to make the explanation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The seventh grade starts at the top and comes down; we start in the higher grades and come down to the lower. The buck private, so-called, is in the seventh grade. The first-class private would be the sixth grade; the corporal would be in the fifth grade; the sergeant, sometimes referred to as the buck sergeant, or the line sergeant, would be a fourth grade.

Then we come into the staff sergeant, which would be the third grade; the technical sergeant, I believe, would come next, in the second grade, and the master sergeant and the first sergeant would be in the first grade.

In the Navy we have a similar classification, which goes through the chief petty officers, and which includes all classes, as I understand it, with the exception of commissioned officers and warrant officers. I think I am correct in that statement.

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

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman is incorrect with respect to the second grade; I think we included the technical sergeant in the second grade.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The staff sergeant would be in the third; the technical sergeant would be in the second, and the master sergeant and first sergeant would be listed in the first grade.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First sergeants were put in first grade about a year ago, and now they are in the first grade.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two other provisions: First with reference to dependents of WAVES, WAC's, and other women who are in the service. The husband and the children of women in the service may be their dependents, but we do not pay it to them automatically; it is necessary to prove actual existence of dependency. It is realized that the wife may have children or a husband who are dependents, but payment cannot be made without proof of dependency of the husband or the child or children of the woman in the service, and they will have to prove actual dependency or chief support.

The only other provision relates to the effective date of the act. We make the act effective on the first day of the calendar month following its enactment. In other words, if it is enacted during the month of October, it will become effective November 1, and that is true, I think, in reference to payments and to the initial payment.

We do provide there shall be an adjustment period and we give to the departments concerned 4 months in which to make any adjustments; we also protect them against any overpayments that may have been made during that time because they just simply cannot adjust overnight.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I just want to ask the gentleman one question with reference to dependency of women in the service: Is it not true that as to all women in the service they are precluded from enlisting in the service if they have a child, dependent child, under 18 years of age?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe that is true; I think probably the age is 14 years, as to the WAC's; I am not sure what it is for the WAVES. But, the gentlemen can think of cases in which there might develop cases of dependency of a husband or a child after they went into the service.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to make sure that I heard the gentleman correctly with reference to the question of the cases arising out of divorce where there are children. I understood the gentleman to say that the compensation fixed by this act will be paid regardless of the amount allowed by the court, that under this law the Office of Dependency Allowance will pay the full amount allowable under this law and disregard any lesser amount which might be made by the court.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, even if the court decree is silent and does not give anything.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What do the hearings disclose as to the differences between the proposed allowances and the allowances that similarly obtained during the First World War?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I do not know that; someone else may have the information, but I have not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And this second question if the gentleman will permit: What do the hearings disclose as to the differences in the cost of living now and the cost of living in the First World War?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We spent our time trying to study the levels of the cost of living at the present time rather than comparing it with World War No. 1. We did not try to arrive at the rates by comparing the present situation with that in World War No. 1; we tried rather to tie it to the present cost of living. I was going to come to that in a moment, how we arrived at our rates.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would assume that the committee did give consideration to the matter of the cost of living inasmuch as the committee proposes to increase the amount of the benefits.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did that but we did not try to tie it to the First World War.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; unquestionably not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We already had the law; we were trying to meet conditions growing out of this war.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then how does it compare to the time we first fixed the benefits?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me state how we arrived at the figure that was finally agreed upon. The gentleman, of course, must know that in such legislation any particular figure arrived at is the result of conciliation and compromise. Some 15 or 20 different bills relating to this same subject have been introduced. They started out with a 10-percent flat increase. I do not remember just whose bill that was. I remember that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was one of the early leaders, and if I recall correctly—I do not have his bill before me—but if I recall correctly, it provided for a 15-percent horizontal increase. Other bills then came along with different figures. As it happened, we did not arrive at any quotient product on this but it happened that the average of all those bills would have been almost identical with what it provided in this bill. That, however, is just an accident, as I say; we did not arrive at it in that way.

Miss Faith Williams, the head of the Cost of Living Division of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, appeared before the subcommittee. You will find her testimony in the back part of the hearings. She testified that the average cost of living in 33 cities in the United States amounted to approximately for the wife about $64 and for each child about nineteen dollars and some odd cents.

In addition to that she further testified that some items were included in those figures that probably would not have to be included in the Budget such as we were trying to set up here. For instance, she said, as I recall, that she allowed $46 for life insurance. The Government takes care of life insurance under the Soldier's and Sailor's Civil Relief Act. Furthermore, the Government offers to the servicemen as much as $10,000 life insurance, taking the premiums out of the soldier's pay if the soldier wants it. So about $4 a month could come off of that figure.

Mr. MAY. Was that $46 for insurance a monthly allowance or annual?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was on a annual basis; it was approximately $4 a month.

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield while he is on that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that on page 60 of the hearings is a full tabulation of the cost of living in 33 of the large cities of the United States. I think the gentleman from Mississippi may be interested in these data.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Miss Williams further on, however, made the flat statement as to cost of living. You will find it a little more specific in the testimony that she gave; so we tried to tie this increase just as nearly as we could to the cost-of-living figures. We realized that as practical matter that we could not possibly reach the highest level. We could not legislate, for instance, to meet the San Francisco level or the New York level. I think the table shows New York to be the highest, but recently it develops that San Francisco has the highest cost-of-living index. The amount we have allowed may be too much for some sections of the country but we arrived early in the consideration of this bill at the decision that we could not place this strictly on a need basis; in other words you could not have varying grants in varying parts of the country; we had to have a uniform level and after checking the various figures, I say very frankly some lower and some higher, we

arrived at the particular figures that are included in this bill.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to need, does the gentleman care to add anything to the statement that where there is no need at all for the wife and children, the committee gave consideration to that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the only remaining point I wanted to touch on. We discussed in the subcommittee and in the committee as a whole whether or not a need test should be applied as to the wife and children and we decided against that. There were two compelling reasons for that.

First, it would be practically impossible to administer with anything like expedition. If you went out to take proof of dependency of wives and children, it would take 3, 4, 5, or 6 months. As a matter of fact, I believe that the experience in World War No. 1 was a very unhappy one in connection with that. We had the spectacle of many dependents, such as would be classified as dependents under this law, not getting their dependency allowance until the war was over, even though the husband had been in the service many, many months before that time. Also, the law imposes upon the husband a legal obligation to support his wife and children regardless of their immediate need. I believe those were the principal reasons that caused us to say that we should not apply any dependency test to the wife. Of course, they must prove the status of marriage and of childbirth. When that is proven, then they automatically become entitled to the payments.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. In administering these class B and B-1 dependents, is there not a likelihood of a lot of confusion in the administration of the act between class B and B-1?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman, perhaps, has seen some of the Navy affidavits that have been sent out. The Army proposes to use a similar plan, and let the serviceman and also the supposed dependent both fill out a sworn statement showing the exact amount of income that those persons have had in the past and the part that the serviceman has contributed to it. Of course, there will be some irregularities—you cannot escape that—but there will be a checkup from time to time and the cases in which there has been fraud or in which there have been irregularities when called to the attention of the Office of Dependency Benefits or the department concerned will be rectified. If it is found that the dependents are not entitled to the allowance, they will be cut off and appropriate action will be taken.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. There is perfect understanding on the part of those who administer this law as to who shall be class B dependents and class B-1 dependents?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, in all probability upon final passage of this bill (S. 1279) to increase and liberalize family allowances of servicemen, there will be few, if any, votes against it, and under ordinary circumstances I would not take up the time of the House to discuss what is conceded to be a noncontroversial bill. My vote itself would be sufficient to indicate my interest and my approval of the measure. However, since I am a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which is scheduled to leave for the west coast next Monday to hold hearings on critical naval production problems in that area, and since I am advised that there is a probability that a vote may not be reached on this bill by Monday, I want to take this opportunity to advise you, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that I am most thoroughly and heartily in favor of this bill, and that I hope it will pass without any opposition whatever.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, when this bill for allowances for dependents of servicemen is read for amendment, I intend to offer an amendment providing certain changes in the figures contained in the committee bill now before us. The amendment which I will offer will be to page 12, line 14, of the committee bill and will strike out the language in lines 14 to 19, including the word "child", in line 19, and inserting in place thereof the following language:

> $50; a wife and one child $80, with an additional $20 for each additional child. A child but no wife, $42, with an additional $20 for each additional child. A wife divorced but no child, $42; a wife divorced and one child, $72, with $20 for each additional child.

The purpose of my amendment is to bring back the payments to be made to the wife and to the children of servicemen to the exact figures contained in the Senate bill which was passed on October 6, 1943, by a vote of 78 to 1 in the Senate. The House committee had the Senate bill before it at the time that it had under consideration the amounts which should be paid in the way of allowances and, so far as I can recall, there was no particular discussion which would indicate any reason whatsoever why there should be the particular difference between our bill as offered and the Senate bill. For instance, so far as the wife is concerned, the Senate bill and the committee bill are the same. So far as the wife and one child are concerned, the Senate bill provides for $80, the committee bill $75. There is no reason that I know of for that deduction of $5. For the second child the Senate provides for $20 and the committee bill provides for $20. They are in exact agreement. When we come to the third and subsequent children, the Senate bill provides $20 and the committee bill provides $15.

In other words, the difference between the Senate bill, which has already been passed by the overwhelming vote of 78 to 1, and this committee bill which has been brought in here amounts to no difference in the wife's allowance, $5 for the first child, no difference for the second child, and a difference of $5 for the subsequent children. There is no economic reason whatsoever for that. In view of the fact that the Senate has adopted what I believe to be fair figures I believe that the House ought to accept them. Then there will be no question at issue in conference and we will know exactly what these dependents are to get.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. If I were a member of that committee I would introduce a similar amendment to what the gentleman has suggested. I understand he will get recognition on the offering of the amendment because he is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. May I say it is a worthy amendment and I hope the House will support it.

Mr. CLASON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. I also was rather bewildered at the change of allotment for the first child as compared to the third child. We might be led to assume the third and fourth child would eat less than the first child. I do not agree with that assumption. They all eat pretty well.

Mr. CLASON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. Miss Williams, to whom the gentleman from Alabama referred, testified before the committee, and it is presumed that she was the Government's own witness. She testified that because of the small amount of money the family is going to have, no matter how many children there are in the family, you cannot decrease the cost of living for each child after you have the first child. She stated that the amount each child must have is $19.56. I see no reason why this House should try to make the child live on $15, when as a matter of fact the child needs the $19.56 to get just ordinary maintenance.

In offering this amendment I do so not only for myself but for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], all members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, all of whom agree that the Senate figures ought to be retained in this bill when it is passed.

While I am satisfied that other cogent arguments can be offered in its support, I am ready to rest the adoption of this amendment upon the evidence received

at the hearings, particularly that of Miss Faith M. Williams, Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Her testimony appears at page 157 of the hearings. I heard her testify and am satisfied that her figures are more satisfactory than any other evidence I heard on the question of allowances. She testified that on figures compiled for 33 cities from all over our country—and they were not all the larger cities, some were smaller cities of less than 100,000 population—as of August 15, 1943, the actual expense of a wife without any children at a maintenance level was $64.39. If the wife has one child to support the cost increases $19.56. There is no change for each additional child.

It seems to me that wives who are without children may very well be given somewhat less than what the statistics show, because we know that a very large percentage of them, a vast majority of them, I may say, can and will go to work and will not depend upon this $50 for their livelihood. On the other hand, if the wife has one or more children to take care of, in most cases she will not be able to work. So I believe that $50 is fair for the wife alone and, if she has a child and her situation has completely changed, we should then add to the $64.39, which Miss Williams testified is necessary for her support, the $19.56 necessary for the first child. This is a total of $83.95.

The Senate says that $80 is fair. My amendment provides for the $80. It cuts this woman $3.95. I feel that she is entitled to the full amount of $80, and this is supported by the statistics of our Government.

When we come to the additional children, we find, as I have said, that the wife cannot supply them with ordinary maintenance for less than the $19.56. Therefore, I believe the Senate is well warranted and I believe the House will be well warranted in adopting that additional sum of $20 for each additional child as provided in the Senate bill.

It is possible, of course, as we did in the present law, to provide $10 for these additional children. The War Department in its bill suggested $11. As I see it, the $15 in the committee bill can be nothing more than a compromise between the existing law and the Senate bill for the third and additional children. In other words, they see fit to compromise on the child's means for actual subsistence. I do not want to compromise on any such issue, so I am willing to accept the Senate's figure, which is absolutely in line with competent testimony that was heard by the committee.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder if the gentleman would repeat those figures. You are going to leave the wife without any children at $50?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Then the wife with one child will receive $80?

Mr. CLASON. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the wife with two children?

Mr. CLASON. She would get $20 more for each additional child.

Mr. STEFAN. That would be $20 for each child uniformly all the way through?

Mr. CLASON. After the first child. The first child would get a $30 allowance and each subsequent child $20.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman say anything about Class B? Would his amendment have anything to do with the change in Class B?

Mr. CLASON. No, my amendment affects only Class A. It will be necessary to put in some clarifying amendments further in the bill to bring the other sentences in the bill into line with my amendment. I attempted to cover only the class A dependents. If my amendment is accepted by the House, it will result in the Senate and the House being in absolute accord.

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

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has referred to the testimony as to the cost of living in 33 cities of the country. What testimony, if any, was there as to the relative cost of living in the country on the farms of the United States?

Mr. CLASON. I would say that the testimony was general and indicated that the cost of living in the smaller towns and smaller cities and in the rural sections, outside of certain northern places like Alaska, would be less than the amount indicated for these 33 cities. Nevertheless, we are in the position where, as to Detroit, for instance, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], of that city, can make a splendid argument in favor of even higher figures, and he is doing so in connection with his own bill. However, I do not believe we want to leave the children generally on the lower level. Remember, there will be hundreds of thousands of them, probably millions of them, if there are 2,000,000 fathers in the service in the next year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that one of the principal items in the cost of living is rental, and that rentals are very much lower on the farms than in the towns?

Mr. CLASON. There is no question about that. For instance, Miss Williams testified that the rental in the allowance is 20 percent of the total; that a wife with one child is going to be allowed $16 per month in order to house her child, wherever she is. It is impossible for me to believe that any wife can get decent accommodations in the city of Washington or in New York, Detroit, or any important city smaller than those cities on $16 a month for a wife and child. I do not think we want to go any lower, because while it is true that in the smaller cities and in the rural districts people are going to have a better standard of living than they have been accustomed to, or at least have the money for it, in some of the cities they are going to be worse off. Many families are going to be far worse off. I think it will be a good thing for this country, in the few months more which we at most hope this war will last, to make this additional sacrifice of perhaps $15,000,000 a month.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did the gentleman's committee give attention to the thought that there might be a tendency for those in the country to go to the cities because of the increased amount provided for their living?

Mr. CLASON. There is no room for them in the cities, if the conditions in cities elsewhere are as they are in mine.

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

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who served as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, which gave full and careful consideration to this bill, has covered the technical and administrative features of the measure so ably and fully that I do not propose to discuss them at this time. I do expect to make a few observations when the bill is read for amendment, but it seems to me that, at this stage of the bill, general debate seems to be lagging, and so my remarks will be brief. This is a highly important bill, and yet at the same time it is a complicated measure that carries with it a good many serious difficulties, about which there are many honest differences of opinion, but I want the RECORD to show at this point that I am heartily supporting this bill as reported by the committee, and I also indulge the hope that the House support the committee in the bill which it has reported, because I assert with confidence that it is a fair bill, and one that has been very carefully considered. No sum of money would adequately provide for some dependents of the men in our armed forces, but it seems to me that it should not be forgotten that in war, and especially in a war such as the terrible one in which we are now engaged, all of us, every man, regardless of his marital or family status, has certain obligations which he owes to his country, and that they necessarily carry with them a certain amount of sacrifice. And so it is just impossible to adequately pay enough in dollars to take care of his wife and children, but this committee was unanimous in wanting to make sure that it did adequately provide, at least reasonably so, for the wives and children of our gallant men in the service. We cannot support them in luxury but we must and will support them in decency. However, as I said, the matter presents very serious and complex difficulties. Many fathers have been drafted and more will be, so it is our duty to amend and make more liberal the existing law. Questions have been asked in the last few minutes about differences in the cost of living, which differences are apparent to all, because in the busy war-plant cities of the North and East, where the winters are very cold, like Buffalo, New York, Pitts-

burgh, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit, the weather is much colder than it is in Florida, Mississippi, south Texas, or California, and where rents are incomparably higher, there is a differential there that is apparent upon its face. The same is true about living conditions in the cities as contrasted with living conditions in the country, especially in warm climates where they do not use so much fuel or clothing and many have vegetable gardens and a cow.

Then another question came before the committee, and that is, that there are many wives who have independent or comfortable fortunes or incomes while many thousands have good jobs. The women of the country have shown a marvelous spirit of patriotism and cooperation. Under Secretary of War Patterson testified before our committee a few days ago that forty-five percent of those now employed in the airplane industry are women. There are differences in pay and living conditions that we would like to compose, but it is impossible. I was one of the members of the committee who expressed regret that there was not some fair and just administrative method that could be worked out to see to it that those who are truly dependent be adequately provided for, but that those who do not need it should not receive so much. I know hardship cases that I would allot twice as much as provided by this bill, and I know some wives of independent means or with fat jobs I would not give a cent. In fact a suggestion has been made by those in social security, and I think encouraged by Mr. Charles Taft, who appeared before the committee and made a most favorable impression, that that would be the ideal way to work it out, on the same basis perhaps as you work out old-age assistance and other dependent claims under the Social Security Act; but the War Department seems to think that is impracticable and difficult of administration and that everybody must be put on the same basis. I am inclined to agree for fear it would create bad morale. So to that end the committee accepted the views of the War Department, and of this subcommittee, who gave it much study, and then the full committee went into the matter extensively, and I invite members to read the hearings on the bill, which are full, fair, and exhaustive. We have brought this bill back here with the almost unanimous vote of the committee, although the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] and others have indicated that they want to raise the figures up to the amount that is provided for in the Senate bill passed three or four days ago. I feel, however, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] does not make a very strong argument when he talks about what the Senate did, because if you will look at the bill we are considering you will find that on July 8th the Senate passed a bill on this very subject raising the allotment of the first child from $10 to $18, with $11 to each additional child thereafter. They then thought a general sliding scale raise of 15 percent would be fair and just.

Yet while the House committee was giving careful and detailed consideration to this very bill, the body at the other end of the Capitol came along and amended the draft-the-fathers bill, giving the first child $30 and every additional child thereafter $20, when they had not held one minute's hearings on the bill and had no facts or record to support their views.

Somebody has got to pay for all this. We would all like to go much higher than this bill goes in truly dependent cases, but, after all, I have an idea that these boys of ours who are in the service, and their children, will have to pay for a large part of this sooner or later. This bill itself will cost in round figures nearly $1,000,000,000. So while we want to be fair and just and as generous as we can be under the circumstances, yet I think we ought to be consistent and reasonable with some regard also for the taxpayers. We must, of course, first be sure that we do justice to these dependents of men who are in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. At the same time we ought not to be overly generous with wives and children who do not need it. We ought to bear in mind the differences in climate, rents, and the difference in the cost of living in various parts of the country.

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

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

Mr. THOMASON. We are not generous enough with the hardship cases and we are too generous with many who are not dependent or deserving. We have done the best possible under the circumstances and I think it a fair bill.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have in mind an enlisted man who left a wife and two children and entered the service. Since he has been in the Army he has married another woman.

Mr. THOMASON. Under this bill both wives are entitled to the allotment.

Mr. GROSS. They both will get it?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That case needs consideration. How would it be handled under this bill?

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. The divorced wife is going to draw the allotment as well as the other one.

Mr. GROSS. But he was not divorced. He has got two wives and two children.

Mr. THOMASON. None but a legal or divorced wife could get an allotment. A woman who was never legally married would not draw anything. All children are entitled to an allotment.

Mr. GROSS. Each wife will get it, or will both get it and both children be cared for?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; any wife who was ever legally married, and regardless if divorced. All children by any wife are covered.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Soldiers pay taxes just as the rest of us—enormous taxes. They are not taxed on their salaries, but hundreds of thousands of those soldiers own property and they will have to pay heavy taxes, levied by the States and the counties as well as by the Federal Government upon their property. We seem to be inclined to think about all the soldiers as little boys who may be taxed through their children, but thousands of them are paying taxes now. Thousands of them are giving their lives to their country, and then the country through the estate-tax law will confiscate their estates after they lose their lives.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, what I have tried to say is that this bill has been given most careful consideration, and while there are some who think the figures are too high, I know others who think they are too low. Yet, when you investigate the record, and I refer you to some remarks which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] put in the RECORD a few days ago, you will find there is no country in the world paying anything like the amount to cover allotments and allowances to wives and children as is covered by this bill. That may not be anything like what is fair and just in some cases, but you must have an over-all picture. We must have regard for the taxpayers of the country, which include most of the men in the service. They and their children will have to help pay for this. So we must be fair and use our best judgment. We cannot let our feelings and our desires completely run away with us. There is not a member on this committee who did not give careful consideration and study to this bill. They wanted to be fair and just. That is the reason why I again express the hope that the House will support the committee in this bill that is now before us.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How does the gentleman arrive at the figure of a billion dollars annually?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has those figures. But for the Army alone under this bill the cost will be around $600,000,000. Including the Navy and the Marine Corps it will run in round numbers close to $1,000,000,000.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. The figure which the gentleman gave is the cost for all services. It cannot be accurately estimated at this time, because there is no way of telling the number of fathers who will be drafted into the service. The best figure we are able to get is $659,000,000 plus.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not have the figures before me, but I think they will run more than the figure the gentleman gave.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman was referring merely to the Army, in fact?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] was reading from the record. He said that covered all those in the armed services.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course it is merely an authorization bill. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and I would like to get some information. This is an annual expense. I wonder what the administrative cost would be. Does the gentleman have any idea about that?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not have that and I do not believe the hearings disclose it, but the hearings do disclose the probable cost in the allotments proper.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any estimate as to the number of individuals who are participating in this allotment?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; 2,800,000 now, and of course there will be a lot more.

Mr. STEFAN. That will increase, in view of the figures we received the other day regarding maternity care.

Mr. MAY. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain as to the original figure of $50 per wife, without child, whether that would be the total amount this wife would receive or does she receive an additional sum in the way of an allotment from her soldier husband?

Mr. THOMASON. No; that is all the wife would receive. There is no change in the present law with respect to the wife, or in any bill that has been proposed. The wife continues to draw $50.

Mr. STEFAN. I am referring to the present arrangement whereby the soldier receiving $50 usually makes an allotment of around $20 to his wife.

Mr. THOMASON. Under the present law he allots $22 and this bill carries the same amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. In any event that goes to his wife, if he has a wife, and the Government puts up $28.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that included in this $50?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. So this will remain, under the present arrangement whereby the soldier puts up $22 and the Government $28?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. Under this bill the wife will continue to draw $50, of which the soldier pays $22 and the Government $28. And if this bill prevails and becomes law, the first child will draw $25 and the second child will draw $20, and any child after that would draw $15.

Mr. STEFAN. How about those in class B where a mother has two sons in the service?

Mr. THOMASON. I am not sure about that.

Mr. STEFAN. Does she get $15 from each son?

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Where a mother has two sons in the service, or more, in the class B category in this bill, does she draw $50 from each son?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to answer that.

Mr. KILDAY. Does the gentleman's question refer to the pending bill or existing law?

Mr. STEFAN. To this measure.

Mr. KILDAY. Under existing law substantial support entitles the parent to draw $37.50 per month, but hereafter she could only draw chief support from one and draw substantial support from the other. In other words, she could not draw her chief support from her two sons; she would not be entitled to draw chief support from more than one son; she might be able to draw chief support and substantial support.

Mr. STEFAN. The present arrangement whereby she draws support from each son is eliminated by another amendment that is going to be put in this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. She would still draw from both, but in the same amount.

Mr. STEFAN. Which would amount to $37?

Mr. KILDAY. The way the bill is drawn she would draw the same amount as a dependent wife.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Where she is dependent; the amount of the allowance drawn by the mother would be the same as the wife, $50.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the class B dependent?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; this bill provides for class B and class B-1 dependents.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentleman from Nebraska that this point under discussion was debated and covered in the hearings on page 37, where I ask that question, the very question, of General Benedict. On page 37 of the hearings I ask this question:

> So that if this mother had five sons in the service, each of them declaring her a class B dependent, she could then get $37 from each of the five?

To which General Benedict said:

> Yes, sir; if none of the five had any other dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. I am supporting this bill as it is reported to the House by the committee, and again I express the hope the House will not amend this bill, so that if there are any differences the bill can go to conference where we can work out something that is fair to the dependents of our fighting men and also fair to the taxpayers.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and the chairman of the subcommitee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for the very splendid hearings and very thorough study made by the subcommittee, and for the high caliber of the witnesses appearing before the committee. I got a great deal of valuable information from the testimony of the several witnesses, and if there is any document that each Member of the House should put away in his permanent files bearing upon the pay and allowance question for the Army and the Navy, I would suggest that he put the hearings and the committee reports on this bill in his permanent files, because there is some information here of far-reaching importance and value. I want, also, to state that the Army has been most fortunate, in my opinion, in having Brig. Gen. H. N. Gilbert as Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits. He has done things in the administration of this allowance program for the Army on a larger scale and a more efficient scale than any similar undertaking in our Nation. The administration of the program for the Navy and for the Marine Corps has also been very efficient, but the number of accounts and the size of the job, of course, has been much larger in the Army, and the job certainly has called for the utmost ingenuity, diligence, and care.

Mr. Chairman, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, has been found to be inadequate in its provision for family allowances for other dependents. The bill (S. 1279) under consideration at this time has for its purpose increasing the allowances to a point that will provide the family and the dependents of the members of our armed forces with the necessities of life insofar as it is felt possible.

The hearings developed the fact that the provisions of our present law for class A dependents are fair enough as to a wife with no children, but that the allowance for children in the present law is very inadequate. The comparison of present rates and the rates proposed in the bill before us today is set out very clearly and briefly on pages 7 and 8 of the committee report—House Report No. 734.

The subcommittee made a very vigorous effort to determine the minimum maintenance costs for families and for other dependents and during the course of our hearings we secured some very valuable information for our guidance from the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. The Chief of that Division, Miss Faith M. Williams, came before the committee and her testimony is of special interest in the matter of determining the allowances needed for the maintenance of families and dependents. Her testimony appears in the hearings starting at page 157 and continuing to page 166 followed by a number of tables which she brought before the committee and which are set out in the hearings, pages 166 to 179, inclusive. I know all of you are interested in the information and data on which the judgment of the committee was based in the establishment of the proposed allowances and I suggest that each of you make a special point to place in your permanent files a copy of the hearings on this bill

so that you will have available for your future reference and use the data and the information therein.

The census reports show that there are 197 cities in the United States having a population of 50,000 or more. The Department of Labor has kept statistics and data for 33 cities of more than 50,000 population and they have selected these cities from a list of 59 cities on which the best records were available from the Works Progress Administration study of living costs starting in 1935. Miss Williams used this list of 33 cities which appears on page 179 of the hearings for computing the estimated cost of maintenance, and in her testimony on page 159 of the hearings you will find that the average cost of living on August 15, 1943, for a wife in those cities is $64.39, and for each child in those cities, $19.56.

On page 164 of the hearings, in reply to my question, Miss Williams stated:

> The budget includes food—a monotonous but nutritively adequate diet—clothing, housing, fuel, light, refrigeration, essential house furnishings, and such miscellaneous items as medical care, laundry, a newspaper, and a visit to an inexpensive movie once a week. It does not include an automobile, and it includes no savings except a small insurance policy.

It was then brought out that the allowance for insurance premiums per family was computed at $46 a year, and the committee considered that this item could be struck from the estimates in view of the provisions made for insurance protection by our Government in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. In other words, the total for a wife and one child, which was given as $83.95, could be reduced to $80 a month and cover the average cost of maintenance for wife and one child for the 33 cities listed.

I mentioned earlier in my discussion that there are 197 cities of 50,000 or more population. The 33 cities in which the survey of the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been made, range in size from Portland, Maine, at 73,643 to New York City at 7,435,000. However, most of the very large cities have been included in their list. For example, 24 of the cities on their list have more than 300,000 population each, whereas there are only 30 cities in the United States above 300,000 according to the 1940 census. This situation leads me to conclude that the figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics more nearly represent the cost of maintenance in the larger metropolitan centers of our country. We have reason to believe that the cost of living is higher in these large metropolitan centers than it is in the smaller cities and the rural areas. However, we most certainly should not undertake to establish any variable allowance on the basis of variable living costs in the home communities of the families and other dependents of our service men and women. I believe we should give full consideration to the cost of living in these larger metropolitan centers, even though it results in a very liberal payment for family maintenance costs elsewhere. We are reaching into those cities for large numbers of men and we are requiring them to leave whatever occupation they may have been following, to serve in the armed forces, whereas they must continue to support their families in the metropolitan centers in which they have been living. I firmly believe that is the obligation our Nation owes to the families and the dependents of the soldiers and sailors who are taken into the armed forces to fight for us in this war. For that reason, I not only voted for the increase in allowances provided in the bill as submitted to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs, but I also supported the motion in committee to set the allowance for the first child at $30 per month.

I requested Selective Service to give me the total number of inductions and enlisted registrants from the 33 cities appearing in the Bureau of Labor Statistics list. I cannot release the numbers credited to each city but I am authorized to state that the total number of inducted and enlisted registrants from the 33 cities is 1,991,674 men. This figure does not include enlisted men who were serving in the armed forces at the time of the first registration for selective service. These men were not required to register for the draft. This number also does not include the women who are serving in the WAC's, WAVES, MARINES, and SPARS. This figure also does not include any inducted and enlisted registrants from the 157 cities between 50,000 and 300,000 population not included in the list and whose families likewise live in metropolitan areas. The figures do prove, however, that a very large number of our armed forces are looking to this bill and to this Congress for justice to the extent of providing a living for their families and their dependents at a maintenance level and I submit that it is our obligation to provide at least this maintenance level for the families and dependents of those who are serving actively in our armed forces.

The need for this increase in allowances is even more urgent and immediate as we face an increase in the drafting of fathers. The bill is of far-reaching importance and already strikes home to a very large number. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, Director of the Office of Dependency Benefits for the Army, testified that 3,900,000 applications for family and dependency allowances have already been made by men and women serving in the Army and that 2,800,000 accounts are being paid to approximately 8,000,000 dependents.

This bill is entitled to our vigorous support and I will also support an amendment that has for its purpose the increase of the allowance for a wife and one child to $80 per month in keeping with the Department of Labor figures for modest maintenance of the families in those areas where they have made a careful study of living costs. I hope this bill will be speedily enacted into law as the need for it is most urgent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of Congress is agreed on the proposition that an increase in allowances to dependents should be granted. The only question before us is how much and to what extent these allowances should be increased. I think that we should all agree that the children of a serviceman should receive the same food, care, clothing, and attention as the children of a civilian receive. I am sure that this Congress does not intend to penalize the children of a father who is called into the armed service.

When the present act was passed by Congress there was no consideration given to the fact that we should be drafting fathers. In fact, a study of the testimony taken by the Military Affairs Committee at that time will show that the bill was designed primarily to assist the childless wife of a young I-A inductee. Now, we face the necessity of drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers as a military imperative. We already have more than 440,000 post-Pearl Harbor fathers in the service—and more than half a million men who have dependents other than wives and children. It is necessary to meet this changed condition by providing for a substantial increase in benefit payments to the dependents of these servicemen and the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who will now be called into the service.

The present bill as reported by the House Military Affairs Committee will give $25 to the first child, $20 to the second child, and only $15 to each additional child. I am wondering if we are, therefore, to assume that the third or fourth child must eat less than his brothers and sisters, or that he must be compelled to receive less clothing and other care. Frankly, I do not know how the committee arrived at this conclusion. Likewise, the committee bill provides for only $11 for each additional brother or sister who is chiefly dependent upon the serviceman for his or her support.

On the basis of $15 per month per child, we are telling the father who is being called into the service that we expect his wife to feed and clothe and house these children on the sum of 50 cents a day. Now, we can assume that one-half of this amount will go for food, and the other half for shoes, clothing, bus fare, school supplies, tooth paste, soap, medical and dental care, cod-liver pills, anticold tablets, a movie, comic magazines, or a little toy or trinket that every child hopes to get once in awhile. That means 25 cents a day for food, and 25 cents a day for clothing and care and these other incidentals.

To break it down further, it means that we expect the mother to bring this child up on 8-cent meals. Now, if any mother can feed a child on a basis of 8 cents a meal in any city, town, or village in the whole United States of America,

I would like to hear about it. For my part, I do not propose to experiment on the children of these servicemen. Now, when we take the $11-per-month allowance that is being granted to chiefly dependent brothers and sisters under the provisions of the bill reported by the House committee, the situation becomes even more ridiculous. Allowing $5.50 per month for food out of this $11, it would mean that we propose that these brothers and sisters must live on 6-cent meals. Now, mind you, these are the provisions that are laid down for the B-1 dependents—the chief dependents.

I am not proposing any increases or changes for the class B dependents, or those dependent for substantial support. I am hoping that they can get by somehow under the provisions of the House bill. I do propose, however, a minimum allowance of 17 cents per meal per person for those dependents in class A and class B-1—that is, for the children of a serviceman, or for his brothers and sisters who are dependent upon him for support, and I certainly hope that no one in this House will accuse me of demagoguery in proposing an allowance of 17 cents for a meal.

To back up my position that 17 cents per meal, or 51 cents per day, food allowance is not exorbitant, I want to state that the Army discloses by its own figures that it costs the Government 57 cents a day to feed a soldier. This is done on a mass feeding basis, where food is bought in carload lots at wholesale or jobber's prices. It costs the Navy something like 62 cents a day. If this food were to be provided at retail prices, on an individual basis, you can be sure that the cost would be more than double the amount. And it is a known fact that a growing child will consume just as much food, and in many cases more food, than will an adult.

Canada has insisted on fair and decent allowances for the children of servicemen. Canada is not nearly the country that we are, and living costs are not nearly as high in Canada as they are in the United States. Yet Canada has seen fit to give $99 to a wife and two children, and takes nothing from the soldier's pay to do so. Under the committee bill, the Government would pay only $73 to a wife and two children, and $22 would be contributed by the soldier, to make a total of $95. In other words, $73 from $99 would mean that our Government would contribute $26 less than the Canadian Government contributes. My amendment proposes a contribution of $98 on the part of the Government, and $22 from the serviceman, making a total of $120 for a wife and two children.

I have read and studied various family budgets and charts and surveys prepared by various organizations, universities, and Government departments—yes, maintenance budgets, bare necessity budgets, emergency budgets, American standard of living budgets, health and decency budgets—yes, all sorts of budgets. Some make sense and some are silly and ridiculous. So I have prepared my own common-horse-sense budget—no frills—just enough to provide a very modest standard of living or just the minimum standards to keep a soldier's family together in any part of the United States.

The schedule is as follows for a wife and two children:

	Cost per month
Rent	$25.00
Food, 17 cents per meal, 3 persons	45.90
Clothing, dresses, shoes, stockings, underwear, etc., for wife and children all included	15.00
Gas, electricity, heat, etc., for operating the home	8.50
For kitchen utensils, furniture repair, laundry supplies, minor tools, linens and general house furnishings and needed things for the home	4.00
For medicine, cod-liver-oil pills, anti-cold tablets, doctors, dentist, hospital, general medical care for all three	10.00
Haircuts for children, tooth paste, tooth brushes, toilet soap and personal hygiene articles (and I am not including any beauty parlor waves, or beauty parlor manicures, perfumes or cosmetics which the husband would ordinarily furnish the wife)	3.00
Movie once a month, daily newspaper, a magazine, a comic or children's book, a concert, school play, church social or bazaar, including all recreation for the three	3.00
Bus fare to school, church, or shopping, or to a picnic on holidays, including all transportation of any kind	4.00
Total	118.40

That makes a total of $118.40, so in order to stay within my $120 figure, we have left $1.60 for all other miscellaneous articles and incidentals, such as an ice cream cone, stick of candy, birthday gift for the children, an Easter egg from the Easter bunny, a doll or a popgun from Santa Claus on Christmas, a meager contribution to the family church on Sunday, or perhaps a piano lesson for sister. Well, I do not know how you will do all of those things on $1.60, but that is all that is left under my budget and the amendments that I shall make to increase allowances.

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I notice the gentleman has charged $10 a month for medical services. Does the gentleman assume that a wife and two children will all three be sick each month in the year?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No; that is on a $120 a year basis. I am allowing $10 as a monthly average for dental and medical expenses, hospitalization, everything that they may need. The kids need injections for diphtheria, antitoxins, and various things. One hundred and twenty dollars a year for medical and dental services is very little.

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

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will not the gentleman from Illinois on the minority side yield me a few minutes?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the House committee bill proposes to do all of these things on $25 less per month. Do you think it can be done?

Am I high on any of the allotments that I have submitted in this breakdown?

I should now like to read a letter from Mrs. James Roach, of Columbus, Ohio:

I am a woman, left with two children to raise, on a Government allotment. My husband was drafted into the army last March and since then it has been a struggle for me to keep my children in shoes and the necessities of life.

I am allowed $72 a month to feed, clothe, and house two children. And it certainly can't be done. Different agencies have suggested that I go to work and help myself. Not only am I unable to work, but it's hard to find suitable places in which to put your children.

I don't think it fair to the children to deprive them of their mother and father both. It's hard enough on them to do without a father. And I couldn't take interest in them and work at the same time.

There are hundreds of mothers just like me, without a home and hardly enough to live on.

I have been to housing projects, which were supposed to be for people with limited incomes, asking about an apartment. At each one I received the same answer, "We're terribly sorry, but we can't rent to a person depending on such a small amount of money. And besides these apartments are for defense workers only."

If my husband isn't doing defense work, then no one else is. And he's getting the least pay, too. The ones who are in defense jobs are making better money than they ever did in their lives.

Because they buy bonds and are helping in the war effort, they get the privilege of renting homes where I can't. And I am sacrificing a whole lot more and getting so little. No one realizes what we sacrifice. I have given up my husband, broken up my home, and the essentials of life which I did have are gone. I haven't clothes fit to be seen on the street.

What are we women supposed to do? Do others have these same difficulties finding housing?

Can a person pay rent, gas, electric, doctor, medicine, clothes, and insurance on $72 a month? If it can be done, then how?

And this letter from Corp. R. J. Payne, Seymour Jackson Field, N. C.:

Amen, for your efforts to obtain a reasonable hike in our family allotments. Have wife and two children, and they have been having tough sailing trying to get by on present allotment. My greatest worry is the welfare of my family, as I prepare to go overseas from this replacement center. Again, thanks.

And also one from a grandmother, Mrs. Carey, of Detroit, Mich.:

I read with much interest your article about an increase in allowances for soldiers' dependents, and I want you to know I and hundreds of others appreciate your efforts. I am an old grandmother and the allowances don't affect me, but I feel so sorry for young mothers struggling along and trying to make ends meet on the meager allotments. Twelve dollars a month doesn't even pay the doctor's bills for the shots children must have for whooping cough and diphtheria. They are doing without baby beds, carriages, bassinets, and strollers. They can't buy all the clothes a baby really needs if they get the proper formulas and baby powder, soap, and oils they need. The only way they have of getting all the necessities is having friends give showers.

Please do your best to give them a larger allowance. It's hard enough for them having their husbands away fighting for us.

Now, I wish to submit to the Membership of the House that I am not asking for substantial increases in allowances. My amendments take into consideration only the actual costs of bare living necessities; and I want to assure the Members of this House that I would not offer these amendments if I felt that the committee bill would only meet the primary needs of the servicemen's dependents. My colleagues who meet household expenses will agree, I am sure, how totally inadequate are these provisions in the committee bill. Why a man is allowed $350 per year income tax exemption for each child or dependent even under the new tax bill. This is $30 per month. And who is it who will arise and say that this exemption is too much, that he can take care of his dependents for less? Yes, and for the wife and home maintenance we have allowed a great deal more, and I have heard no one say that the exemption for the wife and maintenance of the home was too great an allowance. Then why shall we look for new budgets—new allowances to bring down the allotments for these fathers, these soldiers who are going into the service for their country? Are their children going to eat less or wear less clothes, when the father goes into the Army? The members of the Ways and Means Committee who have made these income-tax exemptions for dependents after many years of study know full well that the exemptions that they have submitted for dependents are awfully skinny and cut to the bone. Why should we come here now and tell the father who is in the service or going into the service, that we will take care of his children on half of this amount? It just does not make sense, and it will not make good soldiers.

Of vital importance to the winning of the war, which has only entered its bloodiest phase, and to the future of the country after we have won the war, is morale. Not only here at home, but morale on the battle fronts—in the Pacific, in Italy, and on all our far-flung battlefronts. Adequate allowances to the wife and children will strengthen the home front, which, as President Roosevelt has so rightly said, "cannot be considered apart from the fighting front." A man's family is the closest thing to his heart. We cannot allow our servicemen's families to suffer want. We owe our fighting men, "who give their lives, while we give our dollars," the satisfaction and comfort of knowing that their loved ones are not being deprived of the necessities of life, while they offer their lives to preserve our democracy. It would be denying their families the very thing these men are fighting for.

Oh, I know that certain Members have said, and will say, "Yes, but look at the tremendous increase in cost that these allowances will bring." This, to me, is the weakest argument of all. I admit that it will cost more money. Yes, and perhaps a lot of money, depending on the number of fathers with dependents that we take away from the family and home, but in answer, I submit that this is a big war—a total war. It is a war to save all that we have built over more than three centuries. In answer, I say that America's children are her future, and this future must not be denied by any Member of Congress to the children of a soldier. What is money when weighed against stunted, sickly bodies and sickly minds, which, to my mind, would be the inevitable result of our failure to increase dependency benefits to the actual amount required for the bare necessities of life. Oh, yes; we have money to take care of children all over the world under lend-lease. I definitely am not criticizing our action in this respect, because I think that it is the proper thing for us to do. But I cannot, and never will be able to, agree with anyone who brings up the question of costs and expenses when it comes to taking care of our own children, and especially those children who are left behind by the fathers who have taken arms to fight for our country. Certainly our first obligation is to the children of our own fighting men.

In conclusion I wish to submit a schedule showing the exact changes in allotment increases that my amendments will make to the House committee bill:

Sadowski amendments compared with House committee allowances

Dependents	Committee bill	Sadowski amendments
Wife	$50	$55
Wife and 1 child	75	90
Wife and 2 children	95	120
Additional children (each)	15	30
A child but no wife	42	42
Each additional child	15	30
A wife divorced but no child	42	42
A wife divorced and 1 child	67	77
Each additional child	15	30
Class B dependent or dependents (payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B-1 dependent)	37	37
Class B-1 dependent or dependents:		
1 parent but no brother or sister	50	55
2 parents but no brother or sister	68	90
1 parent and 1 brother or sister	68	90
Each additional brother or sister	11	30
2 parents and 1 brother or sister	79	120
Each additional brother or sister	11	30
Brother or sister but no parent	42	42
Each additional brother or sister	11	30

I also wish to submit an article from the Washington Times-Herald and a letter which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 13, 1943, from a father soon to be drafted:

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 13, 1943]

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The drafting of fathers has been making a lot of headlines lately—to the detriment, I am afraid, of the patriotism of the vast majority of the men in this category. It seems that almost everybody has been heard on this subject excepting those most vitally interested in it, namely, the fathers themselves. As one of them, I am becoming pretty well fed up with all of this controversy, which, in my opinion, is being carried along the wrong lines of reasoning.

I am a Government employee, having given up in 1941 a small business in the Middle West to accept a moderate-salaried position in a permanent agency here in Washington. There are 2 small children in my family, aged 18 months and 42 months. I am nearly 37 years old, and my local board in my former home town recently has reclassified me into 1-A. I have no objection to the board's action, because it had no other choice. My home community is principally agricultural, to which several new munitions and ordnance plants have been added in the last 2 years. The blanket deferment of farmers and the occupational deferment of the workers in these plants have exhausted my local board's supply of single and childless married men. And, in accordance with regulations, any ideas to the contrary notwithstanding, draft quotas are levied without regard to the number of available single men in any given board area.

Inasmuch as I have a very low order number, I am expecting to be called for induction this month. My family can expect no help, financial or otherwise, from either my wife's or my family. My wife could work outside of the home if the children could be well cared for at a reasonable cost. But it seems to be impossible to secure the services of a trustworthy maid at a figure which would allow my wife a net increase in income after assuming the additional expenses of clothing, transportation, and other incidentals so necessary when a mother returns to a business or professional field. Therefore, if I pass the physical examination at the induction station, my family is doomed to what is actually a starvation income.

POP.

[From Washington Times-Herald of October 7, 1943]

DOCTORS REFUSE BABY CASES AT ARMY PAY, WIVES CHARGE

(By Howard Whitman)

Pregnant wives of enlisted men are having troubles—plenty of troubles—trying to take advantage of the Government's plan for free prenatal and obstetrical care. A survey of eastern cities has revealed that these stumbling blocks are impeding the smooth functioning of the plan:

1. Doctors in many cases, according to complaints registered by enlisted men's wives, have refused to work for $50 maternity fee which the plan provides in most States. The doctor is forbidden to receive any additional payment from the patient.

2. The extreme shortage of hospital facilities makes it difficult for Army wives to get accommodations at the figure which the Government allows—approximately $60 for 10 days in a maternity ward.

Last March 18 the emergency maternity and infant care plan was passed by Congress and approved by the President with an initial appropriation of $1,200,000.

An additional appropriation of $4,800,000 was made in July and last week $18,620,000 was added. The money is used for Federal grants-in-aid to any States which join in the plan. So far more than 40 States have joined.

A pregnant woman is entitled to free care if she is the wife of an enlisted man in the lower four grades. If her husband is in the upper three grades she also may have the benefits by supplying a certificate of financial need.

Now if—and this is a big if—the pregnant wife finds a doctor who will take the case for $50 and a hospital which will make room for her, she gets the application signed up and returns it. It then is sent to the State department of health, which makes the payment.

Newspapers have received numerous complaints that the future mamas were stymied when it came to getting a doctor. "When they find out it's a serviceman's wife they refuse the case," was one typical remark. "They don't want to deliver our babies for $50 when they can get $150 from somebody else," was another.

A spokesman for Army Emergency declared that his organization and the Red Cross had received numerous complaints of a similar stamp.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently taken the position that only as a last resort should men with dependent children be inducted into the armed services. That the American home is the foundation of our social system would scarcely be denied by anyone. That it would be threatened by ignoring dependency in the induction of men with children into the military service is equally obvious. It follows as a matter of course that if the allowance we provide for in this bill is inadequate a decent standard of living cannot be maintained for the dependents of a soldier. Should a wife be compelled to accept employment in order that such standards be maintained, a juvenile delinquency problem is presented.

In the very near future it is estimated that 446,000 fathers will be called into military service. During the year 1944 this number may be considerably increased. The question of whether pre-Pearl Harbor fathers should be inducted is no longer a debatable issue, for already such inductions are under way, and a measure in the other body to prevent or to delay their induction has been overwhelmingly rejected—rejected no doubt because of the opinion of the Army and Navy high command that the armed services must reach a certain size if victory is to be assured.

Congress wisely will not set up its judgment against that of General Marshall and Admiral King as to the needs of the Army and Navy. At the same time Congress and the country will hold to strict accountability those who have brought the manpower situation to its present sorry state. This much is certain, Congress is not to blame. When Congress was asked to provide the machinery for the selection of men for military service it acted with dispatch. Obviously, Congress could not undertake the administration of the law. This power was properly delegated to the President, who was given full authority under the Selective Service Act to make necessary rules and regulations to carry the provisions of the law into effect. These delegated powers, however, were not without reservations, and one of those reservations was that dependency should be a ground for deferment.

For a time dependency was recognized by Selective Service as a ground for deferment, and the declared intentions of Congress were respected. With the transfer of Selective Service to the War Manpower Commission, however, the picture quickly changed. With characteristic bureaucratic arrogance the War Manpower Commission has completely ignored the will of Congress. The plain provisions of the Selective Service Act have been violated by this agency. Although Congress specifically provided that dependency shall be recognized as a ground for deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, in his so-called work-or-fight order, declared that dependency should no longer be recognized. The ordering of men from one industry or occupation to another under penalty of being inducted into the armed service, regardless of dependency, is perhaps as glaring an example of bureaucratic usurpation of power as we shall ever witness.

The Selective Service Act was passed solely for the purpose of raising an Army and Navy. Not a syllable of its terms even remotely authorizes the conscription of men for industry. Yet it has been and is being used for that purpose. It has been many months since men with children have known what their status is under the selective-service law. Perhaps no group has been more confused than the fathers of this Nation by the never-ending series of conflicting orders and news releases which have emanated from the War Manpower Commission. I think we can say without fear of serious contradiction that the bungling of the manpower situation by this agency has largely been responsible for the drafting of fathers. The War Manpower Commission permitted Government departments to be loaded with men of draft age. Thousands of them would still be there had it not been for the protests of Members of Congress, particularly the Draft Deferment Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of this House. Industry has likewise been permitted to hoard labor, with no sound over-all program designed to provide replacements for those eligible for military service. Where replacement programs have been adopted it was because industry itself acted and not because of any sensible action on the part of the War Manpower Commission.

Neither General Marshall nor Admiral King are asking for fathers. Undoubtedly they would prefer men with lighter obligations. They are asking only for men. The responsibility for supplying them rests solely with the War Manpower Commission, and the inability of this Commission to supply needed military personnel from single men and married men without children is largely responsible for the legislation before us today.

Some persons will argue that the passage of this bill will greatly add to our already-heavy financial burden. This, of course, is true. But I for one do not feel that the wife of any serviceman should be compelled to seek charity if perchance it is necessary for her to remain at home in order to care for her children. This Nation has not been niggardly with the millions now employed in war plants. We have appropriated hundreds of billions of dollars for the conduct of the war. Our appropriations for lend-lease exceed $60,000,000,000. Notwithstanding a price-control act, prices of some commodities have doubled and trebled in the last year or two.

No one is more for economy in government than I. No one will vote more readily to abolish every useless governmental bureau, activity, and employee than I. This must be our policy if we are to escape national bankruptcy or avoid taxation beyond the ability of the American people to pay. But I am not willing, under the pretense of economy, to deny to the dependent wives and children of those who must do the fighting and the dying that which is necessary for them to live in health and decency. I am, therefore, in accord with the provisions of this bill. In the subcommittee which drafted this measure and before the full committee I proposed an amendment to pay to wives with one or more children, amounts slightly in excess of that provided for in this bill, beginning with $80 for a wife and one child. The amounts finally agreed upon represent the combined views of the members of the committee and I believe are the least we should approve.

In this connection I would call your attention to the very complete testimony furnished the committee by the Chief of the Cost of Living Division of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The record furnished by this Division discloses that on a Nation-wide average $83.95 is required for a wife and one child to live in a fair state of health and decency. As a small part of this amount represents insurance, premiums on which are guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, this amount can be slightly reduced, but certainly not very far if proper standards of living are to be maintained.

Except for very slight differences of opinion as to the allowances which should be paid to wives with one or more children I believe I am correct in saying the Military Affairs Committee was in complete agreement upon this bill. It was approved after extensive hearings with a view to doing justice to those who might be beneficiaries under the act, as well as those who must pay the bill. In a number of respects we have exceeded the recommendations made by representatives of the War and Navy Departments. Moreover, our figures are below those recommended by some of the witnesses who testified before us.

Obviously the allowances provided for under this bill, together with the pay of servicemen, will be insufficient in many cases to meet the financial obligations of affected families. In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act would apply so as to prevent mortgage foreclosures and the like, and will protect private insurance up to $10,000.

It necessarily follows that many inequities will result from the passage of this legislation. As it is not essential that wives and children be actually dependent, some allowances are bound to be out of proportion to actual need, but this cannot be helped. Under the existing act it is mandatory that an allotment be made to a wife regardless of her financial status. She may be employed at a salary many times the pay of an enlisted man and in equity and good conscience not be entitled to anything. There is only one way these inequities can be avoided and that would be to require dependency in fact to be established in all cases. This, of course, would be a tremendous job. To accomplish it a gigantic administrative agency would have to be set up. This would not only be costly, but would result in a further drain

upon manpower. In the end, the cost in dollars and cents would probably exceed the amount of the inequities, to say nothing of the delay that would be encountered in paying allowances if every case had to be investigated. I am sure this House neither wants to set up another bureau nor delay the payment of allowances to dependents of enlisted men and women.

Among other things, this bill for the first time makes it possible that allowances be paid to the dependents of women in the armed services. So far as they are concerned, however, dependency must be established. As to a husband or children of enlisted women, dependency in chief must be proven. This, for example, would make it impossible for a WAC or WAVE to make an allotment to a husband serving in the Army or the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize the urgency of this legislation, particularly now that fathers are being inducted and women are now a part of our armed forces. The increased allowances provided for in this measure are supported by evidence before our committee, and are necessary if this Government wants the children of its soldiers and sailors to live in a state of health and decency while their fathers are offering their lives in order that the Republic might be preserved and all of us be permitted to live as free men and women.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, from the very beginning of the expansion of our armed forces Congress has realized the necessity for providing for the financial and moral obligations of those who were to be taken into the service. At about the same time the Military Affairs Committee reported the Selective Service and Training Act it also reported the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

I am afraid that in the debate here this afternoon we have lost sight of the fact that under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act many benefits accrue to those in the armed forces. Under it, for instance, the payments on a soldier's home during the time he is in the Army are frozen. Payments under any chattel mortgages he may have, whether they be on a washing machine, automobile, furniture, or what not, are frozen. Premiums on private insurance are guaranteed up to an amount sufficient to carry $10,000. This is in addition to the national service life insurance issued by the Veterans' Administration. The private insurance premiums are guaranteed by the Federal Government during the time he is gone. When that act went into effect during a time of peace its provisions were regarded as sufficient to provide for the type of man then subject to military service. Very shortly after war was declared we realized that millions of men must enter the service. The allotment and allowance bill was reported out of the Military Affairs Committee and passed by the House. The payments provided then were regarded as sufficient, considering the family status of the men to be taken into the service. In my opinion, however, in violation of the plain letter of the law the Selective Service System has seen fit to provide that dependency shall be no longer regarded as ground for deferment. As I say, I regard that as being in total derogation of the plain letter of the statute. This House has stated that it regards it as being such and passed a bill to prevent the disregard of the dependency status. Notwithstanding our objection, practically unanimously expressed by this House, the other body did not see fit to proceed with that legislation. We are now therefore faced, even though it be in apparent violation of the law, with an undetermined number of fathers entering the service. When that situation arose we all agreed that there was a real necessity to revise the allowance and allotment law now in effect. As soon as we reconvened after the recent recess the Committee on Military Affairs went into session on this very question. There has never been any disposition on the part of the committee or any of its members to be niggardly about the proposition. There has been a sincere effort to provide as nearly as possible for the situation in which we find ourselves.

It is true that those who appeared before the committee, including social workers, those from the security agencies of the Federal Government, and the representatives of organized labor agreed that there is a wide variance in the cost of living in various parts of the country. There can be no doubt but that the cost of living in those parts of the country in which we have a more equable climate is far less than in the parts of the country where there is a rigorous winter. It is also true that there is a wide variance between the urban centers, particularly those where the pay rolls have been so enormously increased by war production, and the rural areas. I see our friend the Delegate from Alaska here, who has told us of the urgent problem in Alaska, in which the cost of living is even in excess of the highest places in the United States. Then we have the situation in Puerto Rico in which the cost of living is far below the lowest places in the United States. So we have here a problem which has challenged the sincerest attention and the very best efforts of the Committee on Military Affairs. We do not want to be niggardly, as I said before, and at the same time we want to keep it as nearly within bounds as possible.

What is the alternative? Should we fix a reasonable amount which would be static throughout the United States, or should we grant to some administrative agency the right to say that an additional amount shall be allowed in hardship cases or an additional amount be allowed in those areas in which the cost of living exceeds the normal or average cost of living? After a very careful consideration, and some of those considerations I expect to detail to you, the committee came to the conclusion, and I believe I am correct in saying it came to the unanimous conclusion, that it is better to make it a fixed amount to apply uniformly throughout the Nation.

Some of those considerations were these: If you delegated it to an administrative agency you would have a situation in which that administrative agency would have the power to determine what families of what service men shall receive what additional amount of money and the length of time that they shall receive it. I think on its face this House would not agree to a proposition of that kind. It contains far too many dangers to commit to any bureau or to any agency that might be headed by a politically ambitious individual. That is only one of the considerations.

There is another consideration. All of the members of the armed forces who appeared before us agreed that it would be destructive of the morale of the service if one man in the service with a given family status should be receiving more than another man in the service with the same family status. It would be destructive of morale. I can see that if a sergeant on duty in the headquarters of the service command should be drawing more for himself and his family than the tail gunner on a Flying Fortress we would be in a situation quite difficult to explain to the soldier, and to his family as well. So we were driven to the necessity of bringing in the type of bill that we have brought in here, believing that it is not possible for us to go to any other system which would be workable.

What should the amount be? It should be adequate, or as nearly so as possible, for the situation in which we find ourselves. Figures appear in the hearings. I call your attention to the fact that they show the cost of living in 33 cities in the United States, and I wish all of you would look at that list of cities very carefully, because I think you will agree that it contains practically every city you have ever heard of in which there are now tremendous war activities. It is a fact that the cities in which the average per capita income in the United States is the highest, also have the highest cost of living. We have the following cities shown: Atlanta, Baltimore, Birmingham, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Manchester, Memphis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Mobile, New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, Maine, Portland, Oreg., Richmond, St. Louis, San Francisco, Scranton, Seattle, and Washington, D. C.

I grant you that they vary in size, but there is not a congested war area not included in those 33 cities. The allowance is based upon those figures. I do not know of any other place that you could go if you wanted to be sincere to provide a family maintenance level if you did not go to that agency which the Government maintains to provide the index on the cost of living. That we have done.

The figures appearing in the schedule of payments in this bill are not in all instances as large as those appearing upon the cost-of-living index. But the family maintenance level shown on the index is based upon many northern cities and cities in which there has been a

tremendous expansion in pay rolls. The index figures will show that the average in those 33 cities for a wife alone is $62.94 and each child $19, so that under that, figuring a family of four, the cost would have been $120. Under this bill the allowance totals $110. I say that is a pretty fair average when you take into consideration the cities upon which the figures and the cost of living index are based in the Nation as a whole.

Something has been said here about the Canadian figures. I am not in a position to state exactly what was said, but my recollection is it was a little higher than is in fact the case. I have the Canadian figures. It is not possible to state the exact total contribution for families under the Canadian system. They have a very cumbersome system which they themselves have found to be unworkable and they have recently been working with our Office of Dependency Benefits in Washington and in Newark in an attempt to revise their plan and to install our system. Under that system the soldier contributes what amounts to one-half of his pay. He contributes 15 days of his pay, never less than $20 a month nor more than $33 a month, no matter what his rank may be. The only instance in which Canada pays a family allowance more than ours is to the wife alone. I am talking now of the Government contribution because it is not possible to have a comparison of the family payments due to this sliding scale under the various grades of the Army in Canada. The Canadian Government contributes for a wife alone $35 a month, whereas under the proposed bill we contribute only $28, the soldier contributing $22 for the total payment of $50. For a wife and one child, Canada contributes but $47 per month. We contribute $53 per month under the proposal contained in this bill. In Canada for a wife and two children, $59 per month, whereas under this bill the Government contributes $73 per month. Then for six children, which is the maximum in Canada, the total of the Government contribution would be $93 per month, whereas under the proposal now before us the Government's contribution in the United States for a wife and six children would be $133 per month, and there is no limit upon the number of children under this proposal. To each of the above Government contributions under this bill must be added the $22 paid to dependents but deducted from the soldier's pay. So that we are in excess of the contribution made by any other nation in the world.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that we should do all possible. As I said when the pay bill was before us here, there is no compensation adequate for those who are engaged in active combat. Those tens of thousands of my fellow Texans who are in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and rendering such an excellent account of themselves are not hired at $50 a month, nor could they be hired at $5,000 a month. They are fighting for something far greater than that. They are attempting to maintain the Nation to which they want to return.

True, what we propose here is not sufficient to maintain a family in luxury. The social workers say it is sufficient to constitute the family maintenance level. It is based upon what they regard as being sufficient to maintain a family not in luxury, it is true, but in decency and in health.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss one aspect of this bill that I think is a little different approach than anyone has taken today. In considering a bill of this kind I think there are two primary things to take into account. One is, What is the cost of living of the people whom we are trying to benefit? How much does it cost them to live? Does this bill give them enough to maintain that standard of living?

The other question is, Is there any discrimination practiced by the operation of the bill? I believe there is distinct discrimination practiced by the way this bill operates upon the people who receive its benefits. This is why I say that.

The opportunity to volunteer in the Army is gone. Everybody that goes into the armed forces now is taken under the Selective Service Act. It is my opinion that when a man is deferred by the operation of the Selective Service Act that is virtually the same as selecting him to do some kind of industrial or necessary nonmilitary work in the war effort.

Let us see how this operates. How does this work? The men who are deferred go into war plants. We know that the great bulk of workers in America today outside of the farmers are working in war plants. My area is a good one to take as an illustration. These men under governmental edict and by governmental permission are getting very high wages. I do not begrudge them high wages. They are doing important work. But remember, they are living at home, they can stay with their wives and their children, and their lives are not disordered. They can plan their lives. In other words, they are carrying on about as they did in ordinary civil pursuits. They are performing important work, we realize that, but their lives have not changed much because of the fact that they are now engaged in war work and before that were engaged in other kinds of work. Neither the family nor the man who is deferred for war work by the selective-service law suffers any material inconvenience because of his deferment for war work. Also, their actual net pay in most cases is higher than it was before.

Let us look at the man across the street, of the same age and similar physique, with a family. He is taken into the military service by the selective-service law. What happens to him and his family? He is taken away from home. His entire life is disordered. Neither he nor his family can plan for the future. He may be taken abroad, he may get into military combat, he may be maimed, he may be killed. His family does not have the benefit of his company or of his earning capacity. So I say when we take this man away we ought to try to provide reasonably for his family and pay them enough to keep body and soul together while their loved one is away fighting to preserve the Republic.

In my judgment, the allotments provided in this bill are not reasonable, they are not sufficient, they do not meet the cost of living in the United States. My particular area borders on San Francisco Bay. I notice that the cost of living in San Francisco is the highest in the United States. I notice that all the 33 cities in which we have the millions of war workers show that their cost of living exceeds by about 20 percent what we allow in this bill for the wife, and a similar proportion as to the allowance for the children. It seems to me that if we want to be fair, if we want to do the right thing, we ought at least to take care of the women and children who remain here, not in a substantial manner but in an adequate way, in view of the increased cost of living. The tables on which we base the conclusion of the inadequacy of our proposed allowances to dependents were supplied by the statistical bureau of the Labor Department.

I have the utmost affection for our chairman, and I hate to differ with him on this matter, although I must. It has been mentioned here by him and others that we should take the average cost of living as a basis. Do you not see what that will do to us? It means that a great segment of our population, perhaps half of them, will be given an allowance, a subsistence pay, that will be below the actual cost of living in the place in which they live. This is so because the average is obtained by lumping together the low standard of living and the higher standard of living, and the cost thereof, and taking an average thereof. That is absolutely unfair. To make up the difference they will have to go on the relief rolls, they will have to go to friends, they will have to go to relatives, they will have to tap their little savings accounts and drain away the money which they have saved for a rainy day.

Remember, these particular persons are the ones that are making the greatest sacrifice of anybody in the war effort. They are the very ones that have to look to outside sources to maintain themselves in order to have the bare necessities of life.

The bill that I think is fair as a very minimum is the one suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. I suggested an amendment of the identical nature during the committee meetings. In that bill we provide $50 for the wife, $30 for the first child, and $20 for each additional child. If you look over the figures in the reports here and review the cost-of-living statistics, you will find that that is just barely enough to maintain a family in the United States in the great industrial war plant areas like Vallejo, Sacramento, Stockton, and San Francisco, Calif.

For instance, the figures show that in my area, the San Francisco Bay area, the cost of living as computed by the Department of Labor is $1,807 a year for a family of four. Under the bill we sponsor, with this slight increase over the com-

mittee bill, they would get only $120 a month; in other words, they would get $30 a month below the actual cost of living in San Francisco, as computed by the Department of Labor. But those war workers in our area are receiving adequate pay to live under those conditions. Right in the same community are the very people whose sons and fathers have gone away to war, but whose allowance is far below the earnings of those who have not been sent away, with the attendant hazards and uncertainties.

Another matter that was mentioned here that requires some attention and some answer is this: The gentleman from Texas mentioned many benefits that men in the service get, and they do get some benefits. But remember that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act does not wipe out their obligation on the mortgages on their homes and on their notes and their papers. It merely suspends the payment thereon. Neither does it wipe out the interest. For instance, a $3,000 note a serviceman might have every year that he is away accumulates $180 in interest, which he must pay back within 12 months after his discharge, unless a court grants him an extension.

So, in every way, I say that this bill does not measure up to the requirements that I think a bill of this kind should. It does not meet the cost of living in the great cities and the war areas of this country where millions and millions of men are working, and where we have also side by side with the war workers hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of widows, and the children of service workers; it does not meet the challenge that is ours that we should pass laws that do not discriminate in their operation, for I believe the operation of this law and the facts that men who are selected by this law are taken by the Selective Service Act and that that act also selects men for the armed forces make its operation clearly discriminatory.

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

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may not have understood the gentleman correctly, but I am sure that he wants the RECORD to speak the truth. I understood him to say that insurance payments that were made by the Government or guaranteed by the Government had to be paid back by the insured within 12 months after discharge.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I made no comment on insurance. I made a comment on promissory notes on which the interest is merely suspended and the payment suspended for the duration of the war, to 1 year thereafter, and I did say that in those cases all that accruing interest must be paid by the serviceman when he comes back. I made no comment upon insurance payments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It must not necessarily be paid within 12 months. He can go into court with reference to any kind of indebtedness that may accrue and have the court work out an amortization plan for him. I would not want the country to get the idea that we are going to have a great amount of debt piled on these servicemen that they have to pay within 12 months.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Oh, no. The law provides it must be done within 12 months, or he may make legal arrangements, but he does not have any of his debts or any of his interest wiped out. I do admit that the court may give an extension of time to pay them, but the burden will be rather heavy to make up these back payments, plus accrued interest.

We see then that the very act, that is, Selective Service Act, which selects men for the military force is the one that also virtually places and holds men who are subject to military service, in war industry by granting them deferment from military service.

The first group of men receive small pay, although no one is now objecting to their pay schedule. Their dependents are given allowances and allotments to take care of themselves because the man who supports them has been taken away. At the same time the family of the man who is deferred have their source of support (father, husband, brother) intact. He is working and drawing good wages, which have been fixed by Government in most instances.

The very group who make the greatest sacrifice, both physically, socially, and financially we do the least for. The wives and children and mothers of these men should be given enough to enable them to get the bare necessities of life without going to the relief agencies or becoming the victims of the generosity of friends or relatives. Under the committee bill I know the payments will not be adequate to maintain most of the dependents in my district at the present cost of living in that area. Consequently, we should raise it to the amount suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. That is the very minimum that will enable these people to live adequately. The defenders of the Republic, who are willing to lay down their lives for our country, have a right to expect that from their Government.

It seems obvious to me that the very operation of this proposed law will constitute a grave discrimination against the dependents of our men in the military service. The only way to correct this discrimination is to give as a minimum the amounts suggested in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

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

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McCORD].

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Chairman, if this were a controversial question I would forego an engagement I have which takes me out of town on Monday, but since it is not, and since the country looks on this with as much interest as any legislation that will be presented here during this war in which we are engaged, I do want to stand here and be on record as favoring wholeheartedly the bill before the Committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, as we move further into this war we realize more and more the sacrifices which, often times unexpectedly, must be made by our people. The present war is the greatest struggle which the human race has ever seen, and we have reached the point in the mobilization of our resources, as our Selective Service headquarters tells us, that the induction of fathers on a large scale is imminent. Those of us who have given the matter much thought realize what this means to the Nation. It means the establishment of an additional large class of persons, namely, children of servicemen, who will be dependent upon the United States Government and for whom we will feel an obligation for perhaps the next 100 years. At this point we feel that a revision of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, which we passed in 1942, is necessary so as to more adequately take care of the new group of dependents which will shortly, in large numbers, become in effect wards of the United States Government.

In 1942 we passed the first Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, in effect blazing a path for legislation of this character. Prior to that time enlisted men in the armed services could make an allotment to dependents, but the entire sum allotted came out of the pay of the soldier, the sailor, or the marine. The purpose of the initial act, which purpose is adhered to in the present legislation, is to so supplement the pay of the enlisted man that those who had been dependent upon him at home would not suffer from want while he was in the armed services. This is a proper obligation of the United States Government to take care of the loved ones of the Nation's defenders, and this purpose certainly contributes toward the raising of the morale of the men in service, as well as to the efficiency and operation of the Army itself.

This bill provides for three classes of dependents, namely, class A, class B, and class B-1. In the category of class A dependents it permits the allotment to a wife to remain at $50; to a wife with one child it raises the allotment to $75; to a wife and two children it raises the allotment to $95, and permits payment of an additional $15 for each additional child. This is a considerable increase for the children of men in the armed service and should help a great deal toward paying the heavy expenses the wife of the serviceman must sustain in caring for her family in the absence of the father.

Class B dependents, as described in the original Servicemen's Dependents Allotment Act, is now divided into two parts known as class B dependents and class B-1 dependents. The class B dependents include any parent, grandchild, brother, or sister who is found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for a

substantial portion of his support. The class B-1 dependents include any parent, brother, or sister who is found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for the chief portion of his support. Allotment shall not be paid to dependents in both class B and class B-1 for the same serviceman.

One of the unfortunate things under the law is that a grandchild partially dependent upon a serviceman may receive support, while a grandchild wholly dependent upon a serviceman under this act will receive no help at all. Therefore, when we come to this particular provision, it is my purpose to offer an amendment to correct that inequity which I think will be recognized by everyone.

One of the greatest problems which concerned the committee in drafting this bill was that of dealing with a wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a decree of court or a written agreement. In such cases, it is extremely difficult to be entirely fair to the enlisted man who makes a contribution and at the same time work substantial justice in favor of the estranged or divorced wife. In finally deciding this matter the committee provided that the allowance to the wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man should not exceed the order or decree of the court or the written agreement previously existing. Another important change in the law, with which I am not altogether in sympathy, is that which requires an enlisted man in such a case to pay the entire amount of any allotment made under this subsection out of his own meager earnings should the allotment to the estranged or divorced wife be less than $22 per month.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman understand that this bill provides that the amounts specified in the bill are to take precedence over any court order which may be made in this country for support of the child of divorced parents?

Mr. BROOKS. That is my understanding.

It has not been an easy job to so standardize the needs of the families of these men (and women also, as the families of WAC's, WAVES, and other women's service organizations are included in this act) that no injustices may be done to various groups of dependents which we feel to be truly in need of help, and at the same time be fair with the taxpayers of the Nation who are paying the cost. Each group of dependents has its own special appeal to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and each group has had its reasons for claiming some increase or some adjustment in the amounts paid. Those which I think reached down into the hearts of the members of the committee as being worthy of every consideration were the children of the men who go out and offer their lives for the Nation in this war. The committee felt that no amount of money would in fact be adequate for the sacrifices which these youngsters are making in giving their fathers to the service in these perilous times, but we have sought to establish rates of pay that will provide for their necessities and their current needs even during the period of high prices to which we are going.

Much of this act is very technical in its nature. We have studied the manner in which the original act has been administered, realizing as we do the tremendous job which Congress has placed upon the Allotment and Allowance Division of the War Department. The figures on this matter are very illuminating, and I believe will be most interesting to you. General Gilbert, who heads this division, testified that about 3,900,000 applications for allotments have been received by his office, and that there is in effect at this time 2,800,000 applications upon which current monthly payments are being made. While it was testified that approximately $2,225,000,000 have been paid out in allotments, it is only fair to state that this figure includes all allotments and for all purposes, many of which were voluntarily made by the serviceman without Government contribution. In the category of allotments toward which the Government makes a contribution, the hearings disclose that the War Department in the last 14 months has paid out a total of $1,058,409,398.16, and the soldier has contributed roughly 44 cents out of each dollar paid to these dependents. In other words, out of the total paid, the Government has contributed $593,000,000 while the soldier out of his meager pay has contributed $465,000,000. These figures alone give some idea of the Herculean job which the War Department is handling in the field of the dependents of the enlisted man.

General Gilbert, who handles this work, testified that the average allotment is now being processed in about 5 days, and, judging by the mail which I receive from my own area, I am satisfied that the Division of Allotments and Allowances of the War Department is doing a magnificent job. This Department is handling this work with dispatch and without delay; it is handling it in such a way as to relieve suffering and distress throughout the Nation, and General Gilbert is entitled to receive the gratitude and appreciation of this Congress for handling a very technical law in a most businesslike and practical way.

As we proceed with this debate, in passing upon the amendments, I hope that this body will not lose sight of the fact that the bill is very technical in its nature and is balanced one part against the other. While personally I would like to see one or two amendments adopted, I do not want to see such changes in the bill as will throw it completely out of adjustment, the one section with the other. I believe it is a good bill which will relieve hardship, suffering, and want among those near and dear to our men in service, and I hope then it will pass by a unanimous vote.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to ask special permission in the House to include the newspaper editorial. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] expressed a desire which we all have. It is his idea, and that thought has been expressed many times before in the House, that the Congress should make provision for all those who are dependent upon the men who fight our battles and who are in service. It is just unfortunate that adequate provision cannot be made for all of them. That is one of the penalties of war. It is my intention to go along with any bill which is introduced for the appropriation of money for these dependents. That may not be a sound policy, but the excuse for following it is this, that if we are not bankrupt now, we will be before we are through with the New Deal. I voted for the soldiers' bonus not because I thought we could stand it, not because I thought it was a good policy, but because it was my opinion that the administration intended to spend every dollar it could put its fingers on.

I believed then, as I believe today, that any dollar that can find its way into the pocket of an American serviceman or any man or woman who is dependent upon him is just a dollar saved for an American, instead of being spent somewhere else.

To digress, it is my opinion, after listening to the testimony of the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bard, before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, that it is time the politicians in this administration did a little something for the men who are doing the actual fighting while Congress is trying to take care of their dependents.

BREWSTER AERONAUTICAL CORPORATION—A MONUMENT TO POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY—A NIGHTMARE TO THE TAXPAYER

The Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, Tom DeLorenzo and the leadership which he represents—not the individual employees who belong to his union—might well be viewed as monuments to the memory of the loyalty owed to the American taxpayer by the Administration and to the duty owed to the American fighting men by labor leaders, for both lie buried at Brewster.

This administration, carrying on a world-wide war, is under a solemn obligation to see to it that every dollar contributed by the hard-pressed American taxpayer is economically spent and that every dollar brings forth the utmost in production. The administration having failed in this duty, it now devolves upon the shoulders of the Republican minority in Congress.

The men who are fighting our battle all over the world have the right to demand that every American worker remaining here at home, every labor leader, do his utmost to furnish the munitions of war, including planes, which the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation is supposed to be making.

Every thinking individual knows that the munitions of war, and especially planes, must be supplied to those in the battle line in the quantity and at the

time when needed, and that, at times, even a few minutes' delay in the arrival of a plane may mean the loss of American lives.

This being true, there is—there can be—no excuse for the failure of any American, either in management or on the production line, to render his full measure of service.

The overwhelming number, both in management and on the assembly line, are doing just that thing. Only a few—a very few—fail to realize the tragic result which follows inefficiency or loafing on the job.

The man who in the service willfully fails to bring up needed supplies to the men in the battle line would be shot, and the man, either in management or in a responsible position in a labor organization, who deliberately, either for profit or to advance his political position with the union, delays production should be exposed and ostracized by every decent American.

From the well of the House, on the 27th of April 1942, that human dynamo from Michigan, our colleague, ALBERT ENGEL, who has so often conducted a one-man investigation exposing those who were failing to wholeheartedly support the war effort, called attention to the fact that the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation had paid to Alfred and I. J. Miranda and F. William Zelcer, under a contract made by that corporation, $5,400,000 as commissions. The two Mirandas also received, as pointed out by our colleague, $250,000 as a commission from the Hayes Aircraft Accessories Corporation, which they and Zelcer formed while they were in jail.

Our colleague demanded and secured the cancelation of that contract. But that did not wholly remedy the situation. From that day down to the present moment, the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation has been used as a vehicle to rob the taxpayer and advance the political fortunes of Tom DeLorenzo, president of CIO United Automobile Workers Local No. 365, at the Brewster plant.

The administration has placed the Navy in charge of this corporation and there have been successive changes of management, a part of the story having been placed in the RECORD on October 4, 1943, on pages 8046 to 8051.

On October 13 one of the Washington papers carried a story headlined "Labor problems at Brewster already eased, Kaiser says." The story contains the statement by DeLorenzo, who said:

> Yesterday Mr. Kaiser and I visited all the Brewster plants in Long Island City. The trip was most productive in that we both agreed that it was absolutely essential that we both, almost as one family, give our utmost to the Navy in its efforts to produce the greatest number of planes. I am convinced that the absolute cooperation between the Navy, management and ourselves, acting as one unit, can and will get excellent results. Discussions between Mr. Kaiser and myself threw new light upon the situation, which makes it clearly evident that my paramount duty under the present war conditions is to support the Navy and the Kaiser management, and do everything within my power to be useful. I am certain that every one of the Brewster employees and myself will take this position.

If Mr. DeLorenzo made that statement in good faith and if he intends to, and does, carry it out, that is all to the good, and the taxpayer may expect value for his dollar; the soldier, the sailor, the Marine, the men in the air corps, the loyal support to which they are entitled.

Too much faith cannot be placed in DeLorenzo's statements. It was only a few days ago that, speaking of the policy of the union which he represents, he said: "Our policy is not to win the war at any cost," and then continued with statements to the effect that the production of planes would be delayed unless management and the Navy complied with union demands, as expressed by DeLorenzo.

Unfortunately, however, at the instance of the Navy, controlled as it is by Administration politicians who from time to time overrule the decisions of Navy officials who would bring about production, managements, because of DeLorenzo's activities, have come and gone, while he has remained supreme and in control of union activities.

No one who is familiar with the situation at Brewster doubts for one moment but that the overwhelming majority of the workers desire the opportunity to render full measure of service and would give it, were it not for the demands of a few who will always, for one reason or another or for no reason at all, hinder production.

While the management has from time to time been changed, DeLorenzo has continued in power. It would have been far better if the Navy, when it took over control and insisted upon a change in management, would have kicked DeLorenzo out. But that, there is reason to believe, was not done because of the political hookup with prominent New York politicians.

The old contract between management and the union still remains in force and no one, not even Kaiser, can make the plant fully productive if that contract continues and union activities which have heretofore prevailed are longer permitted.

Note this section of the 1942 contract, which, although it has expired by limitation of time is, under the direction of the Navy, still in force from month to month. The provision, from page 10, under management, section 4, reads:

> The company may discipline or discharge any employee for just and proper cause, except that before any employee is disciplined or discharged, there shall be a hearing and mutual agreement between the shop committee and a representative or representatives of the management appointed for such hearings. The decision, if mutually agreed upon, shall be final and binding upon both parties.

The joker lies in the four words, "if mutually agreed upon," in the last sentence of that paragraph, which reads: "The decision, if mutually agreed upon, shall be final and binding upon both parties."

Under that section of the contract, DeLorenzo has been in absolute control of the manpower problem at Brewster. He has so exercised that power as to prevent management and the Navy from getting full production. He has exercised it in such a tyrannical and dictatorial manner that the loyal workers in the factory dare not, because of fear of him, give full measure of production to the company, their Government, and the men they have sent to the front.

Proof of this is found in the fact that, time and again, when management has given orders; when the Navy, through its officers, has given directions, they have been flouted, ridiculed, and disobeyed by those under DeLorenzo's protection.

Let me cite just one instance.

During the week of June 21, 1943, a foreman in one department at the Johnsville plant discharged three women for loitering. The three women had been reprimanded the previous week for the same offense. None belonged to the union. All three were serving the usual 60-day probationary period provided for in the union contract before becoming members of the union. They not being members of the union, under the contract the company could discharge them at any time, for the union had no jurisdiction over the matter.

The three women had attended a union meeting the night before they were discharged, and members of the union claimed that they were discharged because they had attended a union meeting, and thus the union was discriminated against. That charge was not true.

On Thursday of that week, the union stewards went through the shop and ordered the employees to quit work at 4:30 p. m. and not to work overtime. That would have resulted in a 40-hour week.

The employees did quit at 4:30 on Thursday afternoon and the shop committee, on Friday, told the management that, regardless of the fact that the discharged employees were not members of the union, they would not stand for employees working more than 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, on regular pay. The dispute was settled by the reemployment of the three discharged employees.

Some of the employees, stenographers, did not go out at 4:30 p. m., as ordered by the union. Later, the union wrote some of the stenographers, telling them that charges had been preferred against them for not leaving work at the specified time of 4:30 p. m. on Thursday, June 24, 1943. They were then ordered to appear before the trial board to answer those charges.

Later, the union agreed to withdraw the chages, but the employees were required to appear and they did appear and they were fined $50 each. When the attention of the union officials was called to the fact that they had agreed to withdraw the charges, the union officials then claimed that the stenographers were not fined for not leaving work at 4:30, but because they did not speak to another girl who did leave at 4:30 p. m.

It is evident that those stenographers who did not walk out at the request of the union officials were fined by the union for not obeying orders. They stayed to aid in making bombers and fighters for the men who had gone to the front. They obeyed the management and the Navy, both of which were seeking production, and because they did, because

they violated the order of the union to walk out, they were fined.

What action, may I ask, was taken against those who walked out—virtually a strike—in violation of the Smith-Connally Act?

A man who remained at his job, in defiance of a union strike, was suspended for 30 days.

Guards, who had taken an oath to support the Government, violated that oath, defied the orders of the Navy, were sentenced by a court martial, but DeLorenzo had enough political pull with this administration to nullify the sentence.

Other instances might be cited, and it is hoped that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which is investigating this situation, will dig them up and lay the facts on the record.

THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

We are asked, What is the remedy? It is plain and simple.

The Government has poured millions of dollars into this plant, which is not giving even a decent percentage of production in return.

The people who work there—many of them—men and women in the assembly line, at the production machines, engineers and technical workers, are ashamed of the fact that they work at Brewster's, and they are ashamed of the production record of Brewster.

One of two things should be done. The Government should either write off the loss and close the plant, or it should abrogate the contract now existing between the union and management, place someone with absolute authority in charge of the plant, and open up the jobs in the plant, from janitor and floor sweeper to the top technical men, to all Americans who want to work to support the war effort, and this regardless of membership in any union.

If Brewster can be made to produce, there is a valid objection to a cancelation of the Government contract with it and junking the plant.

James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, appearing before the Subcommittee of the House, Naval Affairs, on October 13, stressed the Government's vital need of every single plane it could procure. He admitted that, as a business proposition, the Government's experience with Brewster had been and now is bad, but in substance he said that in spite of the high cost, in spite of weak management, in spite of labor trouble, the Government had continued to hope that Brewster would do better and had continued its contract with them.

He said that the Government had invested nine million in the plant and had loaned Brewster fifty-five million more. The substance of his statement in that respect was that it was only because of the dire need for planes that the Government continued its effort to get them from Brewster.

It was clear from his testimony that there was no other place where the planes could be produced. It is equally clear to those who know the facts that they are not being produced at Brewster and that they will not be produced as long as the present manpower situation is controlled by Tom DeLorenzo.

What the Under Secretary did not explain was the reason why certain high officials in the Government refused to give support to Brewster management but went along with Tom DeLorenzo in his obstructive tactics.

The situation never will be remedied, the troubles at Brewster never will be solved by Kaiser or anyone else, until the Navy turns over to management, whoever that may be, the problems that belong to management.

Certainly production cannot be had when the manpower is under the domination of a man who thinks first, as has DeLorenzo, of union rules, union activities, the advancement of labor politicians, rather than of production.

This administration in a day could break the dictatorial power of Tom DeLorenzo and others like him who, by slowing down production or transportation—as in the present strike in the South, where 10,000 teamsters are refusing to haul merchandise needed in the war; or the strike on the west coast, where 2,000 carloads of freight jammed the shipping yards—are lessening the fighting ability of our men who every day are giving full measure of service—yes, even to loss of life itself—to preserve the Government which is giving these men jobs, if an end were made to the closed shop; to the maintenance of security-of-membership contracts, to the contracts, under whatever name they may be called, which deny, in violation of the provisions of our Constitution, the right of every man not only to earn a livelihood, but to work in defense of his Government.

Cancel the present contract between the union and Brewster Aeronautical Corporation; throw the plant open to every man who wants a job, and the power of Tom DeLorenzo to interfere with the efficiency of the Navy and the Army will be destroyed.

The solution of the trouble at Brewster rests with the administration, which clings like a bulldog to its corrupt political alliance with labor politicians.

We know that the C. I. O. at a convention recently endorsed the President for a fourth term, but that endorsement is too high a price to pay for the continuation of a policy which denies to our men who are fighting and dying day after day the planes which they must have if this war is to be won.

Once more I call attention to the fact—and it is a fact—that the fourth-term campaign is standing in the way of all-out production.

The President can call the Senators who attempted to give us the facts from the fighting fronts "fellow travelers" if he wishes, but he and labor politicians are fellow travelers along the road which so far, in the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation at least, has been reducing production of planes so vitally needed by the Navy.

The administration and its political cohorts having made a mess at Brewster, having wasted the taxpayers' money, having failed to get production there, the Republican minority should have the courage to solve the problem.

It was my privilege to hear the testimony of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard given before the House Subcommittee on Naval Affairs.

No one would venture for a moment to question the courage of the men who are on the battle front with the fighting naval forces, nor would anyone question the willingness to serve of the other personnel of the Navy who for one reason or the other are compelled to serve in noncombat areas. Nor would any true American with knowledge of the situation fail to condemn the actions and decisions of the politicians, who at the top of our Navy, direct its policies.

As was pointed out yesterday, Undersecretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal stressed the dire need of the Navy for bombers and for fighters. It was evident from his testimony that our men may be dying because of lack of production at the Brewster plants; that our war effort is being slowed down and the day of ultimate victory delayed.

As has been pointed out, he said that, in spite of the high cost, the weak management and labor troubles, which had so seriously interfered with production at Brewster, the need of the Navy was so great, the ability to procure planes elsewhere so slight, that the Navy had continued its contract with Brewster in the hope that the situation would be remedied.

Today, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard testified. It is evident from his testimony that, while the management has been weak; while it has frequently been changed by the administration, the manpower situation has during this period of underproduction or nonproduction been under the control of Tom DeLorenzo and that never has the Navy taken any steps to change that situation by the removal of DeLorenzo. DeLorenzo, as has been shown repeatedly, is the man who places the welfare of his union above the production of planes.

Bard, when his attention was called to that fact and to the failure of the Navy to act, said in substance that DeLorenzo had dictatorial power over the members of his union. It was apparent from Bard's testimony that the security guards, who are supposed to protect the plant, when the pinch came gave allegiance to and obeyed the orders of their union, instead of obeying the orders given by the Navy.

Bard attempted to excuse the disobedient guards and said that their sentences were lessened because, as Bard said, it was thought they did not understand their duty or the obligation which they owed to the Navy.

Of course, these men obeyed the orders of their union leaders and Tom DeLorenzo is directly responsible for this lack of production, for the disobedience of the guards. But Bard admitted that the Navy had not taken action to remedy the situation, although the remedy—the removal of DeLorenzo—is apparent. Why not cite DeLorenzo for sedition?

The Navy is about to meet in combat, either on or under the sea or in the air,

the picked fighters of Japan and Germany, and we have no fear of the result; but it cannot, or will not, and that is Bard's confession, meet Tom DeLorenzo in Philadelphia at the plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and from him win a victory.

If there is anything more disheartening to the fighting forces in the Navy than this humiliating admission on the part of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Bard, I do not know what it can be. However, there is a precedent for it.

You will recall that as long ago as 1939, the then Acting Secretary of the Navy, Edison, followed a similar course and for 42 days surrendered to the C. I. O. of Detroit.

When will the administration forget political expediency; insist upon an all-out war effort?

Bard and Forrestal are in charge, ostensibly at least, although from the testimony of Mr. Bard, I suspect that over and above him, hampering him and staying his hand, is a master politician who is in on the deal through which support is given to labor politicians at the expense of the prosecution of the war.

The testimony shows that four of those guards disobeyed the orders of the Navy. They were court-martialed and sentenced. The sentence was set aside and those same four men, according to the papers yesterday, are back at work in that plant. Now, Bard excuses them by saying that they did not understand the enormity of their offense. All right. He says they only followed orders. Again I say all right. But if he is going to excuse those four men then he should get the man who incited them to stop production and to disobey the orders of the Navy.

Now, what is the use of appropriating billions of dollars? Why appropriate money for the dependents of those who go to war and do the fighting, when down here at the other end of the Avenue in their offices sit men who condone, who do not remedy, the conditions which prevent men who are giving their lives every day all over the world from having the planes that they need? I ask you in all sincerity and in all good faith how long are you going to stand by those two high officials of the Navy? Bard expressing his personal opinion said, in substance, he would not stand for it if he could have his way.

Both Bard and Forrestal know that Brewster is not producing; that it has not produced. Change in management, without a change in the Navy's policy, gives no assurance of production.

Bard and Forrestal should either change their policy or they should resign, or they should be removed from office. If in their case there is the same reason for a failure to perform their duty that applied to the case of the four Coast Guard guards who disobeyed orders and were court-martialed, then they may be excused for failure to follow a course which would insure production.

It is obvious, and they know, that the real trouble at Brewster lies at the door of Tom DeLorenzo. All they need to do to end the intolerable situation is to cancel the contract with Brewster, take charge of the plant, install management and throw open the doors to patriotic workers, regardless of union membership. Make the place an open shop and patriotic Americans, if protected in their right to work, will work, not only because of the high wages, but because they are patriotic and because they want to produce planes.

There is no reason in the world why the production of fighters which are needed this very minute on the fighting fronts should be held up until American citizens have complied with the orders of, paid the various sums demanded by, Tom DeLorenzo or any other man.

If Bard and Forrestal cannot follow that kind of a policy because of orders from someone higher up, then Congress should follow that line back to its source and remove or impeach the individuals, whoever they may be, who are sabotaging our war effort.

It is reported now that Mr. DeLorenzo has promised that he will no longer sabotage the production of planes. Now, that is fine. Presumably the Government, until he changes his mind, may go ahead, with his permission, and make fighters for MacArthur and others who need them.

My remedy would be to kick Tom DeLorenzo not only out of the plant, not only out of the picture, but into some country where his ideas will not be so destructive of national unity.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, about fourscore years ago, within 200 feet of this Chamber where we are convened today, Abraham Lincoln stood on the steps of this Capitol and advised the people of his day and time: "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, his widow and his orphans."

Today we have convened for the consideration of a bill to provide not only for the three classes of people that he mentioned in his remarks in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, but to include another class and that is the dependents of the men who are wearing the uniform of our country. To the Committee on Military Affairs and its able chairman we all pay our tribute of respect for the very great care and consideration that they have devoted to this difficult and complex problem. No matter how carefully they have planned and presented this bill to the House, undoubtedly inequities, inequalities, and injustice will appear sooner or later.

I join with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] in the statement that he made earlier this afternoon when he pointed out, regardless of what those in this body might think, that a more liberal sum should be provided, that one of the things necessary to protect the men who wear the uniform of our country is that they might come back to a country and to a Government which is still solvent and able to meet its obligations to them and their dependents. Therefore, I join with the committee and the other Members of this House in voicing my approval of this bill for a reasonable and adequate program devoted to taking care of and providing for the dependents of the men fighting our Nation's battles.

I received a letter from the friend of the court, and by that I mean the circuit court for the County of Oakland, at Pontiac, Mich., within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this Chamber, pointing out some of the difficulties that he, as friend of the court, and charged with the responsibility of looking after the dependents and the children of divorced people, is confronted with from day to day. With the permission of the committee I want to read into the RECORD a few excerpts from this letter, which will point out some of the problems involved in the question of allotments to dependents of men in the armed service. This letter is dated October 11, just a few days ago, and I quote:

> I can see no justice in giving to a wife $50 a month when that wife is perhaps working either in a Government job or in civilian work at $50 or more per week from which she should be self-sustaining.

You will remember that I asked the able chairman of the committee a question earlier in the day whether or not these allotments to wives are on the basis of need. He replied that they were not. This bill provides that it is mandatory and is granted to all alike, rich and poor, regardless of whether there is need or not.

Quoting further from this letter:

> Many of the women married a soldier so that they can get that allotment and then give little or no regard to their marital status after the soldier has been inducted into service.
>
> In some instances the office of Dependency Benefits has reduced the small monthly payments previously allotted to the soldiers' children after the soldier has remarried in order that they can keep up the $50 per month and thereby build up the morale of the new wife so that the husband would make a better soldier if he felt he had home ties through a wife who was pulling for him while in service.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is not for me to dictate to you and the Congress what amount shall be allotted for a mother and children a soldier has divorced and left to shift for themselves while he goes into service and then marries some other woman. However, I have the problem to face every day and if I can assist in doing something that will bring about justice for these children, I feel it my duty as a citizen to speak through you. Our tax burden is increasing already by leaps and bounds, and the additional annual cost of over $650,000,000, estimated by this amendment is a large sum for the overburdened taxpayers to have to assume. However, as a taxpayer I am not opposing the additional burden, but do ask for a reduction in the original act and the elimination in the increase in the proposed act of wives who have recently married the soldier, and especially where they are employed as Government employees or in civilian defense work at $20 per week or more.
>
> I also ask due consideration in the amended act for the divorced children of a

soldier, and that the allotment to them be the maximum amount paid for the support of the child or any wife of any soldier.

Personally I feel that the act should apply to every man in the armed services, be he a private or high ranking officer. Some of the men who have risen to the rank of commissioned officers have cut off the allotment for support of their families as soon as they received a commissioned officer's salary, and there is no way whereby a soldier can be compelled to pay for the support of his dependent children until he returns to civil life.

These observations come from a public official who meets the problems of allotments in his official capacity first hand and knows what he is talking about.

Every consideration should be given to the abuses pointed out by him. It is the plain duty of a grateful people to provide reasonably for the dependents of those who fight the Nation's wars.

I shall vote for the committee bill reported to the House and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time in almost 10 months of this Congress that I have risen to speak my mind on pending legislation, and I want you all to feel sure that were it not for the fact that this legislation affects me and the people of my district very seriously, I would hesitate to speak now. This legislation affects me and the people of my district very seriously for two reasons:

First of all I have to laugh up my sleeve every time I hear the statement made to the effect that the drafting of fathers is imminent. For example, in the debates which lasted for days in the Senate there were arguments as to whether we should or should not draft fathers after October 1, 1943.

I wonder how many people realize they have been drafting the fathers in my district for the last 18 months—1 year and 6 months they have been drafting fathers in my district. But the debate still went on. Therefore there are many people in my district affected by the pending legislation perhaps more so than the people of any other district. Let me give you some figures.

In the county in which my home is located, 15 percent of the population of that county today is in the armed forces of the United States of America. For the 14 counties that I represent, 12 percent of the population of those 14 counties is already in the armed forces of the United States of America. In many cases we have fathers with as many as 4 or 5 or 6 children, in my district, already in the armed forces of the United States of America.

If the draft figures were prorated throughout the entire country as they are in my district, we would have a standing army today of 15,600,000 men; and for my particular county, if these statistics were prorated through the entire county to the draft-per-capita population we have in my home county, we would have a standing army today of 22,000,000 men. My district has a very large percentage of its men in armed forces who are married and have families.

I am interested in this bill for another reason. In the last mail that I have read I have received this letter and this is typical of the many problems I am getting, and the biggest source of worry to me is this matter of dependency allotments. Let me read from this letter I got in my last mail:

I've been in the Army almost 4 months, as you know. My dad is blind, my mother is in ill health, and I have a daughter. My wife stayed at home to try and take care of the folks, but there's no work around Ironwood and Hurley, so she worked 3 nights a week at the Iron Inn. I never knew this until recently. You can understand my views on that. I also have learned that they haven't received 1 cent of allotment money since I have been gone. By they I mean my wife and daughter. Each pay day it was taken out of my pay but no money was received at home. My wife and I finally borrowed a few dollars and we arrived out here where I hope she can get work. Once again we are just about out of cash, and unless something is done soon it will be tough.

Here is a blind father, a disabled mother, a wife, and a daughter dependent on this soldier for aid. How can all these live on $62 per month? This is typical of the many cases I am getting. It takes time to solve them. I have no complaint to make about the local liaison office of the dependency bureau. They have been most fair with every case, but it takes time. In this particular case I have just got off the long-distance telephone. This case was so typical, in fact so pitiful, that I have just returned from the Western Union telegraph office where I wired him a sum of money. This is the forty-fourth case where I have dug down in my own pocket to help these people who have been so destitute. I mention this case not in criticism of the administration of dependency allotments—but I do offer this case to show how inadequate the law is for providing for those who depend on the men who are giving their lives for us.

This bill clears up a lot of the difficulties encountered by the present law. The Dependency Allotment Division has a mammoth job on its hands. The proposed bill removes some of the obstacles and will enable the Dependency Allotment Division to expedite its work.

I think this bill we are considering is a good one. Personally, I hope we will adopt the Sadowski amendment. I think the maximum he proposes is the amount that ought to be passed. I am seriously concerned about this legislation. I think it ought to have the unanimous approval of each and every Member of this House. We will certainly be doing nothing more than justice if we pass it and we shall certainly place ourselves in a position to be denounced if we do not take such action.

It will certainly be helpful to the people of my district. We have no defense plants there where dependents could secure employment as is the case in many districts. Wives and children and mothers of my district must have increased allotments to carry on. The fact that many fathers in my district have already been drafted makes this legislation from my point of view most imperative. I plead with each and every Member of this House to support this bill with the Sadowski amendment—which in my judgment is the fairest allotment of any offered thus far.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1279) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech by the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, on the sponge-iron process of making steel.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MUST WE WIN THE WAR IN 3 YEARS OR QUIT BUILDING AIRSHIPS FOR LACK OF ALUMINUM?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called to the attention of the House the critical situation we are facing in the production of aluminum for airplanes. No one responsible for the prosecution of the war fails to realize that without airplanes we cannot win the war and without aluminum we cannot have airplanes. Many of you, no doubt, do not realize that our own supply of bauxite in the United States, from which aluminum is made, is being rapidly exhausted and within some 3 years may be completely exhausted. We will then be dependent entirely on foreign importations. We have been getting our foreign supply from Dutch and British Guiana in South America, where a considerable portion of our raw material is now being secured. Our only local supply of high-grade bauxite—in Arkansas—is dwindling, and if the war lasts over 3 years, according to experts we will be completely at the mercy of foreign governments for our supply and the ability to keep our sea lanes open for importing bauxite from 2,500 to 3,000 miles from South America.

One-third of our aluminum is now being produced on the Pacific coast, largely

in the Columbia River area. This means a long railroad haul of 2,500 to 3,000 miles from Southern States, where bauxite is now reduced to alumina, to bring the alumina to the Pacific coast plants.

When the Federal Government took up the question of an aluminum supply early in the war these facts were canvassed and it was determined that it would be necessary to develop a supply of raw material from which alumina could be made within our own borders; otherwise, we would be subject to the hazard, if the war continues for some 2 or 3 years, of being completely out of aluminum for airplanes. Scientists were called in to study the problem and all of the available sources of raw material from which alumina could be made were surveyed, tested, and processes developed for utilizing these raw materials. Fortunately there are many huge deposits of clay throughout the United States, and particularly the west coast, which bear aluminum content and which scientific investigations have now disclosed are available and suitable as raw material from which to make alumina. Accordingly, the Federal Government, through appropriate agencies, adopted a program which covered the construction of five semicommercial or pilot plants for demonstrating conclusively the processes and the suitability of the respective clay deposits for use as a raw material. These five projects are as follows:

Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina from alunite.

Aluminum, Inc., Marysvale, Utah, alumina from alunite.

Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina from clay.

Ancor Corporation, Harleyville, S. C., alumina from clay.

Monolith Midwest, Laramie, Wyo., alumina from anorthosite.

The first two of these projects have been constructed or now are under construction.

We on the Pacific coast are particularly interested in the Columbia Metals project to be located in the Northwest, where surveys, tests, and scientific investigations have been made determining the suitability of the several deposits of clay available. This project, after long and careful examination, was approved by the Alumina Committee of the War Production Board; the Young Coordinating Committee; the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board; the War Department, and preliminarily by the Defense Plant Corporation. When the project was ready for beginning construction, a stop order was issued, presumably based on the Byrnes directive and through the office of War Manpower Commission, on the alleged ground that manpower was not available and that there was a shortage of manpower on the Pacific coast and no new project should be initiated in that area. This objection was proven to be untenable.

At the previous hearing before Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, it developed, however, that this so-called reason, lack of manpower, was not the real reason why the project was stymied, but the stop order was issued because there was a sufficient supply of aluminum on hand or in sight to last some 3 years under present plans, and that the War Production Board did not deem it advisable as a war measure to permit the construction of this plant. It is admitted that if the plant is constructed, it would take a year or a year and a half, and it would employ only 300 men for construction, and if found successful it would take another year to construct operating plants of sufficient size to supply the necessary alumina for feeding the aluminum plants.

In other words, it would take 2½ years, if this program is followed out, to make the United States self-sufficient to meet our needs for aluminum to carry on the war. It was further demonstrated that the manpower problem was not involved because ample manpower is available in the territory where the plant will be constructed. These workers would not be taken from other war industries and are not available for other war work.

The whole matter is still pending before the Production Executive Committee composed of Charles E. Wilson, chairman; J. A. Krug, William L. Batt, G. H. Batchelor, Admiral Robinson, Admiral Vickery, Admiral Pace, General Clay, and General Echols. Representatives from the delegations in the Congress from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho have been heard by this committee, at a hearing where it was urged that the adverse decision canceling this program be reversed and that the green light be given for the immediate construction of the plants heretofore approved by the several boards to which I have called your attention.

A. H. Bunker, who is Director of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, the best informed Government official on the aluminum program, made a report to Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of W. P. B., on September 3 last, urging that the action of the Board be reversed and the program be permitted to go forward immediately. I believe anyone who will take the time to read this memorandum of Mr. Bunker which was submitted for the consideration of the Production Executive Committee at our hearing, will be convinced that his conclusions were correct and that we are playing with fate, and jeopardizing the very success of the war on an ill-advised, indefensible policy in refusing to carry out a program to provide within our own territory for the necessary raw materials for the production of aluminum. As shown by Mr. Bunker's memorandum, which I will include in my remarks, within a very few years—perhaps 2 or 3—we will completely exhaust our own bauxite and be dependent upon importations from foreign sources. The submarine menace, which again is becoming most critical, may completely cut off our supply from South America, as was partially done in the beginning of this war, in the treacherous, submarine-infested waters of the Caribbean. Who can say we can win the war in 2 years, or 3 years, or when the war will end? Should we adopt a program that depends on ending the war in 3 years or exhausting our aluminum for aircraft unless we can import sufficient raw material from foreign countries through 2,500 miles of submarine-infested waters?

Mr. Bunker's memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 3, 1943.

To: Mr. C. E. Wilson.

From: Mr. A. H. Bunker.

I am deeply disturbed by the minutes of the production executive committee meeting of September 1, which have just come to hand, insofar as they have voted to cancel out all of the projects for producing alumina from nonbauxitic domestic material and the balance of this program still under consideration. I believe this decision is a grave mistake.

The history leading up to the sponsorship of this program is a long and complex one, dating from almost the moment of my arrival in Washington in June of 1941. The very first step which I took upon arriving here was to cause a careful and thorough examination of domestic bauxite reserves to be made. It was immediately apparent that these reserves were inadequate to bear the full weight of a long and difficult war. The amount of high-grade ore, or that type of ore then regarded as commercial, was extremely limited, and even the lower grades of ore represented by no means extensive reserves. As soon as we had provided initial facilities for expanding the production of both alumina and aluminum by standard processes, we turned our attention to providing ways and means of successfully using all of the lower grade bauxite ores and also to developing and selecting those processes which would lend themselves to the recovery of alumina from nonbauxitic materials. We realized that this latter program would be a long and arduous one.

We enlisted the active help of the National Academy of Sciences, who immediately formed an alumina committee to devote itself to this problem. This work involved an examination of countless processes, recommendations, and suggestions for improving processes, pilot plant work under the direction of the war metallurgy committee largely at Government expense, and encouraging corporations not then engaged to enter into research work on clays, mine tailings, and many other available aluminous materials.

There was, of course, at that time no particular concern as to the safety of shipping in the Caribbean, as this had always been regarded by the Navy as highly defensible territory. However, we were very definitely concerned over the enormous requirements that might be placed upon shipping to conduct any large-scale war. We for that reason felt that every step should be taken to make this country entirely self-sufficient in supplying all of its necessary alumina from domestic raw materials, whether these were to be low-grade bauxites heretofore not used in the commercial production of alumina, or other nonbauxitic materials which we then knew to be extremely abundant.

As far as high-grade reserves of bauxite are concerned, they are being depleted with almost frightening rapidity; as far as the very low-grade reserves are concerned, we have not yet placed in operation our lime-soda-sinter facilities and therefore have no final proof of the degree of effectiveness of those facilities. In any event it is quite evident that another 2 years of war will so seriously deplete both high-grade and low-grade bauxite reserves that the rate of mining is likely to become sharply reduced to such an extent that the output of these ores may be quite inadequate to support the present aluminum system at full scale

operation. Short of ability to use domestic nonbauxitic raw materials this would immediately make us again dependent upon importation of foreign bauxite.

It is true that within recent months the Navy has suggested that conditions are very much easier due to substantial correction of the submarine menace and to the large amounts of merchant tonnage which are being constructed and put into service. Of course I am in no position to judge whether the correction of the submarine menace may or may not be of a temporary nature, and I am certainly not in the final position to judge whether those amounts of merchant tonnage which are now being put into service will all be needed to conduct future military campaigns or whether there will constantly remain a surplus available for the movement of very large tonnage of bauxite. I can only know that the pressure upon us has been constant to reduce imports throughout the entire last 2½ years. There has never been a suggestion that either the Navy or the War Shipping Administration would be willing to commit themselves to an adequate program of imported foreign bauxite. That condition as far as we are concerned would still obtain today even if we did receive some temporary assurance that larger tonnages of bauxite could be moved from South America. This still would seem to me to be an inadequate guaranty that we could continue to count upon such movements over the next few years.

Without being a military strategist I can conceive of any number of vicissitudes which would make it extremely difficult to undertake the importation of the millions of tons of bauxite necessary to maintain the operation of the present North American aluminum system. Any consideration of this problem must include not only the United States but Canada. There are many thoughtful people who consider it quite possible that Russia might engage in a separate peace and that the consequence thereof would be to prolong this war on the part of the Allies by a great number of years. I, of course, have no way of knowing how much substance there may be in a premise of this sort.

However, any decision now made which would eliminate the construction and operation of those plants projected for the treatment of nonbauxitic aluminous metals and would cancel the rest of this program now in progress must, in my opinion, be predicated upon a series of optimistic assumptions and possibly a combination thereof. It must be assumed, it seems to me, that the war will be a short one or that even if it should continue for a number of years shipping would at all times be relatively so free that it would not impose any burden upon military operations to continue not only to import several million tons of bauxite a year from South America, but to increase rapidly the future rate of importation. These assumptions seem very hazardous to me, and if they should turn out to be wrong this country could easily be placed in a position of great jeopardy. It is a fact that we have already stripped the cream of the high-grade deposits from Arkansas and are continuing to strip them at an unparalleled rate. Each 12 months leaves this county's limited bauxite resources in a weaker condition.

It is a function of any process work, such as that under consideration, that it takes long periods of time to select and develop the means best suited to the solution of new technological problems, and from that point to the stage of commercial production requires further large periods of time. The whole program is now so timed that one has a right to assume that as our domestic bauxite deposits are being reduced we are preparing in a timely fashion to replace them with other raw materials as bauxite production declines. For example, 2½ years from now we could be in a position to produce on a large commercial scale such alumina as we might need to support the present aluminum system even with substantially decreased domestic bauxite production.

This whole question of preparing for the self-sufficiency of raw material supply for the continental aluminum system has received very extensive consideration by large numbers of technical people, and I think it is fair to say that all of those individuals and groups are in agreement that the steps we are now taking are justifiable and in order and that they should, if anything, be extended. It is my own personal opinion that we have not gone far enough and that to be entirely safe we should add at least two or three more processes of promise to our program.

In conclusion, if we cancel out this program we can claim self-sufficiency for the aluminum system, undoubtedly the most vital metal system in the entire conduct of the war, only provided we assume either a short war or a far greater degree of shipping freedom than we have ever enjoyed in the past 2½ years. Both of these premises seem to me to be extremely hazardous and are not assumptions upon which we should dare to risk the possible outcome of this war. I feel this matter deeply and have therefore taken this opportunity to present my views, opposed as they are to the action of the P. E. C., and to present them as vigorously as possible. Naturally, I should be very glad to appear before the next meeting of the P. E. C. if you would deem this a suitable method of reopening this important question.

A. H. BUNKER,
Director, Aluminum-Magnesium Division.

Mr. Speaker, those of us, who, like Mr. Bunker, are aroused over the critical situation that exists with reference to aluminum, have made and are making every endeavor to secure favorable consideration of a program which will make us self-sufficient in this strategic material which is necessary to win the war. We do not want to be caught in a box again as we were when our foreign importations of rubber were cut off. The same policy, it seems to us, is being followed now with reference to aluminum as was followed in the rubber fiasco. If we continue to refuse to make our country self-sufficient in aluminum for war planes after 3 years of war we may be without aluminum just as we found ourselves without rubber. I call attention to the following further facts with reference to this important problem, covering in some detail the various factors involved:

ALUMINA FROM NONBAUXITIC MATERIALS

In the past, all aluminum metal has been made from high grade bauxite, principally from Dutch and British Guiana, and to a lesser extent, from Arkansas. U-boat sinkings in the Caribbean and shortage of convoys and ships have forced the use of Arkansas bauxite almost to the exclusion, at times, of South American bauxite.

There are practically no known bauxite reserves in the United States outside the State of Arkansas, where they are estimated as follows:

	Tons
High grade (under 8 percent silica)	6,500,000
Medium grade (8–12 percent silica)	10,000,000
Low grade (12–16 percent silica)	11,000,000

The medium and low grade bauxite require special and nonstandard treatment, the effectiveness of which has not as yet been demonstrated. It is generally conceded, however, that a sufficient portion of the medium grade bauxite will lend itself to successful treatment so as to make a possible but not certain maximum total reserve of only from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons suitable and available for the aluminum industry.

Total bauxite requirements for the United States are approximately 5,000,000 tons per year. Any consideration of this problem should include not only the United States but Canada whose requirements amount to an additional 2,000,000 tons per year.

With the advent of the war it became apparent that these reserves were inadequate to bear the full weight of a long and difficult war, and subsequently with importations from South America being not only threatened but at times practically stopped by enemy submarines and shortage of ships, it likewise became apparent that steps should be taken to develop a substitute for bauxite and thus render the country entirely self-sufficient in supplying all of its alumina from domestic nonbauxitic materials which are known to be extremely abundant.

Immediately prior to this war, total alumina production capacity in the United States was approximately 400,000 tons per year, all produced by the Aluminum Company of America. This capacity has been or is being increased, mainly with Government funds, to approximately 2,500,000 tons, 93 percent of which is to be produced by the Aluminum Company of America. All of these facilities require bauxite, either foreign or domestic, for base material.

Immediately prior to this war total aluminum metal production capacity in the United States was approximately 400,000,000 pounds per year. This capacity has been or is being increased, largely with Government funds, to approximately 2,400,000,000 pounds, 93 percent of which is to be produced by the Aluminum Co. of America.

For many years a great deal of time and money has been spent by Federal and State agencies and by private industry in an effort to develop a process, or processes, for the extraction of alumina from nonbauxitic domestic materials, i. e., mine tailings, alunite, clays, and many other available aluminous materials. About 2 years ago the War Production Board enlisted the help of the National Academy of Sciences, who formed a special alumina committee to devote itself to this problem. This work involved an examination of some 50 or 60 processes, recommendations and suggestions for improving processes, pilot plant work under the direction of the War Metallurgy Committee largely at Government expense, and encouraging corporations not then engaged to enter into research and pilot plant work on nonbauxitic materials.

Of the various processes examined six or seven have been determined as being commercially feasible and worthy of demonstration with Government funds, and under Government supervision and direction. Five small experimental plants, all using different processes, two for the treatment of alunite, two for the treatment of clays, and one for the treatment of anorthosite, were recommended by the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board for construction, as follows:

1. Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina from alunite	$4,954,088
2. Aluminum, Inc., Marysvale, Utah, alumina from alunite	775,000
	5,729,088
3. Columbia Metals, Pacific Northwest, alumina from clay	4,086,500
4. Ancor Corporation, Harleyville, S. C., alumina from clay	2,642,000
	6,728,500
5. Monolith Midwest, Laramie, Wyo, alumina from anorthosite	3,965,000
Total	16,422,588

No. 1 is practically completed and is expected to go into production immediately.

No. 2 is proceeding with construction without interruption.

Nos. 3, 4, and 5 had been working on design and ordering of equipment for the past 60 to 90 days until the Production Executive Committee of the War Production Board recently recommended their cancelation.

Quoting from a recent letter from Mr. C. E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and Chairman of the Production Executive Committee, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY:

"You very properly raised the question as to our bauxite supply for future years of the war's prosecution, and I shall outline our estimate of the availability of this commodity. For the purpose of determining our bauxite requirements through the coming 5-year period, I have quite arbitrarily estimated that aluminum requirements in these years will approximate the same exceedingly high demand estimated for 1944, namely, approximately 3,000,000,000 pounds, thus assuming that aircraft production would continue through these 5 years in excess of 100,000 planes. Accordingly, we plan on taking from our Arkansas deposits 5,000,000 tons of bauxite in 1944, and a similar amount in 1945, thus not requiring the importation of any Surinam bauxite during the coming 2 years for our domestic alumina production. In 1946 it is estimated we would be compelled to resort to use of a limited amount of Surinam bauxite as supply of domestice bauxite was reduced. Accordingly, we estimate that in 1946 we would use between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 tons of domestic Arkansas bauxite, and 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 tons of Surinam bauxite in meeting our total estimated requirement of 5,000,000 tons in that year. In 1947 we estimate we would use 3,000,000 tons of Arkansas bauxite and 2,000,000 tons of Surinam bauxite; and in 1948, 2,000,000 tons of domestic and 3,000,000 tons Surinam."

Mr. Wilson assumes the availability of 18,500,000 tons of Arkansas bauxite as against the best estimates of not to exceed from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons. He further assumes the availability and freedom of movement of shipping facilities to import 6,500,000 tons of bauxite from South America in 1946, 1947, and 1948. The first assumption is subject to serious challenge, based upon facts and information available. The second assumption presupposes a military condition that it would seem hardly wise to count on, but granting the availability and freedom of ships from enemy attack, would it not be safer if not actually cheaper to expand the alumina-from-nonbauxitic-materials plants, whose practicability can have been demonstrated by that time?

Both of the above assumptions presuppose the termination of the war within 5 years, which seems reasonable but by no means certain. There are many thinking people who consider it quite possible that it may continue for many years. No one, of course, has any way of knowing whether this war will continue more than 1, 3, 5 or more years, but it would seem that the cost of the proposed alumina program now being held up—$10,692,500—would be cheap insurance—less than four-tenths of a cent per pound of our annual aluminum requirements—as against such an eventuality. In this connection it can be fairly said that the present supply or oversupply of aluminum metal or of bauxite has no direct bearing upon the question of whether or not to proceed with the alumina-from-clay program. The program was not conceived with the idea that it would make any contribution to the supply of aluminum or alumina at this time, nor any substantial contribution for a year or more, and then only in the event of the realization of such likely eventualities as to make it seem grossly improvident—witness the rubber situation—for the Nation not to have taken those precautionary measures to establish self-sufficiency for the aluminum industry.

Quoting further from Mr. Wilson's letter:

"For the long pull, I believe there is unquestionably great merit in the determination of the feasibility of producing our own requirements of alumina from domestic materials, and particularly from clay, obviously because the latter material is in almost unlimited supply. The War Production Board's determination to refrain from allocating the material and labor for the above-mentioned pilot plants is based solely on the belief that the aluminum supply and requirements figures for the next 5 years are in good balance, and that therefore the expenditure of materials and labor for the pilot plants is not now warranted as a definite war requirement, desirable as is the objective of the United States ultimately being in position to supply a more substantial part of its raw materials for aluminum production from domestic sources."

There seems to be general agreement as to the merits of the program, but disagreement as to the proper time to do it. If the program is not carried out now it will either be done too late at greater expense and less effectiveness or not at all. The Government is presently equipped with all facilities including the best aggregation of technical talent that it could hope to assemble. The sponsors and engineers have prepared themselves at great expense and are ready to undertake the responsibility of carrying the program to a successful conclusion. Manpower and materials required are small by comparison with the over-all war requirements, and insignificant in relation to the consequences of a possible situation which the program is designed to avert. Moreover, why should we spend money, manpower, and materials for the construction of ships in anticipation of bringing raw materials from a foreign country when for lesser amounts of money, manpower, and materials we can demonstrate the practicability of utilizing our own abundant national resources and at the same time render ourselves capable of becoming self-sufficient in one of our most important industries? Furthermore, if at the present time any money, manpower, or materials are being spent for the construction of ships for the movement of large tonnages of bauxite from South America, those resources could be more wisely spent by diverting them to this program and thus obviate the necessity for the ships.

The record is clear and the facts are well known to those who are responsible for prosecuting the war effort. The program is recommended and endorsed by responsible and representative authorities. Abandonment of the program may involve the making of a grave mistake and will invite never-ending criticism of those responsible for its abandonment, the justice of which will be difficult if not impossible to determine. Conversely, approval of the program in light of the record and all the circumstances will receive popular and substantial endorsement as a well thought out and intelligent effort to protect the most vital industry of the Nation.

SOME REASONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ALUMINA-FROM-CLAY PLANT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

1. There is an abundance of suitable clays in the Pacific Northwest, the existence and character of which has been established by the Bureau of Mines and private interests at great expense.

2. There are five aluminum reduction plants in the Pacific Northwest with a production capacity of 600,000,000 pounds, and two in California with a capacity of 256,000,000 pounds of aluminum per year. This is over one-third of the total United States production.

3. There is a rolling mill at Spokane, Wash., with capacity to accommodate a substantial portion of the aluminum metal production.

4. Over half of the Nation's aircraft industry, principal user of aluminum, is located on the Pacific coast.

5. One million two hundred thousand tons of high-grade bauxite ore, or 600,000 tons of alumina are needed to supply the aluminum reduction plants in the Pacific Northwest involving tremendous water and rail transportation. At the present time, alumina is shipped by rail a distance of from 2,500 to 3,000 miles, much of which is made from Dutch or British Guiana bauxite, which in turn has to travel by water some 2,000 to 3,000 miles.

6. The Federal Government already has many millions of dollars invested in the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest, and many more millions invested in the several hydroelectric projects which depend importantly upon the aluminum industry for a substantial portion of the generating capacity.

7. There are several suitable locations in the Pacific Northwest nearby the clay deposits and having adequate facilities, including manpower.

8. All of the reasons for the over-all alumina-from-non-bauxite-materials program are magnified in their importance when applied to the Pacific Northwest because of the greater distances involved and the ready accessibility to cheap power, raw materials, and market.

There is something over $500,000,000 invested by the Government in the aluminum program, including power facilities, in the Pacific Northwest which may be seriously jeopardized if we fail to develop sources of raw material for the production of aluminum in the Northwest. Those of us who have fought through the years for the development of the natural resources in that great territory and for marshaling these resources in the work of winning the war are deeply concerned over this proposed program which will stymie our efforts, rob the Government of much of its investment, and spell doom for an immense industry in the post-war period. In fact, if we had not had this vast pool of hydroelectric power and the aluminum plants in the Columbia River area producing one-third of our aluminum for war we could not be meeting with the success we now are on every battlefront. This huge industry will fold up when raw material for alumina is cut off. I call to your attention also three editorials from the two leading local newspapers in my congressional district, which show the feeling in that territory against the canceling out of this aluminum program.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of September 25, 1943]

THE ALUMINA PLANT

It should be clear from the testimony of the War and Navy Departments in regard to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers that our high command is not confident of quickly winding up the war. If it were, much more could be gained from leaving the fathers at

their jobs than in putting them into training camps.

This being the judgment of the high command—proved by their testimony on the fathers, whether or not they say it in so many words—what are we to think about the delay in establishing a Pacific Northwest plant for reclaiming alumina from our native clays? Such a plant, to cost $4,000,000, has been approved by the War Production Board and the War Department. The War Manpower Commission meanwhile has held up the project because of an alleged manpower shortage—primarily, it is well known, because of the situation which existed at Boeing's.

But every reasonable person who has made any study whatever of the aluminum needs will realize that whether or not there is a manpower shortage, the question of the clay-reduction plant should hinge not upon the manpower situation but upon the probable length of the war. Which is to say that the bauxite deposits of Arkansas will not last long, and those of South America cannot be depended upon in case of an emergency or in case of success of the submarine campaign when it is revived. Consequently, if we are to fight a long war, nothing whatever should stand in the way of the clay plant. And since it is the admitted judgment of the Army and Navy that we may have to fight a long war, why the delay? The War Manpower Commission is endangering the Nation.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of September 30, 1943]

AN OBSTRUCTION OF THE WAR EFFORT

One of the most important war industries of the Nation and what may well become the most important industrial development in the entire Pacific Northwest—the Columbia Metals alumina-from-clay plant—is being held up by a theoretical shortage of manpower.

This plant has been approved by the Aluminum and Magnesium Division and the Mineral Resources Coordinating Committee of W. P. B., and by the War Department. The Defense Plant Corporation has signed contracts with Columbia Metals to operate the plant for the Government, and with Chemical Construction Corporation, which developed the process, as engineer-contractor. The alumina committee of the National Academy of Sciences has investigated and approved the process. Chemical Construction Corporation, a subsidiary of American Cyanamid Corporation, has proceeded with the design of the plant and the ordering of equipment under letters of intent from D. P. C., aggregating $1,100,000, has applied for another $1,000,000, and will apply for the balance of a $4,000,000 cost of the plant by the end of the year. The Pacific Northwest alumina committee, made up of representatives of business and civic interests, labor and agriculture, from Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, has agreed to allow experts to locate the plant where it belongs; that is, where raw materials, transportation, water, power, housing, and labor conditions are best, and is working wholeheartedly together to get the plant started. Actual surveys by both chambers of commerce and Federal agencies have shown that the 300 construction men needed to build the plant and the 150 men needed to operate it are available, at least, at two strategic points in Oregon, points too far away from Portland to interfere in any way with existing war production plants. This plant can be taken to an available labor supply and would actually add to rather than subtract from the war production labor supply of the region, which, while having an admitted over-all shortage of manpower, has areas in which an actual surplus of labor exists, one that cannot be utilized effectively unless a plant is set up near it.

This alumina-from-clay plant, designed to permit ready duplication of units, can prove and make available for the war effort at least 100,000,000 tons of aluminous clay in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. It can become the means of making us independent of far-away foreign bauxite, and supplement the almost exhausted domestic supply. It can feed aluminum to hungry Pacific coast warplane plants, and become the center of a new chemical industry. It can be built and in operation in less than a year, if it is started immediately. It should be started immediately. Precious months have already been lost. Further delay, more especially a delay based upon the assumption of a labor shortage that does not exist so far as this plant is concerned, is inexcusable. It represents actual obstruction, either witting or unwitting, of the Nation's war effort.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of October 4, 1943]

THE ALUMINA FIGHT

When the War Production Board this week reviews the application of Columbia Metals Corporation for permission to establish in Oregon or Washington a small plant to produce alumina from native clays, it well may admit as evidence the news that Germany's submarine packs again are prowling the sea lanes, bearing new and vastly more destructive torpedoes. More lives may be lost in the sinking of one ship—a vessel which may be bringing bauxite from Dutch Guiana to the United States—than are required to build or to operate an alumina reduction plant.

The new Pacific Northwest alumina committee, in the last 10 days, has done a magnificent job on short notice of hammering home to the W. P. B., to McNutt's project-blocking Manpower Commission, and to Congress these primary facts: (1) The war is not over; (2) aluminum is needed in ever greater quantities to win the war; (3) renewal of Nazi submarine warfare shows the suicidal folly of our dependence upon bauxite ore shipped from Dutch Guiana; (4) the domestic supply of bauxite, in Arkansas, is sufficient to last only 1½ or 2 years if foreign imports are cut off.

This is a practical view of the alumina situation which rightfully subordinates the long-time need of the western light metals industry for an ore supply adjacent to the pig metal plants and rolling mills. The regional view on this matter has been adopted wholeheartedly by the northwest aluminum committee, on which are represented the chambers of commerce of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho (with one exception), the granges, labor, industry, and civic groups. This committee has swept away sectional considerations, espouses no one site, demands only that northwest clays be developed by an approved process for the northwest aluminum industry.

The only community which appears to be out of step with the rest of the region is Spokane, which has benefited most from the northwest's aluminum boom by acquisition of a reduction plant and a tremendously large fabricating mill. In recent statements published by Spokane newspapers, an ex-State senator and the president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce have hinted at a plot to locate the alumina plant on the coast and seen a threat to the light metals capital of the West.

The astonishing proposal emanating from Spokane is that the fight for an alumina-from-clay plant be abandoned and that instead authorization be sought for a plant at Pasco to produce alumina from bauxite shipped from Dutch Guiana.

No one familiar with this region's lusty aluminum baby will oppose an alumina-from-bauxite plant either now or as a postwar project. After the war we will need both a bauxite and a clay development to keep our great aluminum plants operating against eastern competition. What Spokane's spokesmen do not seem to realize is that the clay plant is an immediate, a pressing war requirement. It is also a test for regional strength.

The only reason so far advanced at Washington, D. C., in objection to construction of the clay plant comes from the War Manpower Commission. It is that of a regional labor shortage. The argument has been thoroughly exploded. Construction of the plant would require 300 men, starting in about 6 months. Operation would need but 150 men, some of them skilled chemical workers brought from the East. Manpower Commission directors of Washington and Oregon have already certified that these needs could be met without tapping any war industry by selecting a site in Longview, Canby, Eugene, or several other communities.

The Spokane sectionalists who decry a sectional plot should realize that if the region is beaten in this effort to obtain an alumina-from-clay plant it might as well put aside any hope of obtaining other new war industries, possibly including a bauxite plant. And no one knows what difficulties will arise if we wait until the war ends before taking steps to protect and preserve the industries we already have.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the memorandum to which I have referred—that of Mr. Bunker under date of September 3—I call attention to another memorandum of October 5, giving additional data with reference to the aluminum situation:

OCTOBER 5, 1943.

MEMORANDUM

To Mr. C. E. Wilson.
From A. H. Bunker.
Subject: Alumina and Aluminum Expansions.

I am listing below answers to a number of questions which you submitted to me last Saturday:

1. How much alumina capacity was planned?

In July 1941, the first aluminum expansion program took place. This provided for an alumina plant at Hurricane Creek, with an annual capacity of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, to be operated by the Aluminum Co. of America. It also provided for the privately owned plant of Alcoa at Mobile, Ala., to be expanded by 320,000,000 pounds a year. This expansion was paid for with private funds. As incidental alumina facilities, we provided for an alumina-from-alunite plant at Salt Lake City under the operation of Kalunite, Inc. This plant was to have a capacity of 72,000,000 pounds a year.

The second alumina expansion took place in February 1942. This provided for increasing the plant at Hurricane Creek from 1,000,000,000 to 1,300,000,000 pounds a year and the construction of a new Government-owned plant at Baton Rouge with a capacity of 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, to be operated by Alcoa.

In March 1943 the plant at Hurricane Creek was further increased by 255,000,000 pounds a year. This was made necessary by the fact that the reduction plants had demonstrated that they could produce more aluminum metal than they had been planned for. The Government alumina plants had capacities therefore of 2,555,000,000 pounds. The Mobile plant, as above stated, expanded by 320,000,000 pounds. The total of these expansions was 2,875,000,000 pounds.

In 1941 Reynolds Metals Co. completed the construction of an alumina plant having a capacity of 200,000,000 pounds. While this was a privately owned plant, the funds for the same had been borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In addition, there exist the privately owned plants of the Aluminum Co., one at Mobile with a total capacity, including the expansion indicated above, of 1,300,000,000 pounds a year, and one at East St. Louis with an annual capacity of 800,000,000 pounds a year. The total capacity of both Government-owned and privately owned plants using the Bayer process is therefore 4,855,000,000 pounds.

2. You have asked who was to produce the alumina and where. All this information is contained under No. 1.

3. How much of this capacity is now in operation?

The privately owned plants of the Aluminum Co. at Mobile and East St. Louis and the Reynolds Metals Co. at Listerhill are all running at full-planned capacity. The Government-owned plant at Hurricane Creek is now running at the full capacity of the first planned expansion, including the first 300,000,000-pound addition. The last expansion of 255,000,000 pounds has not been brought into production. The Government-owned plant at Baton Rouge is running at an annual capacity rate of 800,000,000 pounds, or 80 percent of its ultimate planned capacity. It is estimated that its full capacity rate will be achieved by December 1943. There is no question that all of these facilities will operate at 100 percent of their planned capacities.

4. How much aluminum capacity has been planned by the Government?

The first aluminum expansion provided for 7 plants, 1 to be operated by the Olin Corporation at Tacoma, Wash., with capacity of 41,500,000 pounds a year; 1 to be operated by Reynolds Metals Co. at Listerhill, Ala., with a capacity of 62,200,000 pounds a year, the former being Government financed, and the latter being privately financed, although through direct loans between that company and the R. F. C. In addition, arrangements were made for the construction of D. P. C. plants, to be operated by Alcoa. Following are the capacities of these plants:

	Pounds
Massena, N. Y.	96,000,000
Troutdale, Oreg.	96,000,000
Jones Mill, Ark.	128,000,000
Spokane, Wash.	64,000,000
Los Angeles, Calif.	128,000,000
Total	512,000,000

Total capacity of the above plants in the first expansion was 619,700,000 pounds. These plants later proved themselves to be capable of producing approximately 640,000,000 pounds a year.

The second aluminum expansion provided for increasing capacities of the Aluminum Co.-managed defense plants at—

	Pounds
Los Angeles	32,000,000
Spokane	128,000,000
Troutdale	32,000,000
Total increases of	192,000,000

In addition, plants were provided by D. P. C. to be managed by Alcoa at Burlington, N. J., with annual capacity of 96,000,000 pounds; at Queens, N. Y., with annual capacity of 256,000,000 pounds; and at Riverbank, Calif., with annual capacity of 96,000,000 pounds. The combination of increases and new plants represented an aggregate capacity of 640,000,000 pounds. These plants have since shown a capacity to increase their annual output by about 7 or 8 percent, or in the aggregate can probably produce about 40 or 50 million pounds more metal than originally planned for.

5. How many of these aluminum facilities are now operating at full-scale operation?

All of these aluminum facilities are running at full capacity, with the exception of two potlines at Los Angeles having an annual combined capacity of 64,000,000 pounds; and the one unit at Riverbank, Calif., which is not yet completed, has an annual capacity of 32,000,000 pounds.

6. What are the estimated requirements for alumina for 1944?

In order to run all of the aluminum facilities in the United States at full capacity, both Government owned and privately owned, there would be required 4,653,173,000 pounds of alumina. There would be required, in addition, for abrasives, chemicals, etc., 166,000,000 pounds; or total requirements would amount to 4,819,170,000 pounds.

It is doubtful whether this amount of alumina will be required, inasmuch as the consumption of aluminum by the various military agencies is not as great as that which they estimated. Large amounts of aluminum metal have already been made available for stockpile purposes, and it appears that at the present rate of production, including imports from Canada, aluminum metal may accumulate beyond the consumption rate, at around 25 or 30 million pounds a month. In view of this, and in view of the serious labor conditions on the west coast, it has been decided at least on a temporary basis, not to undertake the operation of the two remaining potlines at Los Angeles. If metal continues to be produced at a rate substantially in excess of consumption, it is anticipated that after accumulating a reserve stockpile of 250,000,000 pounds, operations will be reduced so that production will be brought in line with consumption.

7. What are the plant costs?

Alumina

East St. Louis, Ill.:	
Bayer	Privately financed
Lime-soda-sinter	$9,300,000
Mobile, Ala.:	
Bayer	Privately financed
Lime-soda-sinter	$12,393,000
Hurricane Creek, Ark.:	
Bayer, original	16,480,000
First expansion	2,725,000
Second expansion	4,500,000
Lime-soda-sinter	10,340,000
Baton Rouge, La.:	
Bayer	15,900,000
Lime-soda-sinter	10,421,000

Aluminum ingot

Burlington, N. J.	$12,080,000
Los Angeles	21,788,000
Queens, N. Y.	34,657,000
Riverbank, Calif.	12,754,000
Spokane, Wash.	23,847,000
Troutdale, Oreg.	17,968,000
Jones Mill, Ark.	27,680,000
Messena, N. Y.	16,791,000

8. Why did we plan an alumina expansion of 600,000,000 pounds capacity and 2 months later cancel this planned capacity?

The Canadian Government requested permission to increase their alumina and aluminum facilities in Canada by a sufficient amount to increase their metal production by 180,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year. This would have required 360,000,000 pounds of alumina. The material coordinating committee decided that it would be unwise to create these facilities in Canada owing to the long hauls required for bauxite and the potential limitations of electric power, and agreed that the United States would undertake to supply the United Kingdom with this amount if it proved to be necessary.

An examination of the combined military requirements of the United Nations indicated that aluminum requirements would be approximately 4,400,000,000 and that aluminum supply would be approximately 4,400,000,000. It was evident that if these requirements were to be met there should be provided some margin of safety. There was, however, some doubt surrounding the over-all requirements as stated by the various military agencies.

Inasmuch as it requires about twice as much time to construct alumina facilities as it does to construct reduction plants, it was decided to proceed with plans for additional alumina facilities in the amount of 600,000,000 pounds, and to later on determine whether it would be necessary to provide reduction plants.

A new review of all military requirements for aluminum was again undertaken and 2 months after the decision had been made to increase the alumina facilities, the P. E. C., representing the Army, the Navy, and the W. P. B., was able to reach a conclusion that the over-all requirements of the Allied Nations had been overstated and that it would not be necessary to provide any aluminum capacity above that which was already under construction. The 600,000,000 pounds of facilities had only reached the drawing board stage, and, therefore, the cancelation of these facilities presented no problem.

9. You have asked what the estimated costs of the 6 alumina-from-clay plants are.

There are only 5 plants which have so far been projected for the treatment of nonbauxitic materials; only 2 of these are for the treatment of clays; 2 are for the treatment of alunite; and 1 for the treatment of anorthosite. The companies and costs are listed below:

1. Kalunite, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, alumina-from-alunite	$4,954,088
2. Ancor Corp., Harleyville, S. C., alumina-from-clay	2,642,000
3. Aluminum, Inc., Marysvale, Utah, alumina-from-alunite	775,000
4. Columbia Metals, Pacific northwest, alumina-from-clay	4,086,500
5. Monolith Portland Midwest Co., Laramie, Wyo., alumina-from-anorthosite	3,965,000

A. H. BUNKER,

Director, Aluminum and Magnesium Division.

Mr. Speaker, I only received this copy of Mr. Bunker's second memorandum to Mr. Wilson from Mr. Wilson yesterday, and my colleagues and I have not had an opportunity to examine the factual and statistical data set forth, and therefore I am not in a position at this time to discuss the merits of the contentions made therein, but I do feel that it is proper that this data be made available for study by you, my colleagues, who are so greatly interested in this critical problem.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely hope that every Member of the Congress and every Federal official responsible for carrying out the war program will give attention to this serious problem facing us, which may mean the winning or the losing of the war. At the end of 3 years must we be at the mercy of foreign powers for airplane material? We all know the appeal that came from General MacArthur in Corregidor for airplanes, and every American had to turn his face in shame when he realized what took place in that great American outpost, where we had spent so many millions, where that great soldier, General MacArthur, and his courageous band were called upon to defend American possessions with practically no air force and with no tools of war adequate for the occasion. The heroic fight they made without proper

war equipment has never been excelled. God grant that we may never be caught in such a box again. It was the first time we have ever hauled down the Stars and Stripes at the demand of an enemy. May we not pray that those in charge of our aluminum program will not be called upon later to justify a position taken now which will deprive us of the opportunity to secure aluminum with which to maintain supremacy in the air in the days ahead and to bring victory to our cause. That problem is the one we now face. It is your responsibility and my responsibility as Members of the Congress of the United States before it is too late to bring every resource we have to bear upon this problem to the end that we may not fail in providing airplanes for our fighting men, without which they cannot win. I plead with you, my colleagues, to urge upon the President, as Commander in Chief, and every official having jurisdiction over the aluminum program to approve this alumina-from-clay program to the end that we may become self-sufficient in aluminum for airplanes and not be made dependent on foreign sources after 3 short years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 4 days, on account of official and personal business.

To Mr. McCORD, for Monday, October 18, on account of business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 714. An act for the relief of the commissioned officers of the U. S. S. *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airway, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1347. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

S. 1348. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 123. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 378. An act to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

848. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 28, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 10, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

849. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period August 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

850. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, War Production Board, fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

851. A letter from the Acting Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944, prepared in accordance with instructions of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

852. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

853. A letter from the Secretary, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, National Gallery of Art, transmitting copy of the report "Quarterly Estimate of

Personnel Requirements," called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 421 dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

854. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting two copies of a draft of a proposed bill regulating the commitment of insane persons to veterans, and other United States institutions and making applicable to Federal reservations certain State laws pertaining to administration of estates of decedents, guardianship of minors and insane persons, commitment of insane persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 547. A bill for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham; with amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Frank A. McMenamin; with amendment (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; with amendment (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse; with amendment (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3330. A bill for the relief of R. B. Walker Funeral Home; without amendment (Rept. No. 775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Spencer Meeks; without amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3448. A bill to provide an appropriation for the construction of the barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, for the purpose of connecting the intracoastal waterways of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic seaboard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3449. A bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 3450. A bill relating to continuing the debtor in possession in certain reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3451. A bill to provide for a jury trial with respect to the value of property condemned for certain flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3452. A bill to amend article 61 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3453. A bill to provide for a jury trial with respect to the value of property condemned for certain flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3454. A bill relating to overtime compensation prior to December 1, 1942, of certain per annum employees of the field services of the Department of War, the Panama Canal, the Department of the Navy, and the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3455. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a "T" tunnel as a means of communication and transportation between San Pedro, Wilmington, and Terminal Island, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3456. A bill to provide that retired Justices may serve on the Supreme Court of the United States when a quorum cannot be obtained because of the voluntary disqualification of one or more active Justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3457. A bill to provide that the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 and the act of December 22, 1942, increasing the pay and allowances of Army and Navy nurses, shall take effect as of December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 3458. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3459. A bill to authorize war bonus at time of discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3460. A bill to provide vocational training and college educations for veterans of the Second World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President and Members of Congress to 6 years, and imposing certain limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to enable soldiers to vote by proxy; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Mulcahy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Bertha Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Donna May McNulty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Cooley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Archie Berberian, Kurken Berberian, and Mrs. Osgetel Berberian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3466. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Miss Anne Watt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3469. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McNellis; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Maj. William T. Owens; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2877. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of J. M. Gailliot, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2878. Also, petition of Charles Lully, of Washington, D. C., and 16 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2879. Also, petition of Julius Lully, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2880. Also, petition of Charles A. Reed, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2881. Also, petition of Dorothy Throckmorton, of Washington, D. C., and 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of

House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2882. Also, petition of Lillian Newson and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2883. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Husmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2884. Also, petition of John D. Husing and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2885. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Mandeville and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2886. Also, petition of the Oberjuerge Rubber Distributing Co., signed by five St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2887. Also, petition of the Ace Pattern Co. and signed by 15 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2888. Also, petition of John Rugger and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2889. Also, petition of Robert H. Brady and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2890. Also, petition of H. Willenbrock and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2891. Also, petition of Joseph H. Buckholz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2892. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of J. M. Sloan and others of Dubuque, Iowa, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2893. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Neal D. Ireland and others, on the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2894. Also, petition of Jesse L. Luthi and others, urging the 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.

2895. Also, petition of Rev. Robert B. Munger and others, favoring the 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.

2896. Also, petition of Ida Young and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 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.

2897. Also, petition of Florence A. Babcock and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 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.

2898. Also, petition of R. R. Detweiler and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 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.

2899. Also, petition of Rev. Lowell C. Wendt and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 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.

2900. Also, petition of R. E. Rose and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 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.

2901. Also, petition of Rev. Robert E. Cordell and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 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.

2902. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of residents of Ulster, Greene, and Columbia Counties, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2903. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Rev. James M. Dooley, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 31 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2904. Also, petition of William F. Woodard, of Pomono, Calif., and 39 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2905. Also, petition of Dr. C. E. Britton, of Alhambra, Calif., and 257 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2906. Also, petition of Alice Meyers, of Alhambra, Calif., and eight others urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2907. Also, petition of Gladys M. Jessup, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2908. Also, petition of Mrs. Daisy W. Howard, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2909. Also, petition of H. C. Scott, of Alhambra, Calif., and 12 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2910. Also, petition of Mary B. Sanborn, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2911. Also, petition of Mrs. H. S. Whiteman, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2912. Also, petition of Ida Belle Lenhart, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2913. Also, petition of Gordon W. McGreeley, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2914. Also, petition of Gladys F. Fellows, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2915. Also, petition of Mrs. Oliver Wilson, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2916. Also, petition of Everett Ventrees, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2917. Also, petition of John S. Phelps, of Glendora, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2918. Also, petition of Edwin G. Sweet, of Glendora, Calif., and 11 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2919. Also, petition of Emma G. Wiff, of Glendora, Calif., and 11 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2920. Also, petition of Florence Nicholson, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 42 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2921. Also, petition of Mrs. J. M. Pearson, of Rosemead, Calif., and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2922. Also, petition of Myrtle Farrar, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 17 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2923. Also, petition of Rev. J. Harvey Deere, of Alhambra, Calif., and 118 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2924. Also, petition of George T. Counts, of Altadena, Calif., and 19 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2925. Also, petition of Mabel L. K. Shireman, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2926. Also, petition of Sue TerMoot, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2927. Also, petition of Sydney E. Boyd, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2928. Also, petition of Saidee L. Culver, of Pomona, Calif., and 20 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2929. Also, petition of Etta Dunlap, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 30 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2930. Also, petition of Lottie E. Neher, of La Verne, Calif., and 284 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2931. Also, petition of Gertrude M. Reitz, of Monrovia, Calif., and 14 others urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2932. Also, petition of Mrs. Abbie Helms, of Whittier, Calif., and 39 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2933. Also, petition of Margaret I. Sheffey, and 52 others, of Whittier, Calif., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2934. Also, petition of Mrs. Ivy C. Newland, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2935. Also, petition of Laura M. Sanders, of Glendora, Calif., and 33 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2936. Also, petition of Margery E. Van Derpoel, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2937. Also, petition of Ruth E. Lutz, of Wilmar, Calif., and 18 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2938. Also, petition of Beatrice M. Lolger, of Whittier, Calif., and 15 others, urging pas-

sage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2939. Also, petition of Lillian K. Church, of Whittier, Calif., and 12 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2940. Also, petition of Harriet B. Pyle, of Whittier, Calif., and 34 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2941. Also, petition of Arthur J. Morris, of Whittier, Calif., and 34 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2942. Also, petition of Rev. Galen K. Walker, of Glendora, Calif., and 53 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2943. Also, petition of Mrs. James F. Noble, of Alhambra, Calif., and 15 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2944. Also, petition of Shirley V. Tomkins, of Alhambra, Calif., and five others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2945. Also, petition of Miriam T. Knight, of Pasadena, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2946. Also, petition of R. J. Flanders, of Whittier, Calif., and 77 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2947. Also, petition of Olive A. Fitzgerald, of Whittier, Calif., and 36 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2948. Also, petition of Charles E. Johnson, of Whittier, Calif., and 28 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2949. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Bell, of Whittier, Calif., and 33 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2950. Also, petition of Arline Lewis, of Glendora, Calif., and 43 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2951. Also, petition of Caroline L. Stone, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2952. Also, petition of Mrs. Wayne Hyde, of Whittier, Calif., and 21 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2953. Also, petition of Bernard Beck, of Montebello, Calif., and 13 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2954. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. Loy Snow and 42 other citizens of Terre Haute, Ind., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2955. Also, petition of A. L. Watt and 76 other citizens of Hamilton County, Ind., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2956. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2957. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition with 1,151 signatures of citizens of the Fourteenth Congressional District, protesting against the moral and liquor conditions around the Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2958. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Sarah E. Ellsworth, Mrs. Charles Decker, and 193 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2959. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Joe Tessey, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 238 other citizens of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2960. Also, petition of Peter Scure, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Aberdeen, Hoquiam, and vicinity, protesting passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2961. Also, petition of Christine Clark, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Hoquiam, Aberdeen, and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2962. Also, petition of D. N. Haydon, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 149 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2963. Also, petition of J. K. Sundstrom, of Aberdeen, Wash., and 189 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2964. Also, petition of J. C. Withrow, of Cosmopolis, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Cosmopolis and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2965. Also, petition of Burton Taylor, of Hoquiam, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Hoquiam and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2966. Also, petition of J. E. Owen, of Raymond, Wash., and 117 other citizens of Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2967. Also, petition of W. G. Shumway, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2968. Also, petition of Peter P. Perry, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2969. Also, petition of Marius Eaton, Elma, Wash., and 83 other citizens of Elma and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2970. Also, petition of L. E. Jensen, Raymond, Wash., and 25 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2971. Also, petition of Ray Nouska, Aberdeen, Wash., and 119 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2972 Also, petition of D. I. George, McCleary, Wash., and 29 other citizens of McCleary and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2973. Also, petition of Rachel Miller, Raymond, Wash., and 16 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2974. Also, petition of Russell McCurdy, South Bend, Wash., and 29 other citizens of South Bend and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2975. Also, petition of Earl Biggs, Raymond, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Raymond and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2976. Also, petition of Perry G. McGee, Montesano, Wash., and 58 other citizens of Montesano and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2977. Also, petition of J. C. Winten, Montesano, Wash., and 29 other citizens of Montesano and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2978. Also, petition of W. E. Burkinshaw, Aberdeen, Wash., and 89 other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2979. Also, petition of L. L. Swaney, Bucoda, Wash., and 29 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2980. Also, petition of Fred Drebis, Centralia, Wash., and 59 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2981. Also, petition of T. Watson Ross, Shelton, Wash., and 29 others protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2982. Also, petition of W. B. Needham, Olympia, Wash., and 29 others, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2983. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petition of Society for Christian Service, First Methodist Church of Oneonta, N. Y., and 61 signers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2984. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Robinson's Tavern, Mokena, Ill., and 21 signers, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2985. By the SPEAKER: Petition of city and county clerk of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amending the immigration and naturalization laws so as to permit entry of Chinese into the United States and to grant them citizenship privileges; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2986. Also, petition of pastor, the Harlem Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Finnish-American Trade Union Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

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

The Reverend Wiley J. Ferguson, of Wesson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the manifold blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon this great Nation. We are grateful for the ideals and benefits of the Christian democracy which we enjoy.

We come with humble hearts into Thy holy presence at this hour, O Father of all mercy, and pray that Thou wilt guide the Members of the Senate in the discharge of their duties.

Bless all the nations of the world and hasten the day when we shall have peace in keeping with Thy divine will. With faith in Thee we herald the coming of the new day of brotherhood throughout the world.

In this critical hour of the world's history we need Thee and the guidance which Thou alone canst give, O God of truth and justice and love and peace.

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin;

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson;

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

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	Danaher	Langer
Andrews	Davis	Lucas
Bailey	Downey	McCarran
Ball	Ellender	McClellan
Bankhead	Ferguson	McFarland
Barbour	George	McKellar
Bilbo	Gerry	McNary
Bridges	Gillette	Maloney
Brooks	Green	Maybank
Buck	Guffey	Mead
Burton	Gurney	Millikin
Bushfield	Hatch	Murdock
Butler	Hayden	Murray
Capper	Hill	Nye
Caraway	Holman	O'Daniel
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Kilgore	Pepper
Radcliffe	Taft	Wagner
Reed	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh
Reynolds	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Scrugham	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Smith	Vandenberg	Willis
Stewart	Van Nuys	Wilson

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

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] are absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Creal, of Kentucky.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13, where he is now recovering from virus pneumonia.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS EXCELLENCY, ELIE LESCOT, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, His Excellency, Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti, is in the Vice President's Chamber and is about to visit the Senate as its guest. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess in order to greet the President of Haiti and to hear his address. I further ask that the Vice President appoint a committee to escort him to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to greet the President of Haiti and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti, escorted by the