

MASSACHUSETTS

Joshua T. Wilkinson, Charlton City, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MICHIGAN

Charles C. Malosh, Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry J. Skinner, McMillan, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sister M. Margaret Rose Dushane, Nazareth, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Homer B. Fouts, Omena, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James C. Bedell, Wakefield, Mich., in place of Arthur Cavender. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mae Dust, Wellston, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Howard S. McCormick, Whitmore Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Ida S. Knauff, Glyndon, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Myrtle T. Ellingboe, Sunburg, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Theresa M. Reichensperger, Waite Park, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George J. Klosterman, Woodstock, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albert H. Sugg, Zumbro Falls, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MONTANA

Bernard R. Carey, Crow Agency, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Orville C. Hanson, Gildford, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John C. Abrahamson, Roberts, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gertrude M. Neese, Savage, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEBRASKA

Mildred I. Onstot, Riverton, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

J. Wilbur Brawner, Wilcox, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Gerald J. Buchanan, Parlin, N. J., in place of J. F. Creamer. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

NEW YORK

Henrietta Fairbanks, Bainbridge, N. Y., in place of Henrietta Fairbanks. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1940.

Maria A. Goodwin, Blue Point, N. Y., in place of Josephine Adams, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

William Lewis Joyner, Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of W. G. Cherry, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Horace T. Storm, New Leipzig, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Harke, transferred.

OHIO

Muza R. Grove, Curtice, Ohio. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

Alice Salzman, Excello, Ohio, in place of John Roth, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stanley V. Reppy, Plymouth, Pa., in place of T. V. Brennan, deceased.

Ernest F. Haeussler, Shillington, Pa., in place of R. D. Fister, removed.

Myrtus P. Spangenberg, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, appointee declined.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Anna C. Liggett, New Underwood, S. Dak., in place of Kathleen McClaskey, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Marvin M. McKnight, Bemis, Tenn., in place of Marvin McKnight. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1938.

TEXAS

Mollie S. McHaney, Sylvester, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Ruth O. Griffin, Newsoms, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alice L. Paxton, Oceana, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert M. Bradshaw, Rice, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Amelia K. Stalding, Grayland, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert L. Van Arsdall, Lakeview, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bertha M. Simmons, Milton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Londa E. Green, Beaver, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna E. Arnold, Bownemont, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kittie C. Kirk, Kermit, W. Va., in place of J. L. Dunn, removed.

John J. Mathison, Wheeling, W. Va., in place of W. L. Brice, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

William A. M. Burden to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Alfred Fernandes, Waimea.

IOWA

Ambrose J. Leinhauser, Agency.

Ruth Longenecker, Aurora.

Earl T. Van Metre, Clemons.

Lena Berg, Lockridge.

Velma Olson, McCallsburg.

Donald F. Sturtz, Montour.

William H. Lamoureux, Salix.

Anton Balik, Spillville.

Hannah Nelson, Stratford.

LOUISIANA

Linus A. Sims, Hammond.

Irma Hawsey Chandler, Pineville.

OKLAHOMA

Elijah E. Meggs, Fort Towson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou God of all grace and Father of all goodness, wilt Thou sanctify our affections that our ways may be directed into the great undiscovered realm of the soul. Help us to begin this day, scorning every brand of littleness and lift our heads as men who have a great expectation, pledging to keep our minds on pure and unselfish thoughts and our ambitions on worthy objects.

Thou who art the power not of ourselves, let us fold away all fears and strive for that which dignifies society and life and for that which makes a man among men, and all that links him to the attainment of the best type of citizenship. O grant to this great people a deeper sense of divine dependence and self-assertion, a more ardent desire to love Thy law with obedience. May all

selfish power be curbed and intemperate speech restrained that the light of knowledge may rise upon a thorough understanding. We pray that every power and faculty we possess be consecrated to the work of promoting the kingdom of justice and peace among men. In a world which has lost its way, may our presence in this memorable Chamber be an omen of good, a sign of might, and a token that we are pledged to humanity and our Government. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 10, 1944, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address made by myself in New York on Friday before the Citizens for Victory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEMKE and Mr. BOYKIN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a Mount Vernon, Ohio, news article entitled "Unjustly Accused."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on the death of a former Member of this House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made yesterday at Manhattan Center in New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by David Lawrence on the subject Do We Deserve Peace?

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the St. Mary's Press.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Buffalo-Pittsburgh Diocese of the Polish National Church.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the February 21 edition of Broadcasting.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. 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 Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and wish to follow it by a unanimous-consent request. I wish to raise the question now and then follow it by the request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I think the Members of the House ought to be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I am not going to raise my question of personal privilege now.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to insist on my point of order. I think the Members of the House ought to be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Allen, Ill.	Gibson	Morrison, La.
Andersen,	Gifford	Mruk
H. Carl	Gilchrist	Murray, Wis.
Baldwin, Md.	Gillette	Myers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Newsome
Barry	Gossett	Norman
Beall	Hall,	O'Leary
Bell	Leonard W.	O'Toole
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Phillbin
Burch, Va.	Harris, Va.	Phillips
Burdick	Hart	Plumley
Butler	Hays	Ramey
Camp	Heffernan	Ramspeck
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Randolph
Capozzoli	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Hobbs	Rivers
Chapman	Hoch	Robertson
Chenoweth	Hollfield	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooley	Jarman	Rogers, Calif.
Costello	Jennings	Satterfield
Cox	Johnson,	Scanlon
Dawson	J. Leroy	Short
Delaney	Jonkman	Smith, Va.
Dickstein	Kee	Smith, W. Va.
Dies	Kelley	Somers, N. Y.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Stearns, N. H.
Domenegeaux	Keogh	Stockman
Douglas	Klein	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Knutson	Tibbott
Eaton	Lambertson	Torrens
Ellison, Md.	Lane	Vorvys, Ohio
Elmer	LeFevre	Ward
Fay	Luce	Wasilewski
Feighan	McGehee	Weichel, Ohio
Fiannagan	McMurray	Weiss
Fogarty	Maas	Wene
Fuller	Madden	West
Fulmer	Magnuson	White
Furlong	Manasco	Wilson
Gale	Marcantonio	Winter
Gamble	Miller, Mo.	
Gerlach	Monroney	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Detroit News of February 3, 1944, there was printed the following:

C. P. Quinn, president of the C. I. O. council, disclosed that a resolution condemning Hoffman for "seditious statements and activities" was passed by the council Tuesday night.

The resolution declares: "This Fascist-minded Congressman has thus climaxed a long record of pro-Fascist activities and by such seditious implications has laid himself open to immediate Federal action under the Espionage Act which places such utterances as this in wartime as treason and aid to the enemy."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has stated a matter of privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may take this matter up and discuss it upon the conclusion of the discussion and action on the so-called Indian bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from Randolph Paul, of the Treasury Department, on tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and insert in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of remarks made by me in New York City on Saturday, March 11, memorializing the invasion of Austria by Germany.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATORIAL SERVICE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks of December 1, 1943, and March 9, 1944, on the efficient and economical system of investigation employed with such success by the Committee on Appropriations, I submit for the RECORD a letter from Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,

March 11, 1944.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Messrs. Francis X. A. Eble and Bernard Connor, who are special employees of the staff designated by your committee to conduct special studies, have presented their credentials and are currently engaged in examining the administrative structure and the operations of the War Production Board. These gentlemen have impressed my staff with their practical knowledge of Federal administration and their sympathetic understanding of the many problems confronting an agency of this size and complexity. I want you to be assured that every courtesy is being extended to them.

I have been concerned for some time over the manner of conveying to your committee a full understanding of our problems and operations in the time allowed for budget hearings each year. Reviews of the type now being conducted by Messrs. Eble and Connor will establish closer working relationships between your committee and the Board. A precedent has now been established which should prove mutually helpful. I welcome the opportunity to furnish any information your committee may require in its deliberations.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is typical of many expressions received by the committee and is indicative of the helpful cooperation received by the committee from the departments. The service is of

mutual benefit to the executive and legislative branches of the Government and not only results in a more complete understanding of the problems to be dealt with but materially lessens the burden of work of both the departments and the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by former Congressman Oscar J. Larson from the Eighth Minnesota District, which appeared in the Virginia (Minn.) Daily Enterprise of Monday, February 14, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Virginia Daily Enterprise, of Virginia, Minn., under date of March 7, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SHOTGUNS AND AMMUNITION FOR FARMERS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEVENSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE HALL FURLOUGH BILL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the report which has come to me from my district of soldiers and sailors of the American armed forces bumping their way home through snowstorms, through sleet and through rain, without any opportunity of having a way to get home after they have been given a 10-day furlough, and after exhausting practically all of their furlough en route, leaving only a day for them to see their loved ones at home, is a sad commentary upon the treatment which Uncle Sam is giving the boys in the armed forces.

I sincerely hope that the Hall furlough bill which has been proposed a number of times before the House will be given immediate consideration, especially when one considers that the coming invasion of Europe is not far off. There will be millions of men leaving the country and as many as possible should be given a chance to go home before they go. My bill will provide each one of these men and women with a travel certificate so everybody who is entitled to a furlough will be able to take advantage of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS OF INDIANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 166, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas a concurrent resolution of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to investigate an investigation and study to determine the necessity and advisability of revising the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs pointing out that—

(a) Most of the said existing laws and regulations were formulated at a time when all the Indians were considered as wards and dependents of the Federal Government and incapable of assuming the duties, obligations, and station of citizenship; and

(2) Most of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation have now been accorded the legal status of citizenship and have advanced in education and progress along the lines of racial development to a point where they should be treated as full citizens, and most of the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action should be removed; and

(3) Many of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation are now graduates of high schools and colleges, and all of them are capable of receiving full high school and college education; and

(4) Many of our Indian citizens have entered loyally into the present war and assumed the risks and duties of active warfare on the same basis as other citizens of the Nation, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly; and

Whereas members of the Indian affairs committee of the South Dakota State Legislature made a personal inspection of living conditions on a typical Indian reservation in South Dakota and there found many of our American Indians living in deplorable conditions, lacking adequate protection against winter weather and suffering from inadequate nourishment, and inadequate sanitary and health provisions; and

Whereas it is believed that many American Indians living on reservations in other States of the Union are similarly lacking in the minimum essentials of living conditions which provide for healthful development and for their eventual assimilation into the general population of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation to determine whether the changed status of the Indian and the

conditions under which he now lives require a revision of the laws and regulations affecting the American Indian and to prepare recommendations to Congress for the enactment of any needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the American Indian.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation and changes of policy and program as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strikes out the whereases.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is the so-called Mundt resolution, giving the Committee on Indian Affairs authority to make investigation for the purpose of effecting economy and saving through a gradual liquidation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and putting the Indians on their own, as the gentlemen who appeared before the Rules Committee stated. At present the operation of the Indian Office costs \$33,000,000 a year; and we have an Indian population of about 350,000. It is estimated that savings in administration of Indian affairs would amount to ten or fifteen million dollars a year after this proposed investigation.

I had been informed and I informed the gentlemen when they appeared before the Rules Committee that the other legislative body has been making an investigation for a "short" period of about 18 years; that it has about 40 volumes of evidence and reports and has made some recommendations; but aside from publishing a report in June 1943, nothing has been done, no legislation has been enacted to remedy some of the evils or reduce costs. The Indian Committee feels that something should be done in behalf of the Indians, and at the same time in behalf of our Government to save unnecessary expenditures.

Personally, of course, I do not have very many of these Indians in my district to whom this would apply. I have some very friendly Indians to whom this legislation would not apply. They would not cost the Government anything. Nevertheless, I am interested that something should be done to effect a release of the real Indian from Government wardship, because many of these Indians today possess as thorough intelligence and knowledge of their own affairs as have white men, and they do not need to be any longer under the wardship of Uncle Sam. The proponent of the resolution, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and members of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I am sure, will explain the need more fully than I can.

I am informed that the gentleman from Missouri, my beloved friend [Mr. COCHRAN], desires 10 minutes in opposition to the resolution. I have stated to him that I will be only too pleased to yield him that time, but I will have to get some of the time from the other side. I do not suppose I will have any trouble in getting a little time for him. If I am unsuccessful, I will have to reduce the time I have promised to the other three gentlemen.

I well remember that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has frequently opposed appropriations for investigating committees.

Although I dislike to take any more time, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], as chairman of the Committee on Accounts, has seen fit to recommend large sums of money year after year to investigating committees, which appropriations I have felt and still feel should not have been approved. I concede that some of the investigating committees have not, after long investigations, effected any remedial legislation. I am not going to call attention to the sum of money allotted for the Dies committee or any other investigating committee, which Dies committee, unfortunately, has gone far afield from the original intent of the Congress.

For instance, the Dies committee was created to investigate un-American activities of Communists, Fascists, and Nazi organizations and individuals, but in the last 3 or 4 years it has devoted practically all its time to investigating personnel of various departments and independent agencies and has actually failed, especially since Pearl Harbor, to properly investigate the Nazi, Fascist saboteurs, and has persisted in finding fault with organized labor and the so-called Communists. This when everybody must know that ever since Pearl Harbor, regardless of what some of the misguided so-called Communists might have said here and there before Pearl Harbor, they have continuously favored and assisted their country in every way in an effort to effect early victory.

Of course, there are other committees that have received much larger allotments of money than this proposed investigation would cost, but when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] stated that no committee has ever succeeded after an investigation in effecting remedial legislation, I know that today he does not mean to include all committees. He must agree with me when I say that the Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations saved thousands upon thousands of people's investments and brought about a reduction of the inexcusably high fees of lawyers, trustees, receivers, and depositories under section 77B of the Bankruptcy Act, and it took out of the clutches of these so-called protective committees, which name is a misnomer, hundreds of properties in behalf of the rightful owners, the bondholders.

That select committee also brought to light the abuses and the nefarious activities of a few manipulators who destroyed

about 42 small life-insurance companies and saved thousands upon thousands of policyholders. Yes; that select committee succeeded in effecting two amendments of the Bankruptcy Act and precluded for the future the wholesale imposition of investment bankers and speculators upon the public.

Had the other legislative body acted upon my original bill as it passed the House, we would have eliminated the professional receiver and trustee and would have taken the rightful owners out of the clutches, I repeat, of the trustees who are still in possession of the remaining properties they have not as yet bartered away.

Moreover, at that time the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] did not realize to what extent 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 American investors had been not only imposed upon but actually robbed of their life savings. That select committee also investigated many suspected judges, a few of whom were obliged to resign, and some later were removed from the bench.

So I say that some investigating committees can be of real service to the people of the country, and I am pleased to say that I had the high honor to be chairman of that Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations, the only select committee of which I have been a member during my long service here.

I was fully aware that the powerful investment bankers and these men who came into control of the \$20,000,000,000 of bonds and property belonging to the bondholders—the receivers, trustees, trust companies, banks, title and insurance companies—left no stone unturned to undermine the progress of that select committee. Notwithstanding the tremendous influence of these powerful men and organizations, I defy anybody to say that a great deal of good was not accomplished by our investigation.

If it were not imperative that we devote all our energies to winning the war, I would urge that another select committee be created to further investigate the activities of many of these trustees who came into possession of hundreds of these valuable properties and operated them not in the interest of the bondholders but for their own profit and purpose.

In view of all this, I feel that, inasmuch as this resolution authorizes the Indian Committee itself to make the investigation and that it will not cost any more than \$15,000, according to the chairman's statement, and it may save from ten to fifteen million dollars annually, the resolution should receive favorable consideration.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and shall yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

I am obliged to reserve 10 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] wishes to proceed now, I will yield to him and will thereafter yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

COCHRAN] and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that for once at least we find ourselves in agreement in support of a measure before this House, House Resolution 166, which as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has so ably stated, simply authorizes the House Committee on Indian Affairs to proceed with an investigation, and giving that committee the power to subpoena witnesses and compel the production of records and papers, in connection with the expenditure of public funds for the benefit of the Indians under the control and supervision of the United States Government.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in considering this measure we must remember that during the past 25 years there has been something like \$600,000,000 of public funds spent in behalf of the Indians, and for their care and advancement. At the present time we have in the United States approximately 360,000 Indians with approximately another 40,000 Indians in Alaska. Of these, between 75,000 and 150,000 are said to live white men's lives.

There is some question, a grave question, as to whether or not the continued expenditure of these huge sums is necessary for the best interests of the Indians and of the country. It is true that the other body of this Congress has had an investigation in recent years, but seemingly has done nothing about it. I am convinced from my study of this matter that the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House can, in a few short weeks, make a careful and comprehensive study and investigation of this matter; and perhaps report back to this body legislation that will result in great economies and great savings to the people of the United States, as well as greater justice and better treatment for the Indians. So I support this measure which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. SABATH. Just one minute before the gentleman yields—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will defer to the gentleman from Illinois if he wants to yield to somebody on his side first.

Mr. SABATH. No; go right ahead.

Mr. COCHRAN. They all, Mr. Speaker, want to reserve their time. Everyone apparently wants to follow me. I am willing to talk now. I am willing to state my case now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman from Missouri want to proceed at this time?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am willing to proceed now. You all want to take advantage of this situation. The gentleman has already yielded to the gentleman from South Dakota. You all know I am against the resolution. I am willing to give my side before the proponents state their case if that is the advantage you want.

Mr. SABATH. If there is any question about it, let the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] proceed now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in position to recognize any Member to whom time may be yielded.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am always ready to cooperate with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will proceed. Let them answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time is the gentleman yielded?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is so kindly disposed I will let him have 10 minutes out of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the preamble of this resolution has been stricken out but if anyone will read it he or she will see that the suggestion for this resolution originated in the Legislature of South Dakota. The Legislature of South Dakota expressed the hope that the Congress would do something in regard to the laws and the administration of the laws by the Indian Bureau. The preamble further calls attention to the fact that the legislators of South Dakota did not like the manner in which the Indians were being treated at one reservation in South Dakota.

It would have been very easy to have referred this matter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and let him correct the situation if it needed correcting, but instead we have presented to us a resolution providing for an investigation by the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I know that for the last 18 years the Senate of the United States has been investigating this subject. Over 40 volumes of testimony has been taken and is available from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. Aside from that, Mr. Speaker, this committee of the Senate has made reports from time to time. Last June it made a report, and in my opinion that report is the cause of this resolution. You talk about comity between the two bodies. What will result if this resolution passes will be an effort to endeavor to get a House committee to repudiate the views of four outstanding Senators, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate for the past 12 years; Senator CHAVEZ, Senator WHEELER, of Montana, coauthor of the Wheeler-Howard act; and Senator SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, each and every one of them having any number of Indians in their States, men who have disclosed throughout their services in the Senate that they are absolutely in favor of helping the American Indian.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I am going to use all my time. I have but 10 minutes. The balance of time, 50 minutes, goes to those in favor of the resolution.

Mr. CASE. Will not the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker. If I can get some time I will yield to the gentleman or any other Member. Surely the opposition should be permitted to use the 10 minutes allotted.

Mr. Speaker, in June the Senate committee made 33 recommendations. Those recommendations, if carried out, would revolutionize the handling of the Indians in this country by our Government. Besides making recommendations they state in their report the amounts that can be saved. So far as I know those recommendations have not been placed in bills, they are not before the Congress; but those recommendations aroused the ire of certain officials of this Government who are in charge of the administration of our Indian laws. That statement cannot be denied. Further I understand the Commissioner of Indian Affairs favors this resolution. Yes, it was the Senate report that excited those who were criticized by that report. I long ago learned the Indian Bureau did not want anyone to tell them how to handle the Indians. Their resentment is what is back of this resolution. They want to repudiate by the hearings that might be held what the Senate committee has said. That report was based, as I say, on investigations over a period of 18 years. If this resolution passes today there will be immediately filed another resolution which will be sent to the Committee on Accounts to give the committee money in order to make the investigation. Why, you could not scratch the surface in an Indian investigation between now and next January. It would be absolutely impossible, with the reservations scattered all over the country.

Let me call your attention to another matter. We have now practically 25 authorities set up by your Rules Committee for investigations by select committees and legislative committees of this House. Well over a million dollars are being spent by those committees. When you talk about waste, extravagance, and the expenditure of public money that should not be made, and when you vote on this resolution, think of these speeches that you have made, especially my friends on the Republican side. It will cost money to make this investigation and once it is started try to stop it. That is the history of investigating committees of this House—start them, and Members want them to go on forever. I am very sorry to say that in the main very little legislation follows the work of an investigating committee. That is the record. Some have brought good results, I admit.

There is not one sound reason why this resolution should be adopted today. We have matters of grave importance before this body which require the presence here of the members of the Indian Affairs Committee and we should not

send them on a joy ride from reservation to reservation taking testimony. If they will go over the Senate report, pick out what they feel is good and bring in a bill here, if it will better conditions and save money, I will vote for it. Let us eliminate these unnecessary expenditures. No one individual has the right to make the statement that if this House passes the pending resolution today it means a saving of \$15,000,000. How are you going to better their condition if you do not give them more money? I say to you it would be a mistake to put another investigating committee to work in this House when there is absolutely no reason whatsoever for it. I appeal to those interested to go through the 40 volumes of testimony that have been taken by the friends of the Indians in the Senate. The Indians themselves have been heard, their lawyers have been heard, the organizations in this country that have been organized for assisting the purpose of the Indians have been heard. All the information you need is there and if the Indian Affairs Committee wants it all they have to do is to study that record.

Mr. Speaker, may I say again that this forum should not be used to repudiate the action of the Senate committee. The House Committee on Indian Affairs is in control. They do not have to bring in legislation here unless they approve it and if they do not approve the report of the Senate committee they do not have to report a bill from that committee even though it passed the Senate; so why start a fight between the Indian Affairs Committee of the House and the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate to satisfy those who are administering our Indian laws?

It costs money to send committees around the country. It costs money to pay their hotel bills, and if you pass this resolution you are going to have to provide the money. I sincerely hope, regardless of what will be stated by Members who favor this resolution, that the House will vote it down. The opposition has but 10 minutes, friends of the resolution will take the remaining 50 minutes. No one can answer any argument they make.

In conclusion, let me read to you a statement, and I will say I am surprised to see it come from this gentleman. It proves to you that what I say in reference to those administering the laws is true. This is at the bottom of a letter written to Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma by Secretary Ickes. He says to Senator THOMAS:

The report is a disservice to the committee, to yourself, and to the purposes, objectives, and achievements of our Government in its dealings with the affairs of our oldest minority.

You complain about people uptown telling the Congress of the United States what it should do and what it should not do in reference to changing and administering laws, but you make no complaint about that strong language.

Find out whether or not the laws are properly administered, whether regulations have been adopted that are harmful, and, if you make that charge,

then you have a committee already set up with plenty of money that is charged with making just such an investigation; to determine whether the laws are being administered as Congress intended and to determine whether they have gone beyond the laws in adopting rules and regulations. That is the committee presided over by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I know if you make charges that they are not properly administering the laws, and that the regulations go beyond the laws, and you make your request, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] will make an investigation and he will respond immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York as the time was allotted for that purpose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we pass this resolution and bring a bill in here to improve the condition of the Indians, in place of reducing the cost it will increase it. I am speaking as a member of the subcommittee having to do with the Indian Bureau. I am in sympathy with the Indians and I believe we should do everything possible for them, but to rise here and say it is going to reduce the cost is not a fact, it cannot do anything of the kind. If you are going to improve the condition of the Indians it will probably double the cost or add 50 percent or more to it.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New York is absolutely right. I regret, Mr. Speaker, the time is not more evenly divided. Now you will only hear from those favoring this investigation. Much more could be said why this resolution should not pass, but time is not available. Those who will speak have been here for years. If conditions are bad, as they will say, then let them explain why they have not brought in legislation that would have provided better treatment for the Indians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 166 has been before the Congress from the standpoint of being before committees for a long time. I do not want the House to feel that my resolution was inspired by Senate Report No. 310, which was issued last June, however, because my bill was introduced here in March a year ago. There were hearings before the Indian Affairs Committee a year ago and that committee by unanimous vote approved the resolution on the 23d day of March 1943, several months before Senate Report 310 was ever brought out. The Rules Committee, as you have heard it said, gave its approval to this bill on the 3d day of March, this year. So much by way

of straightening out the record and by way of reiterating the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all, in response to my good friend from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] because I know he is a friend of the Indians—I have been before his committee—that it is possible to improve the status of the Indians and at the same time decrease the cost of the Indian Service. That is so for this reason: At the present time there is no legislative method by which you can determine when an Indian comes out from under his special status and as a result the Indian Office itself is overburdened with having to account for many people leading a white man's life, but who are still classified as Indians and retaining wardship attributes, and there is no legal manner in which they can be removed from that status. So it is possible, on the one hand, to decrease the cost annually, and on the other hand, to do more for the Indians who actually require help from the Indian Office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations never had any evidence that it would decrease, but on the contrary, it would increase the cost.

Mr. MUNDT. That is true under prevailing conditions only.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the testimony before our committee. I am in sympathy with the Indians.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure you are. It will continue to be an increasing cost until we can find some legal method which we hope will develop from an investigation such as the one I am proposing for taking from the rolls all Indians who should not be there, actually defining the problem confronting us, and then developing a constructive program destined to give fairness and freedom to the American Indian. We propose to suggest methods by which the Government can increasingly help the Indians to better be able to help themselves.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is a threefold purpose that this resolution hopes to accomplish. In the first place, it hopes to improve the status of the American Indian, as I have already indicated. That is our first objective. That is our fundamental purpose. It is our primary goal.

The second is to decrease annual appropriations, and to do that by requiring the Indian Office and the various services to devote their functions and services to the Indians in need of it, and not to the vast population of Indians determined by the Census to have some little portion of Indian blood but needing no help. We have to define the problem and that is one thing this investigating committee hopes to do.

In the third place, we hope to set up a pattern which will work toward the eventual elimination entirely of the Indian Office, not abruptly, not in the next 5 or 10 years, but after the Indian problem has been solved, by a series of constructive measures. It would be unnecessary to maintain the Indian Office at all had we done this 50 years ago. The

chances are that today your subcommittee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, would not be bothering at all with Indian appropriations had Congress adopted a sound and beneficial program 50 years ago. It is my hope the Mundt resolution will help produce such a program.

Our Committee on Indian Affairs hopes to apply this simple test to every existing Indian policy and every proposed Indian policy coming before us. It is this: Does it hasten the day when the Indian can become an independent citizen and take his rightful place in our American economic and political activity? That is one rule we seek to apply to this problem. I believe it is a sensible standard to keep before us.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman from Missouri has stressed the Senate report and has rather implied that action in passing this resolution would be a repudiation of the Senate report of last year. I do not want to be in the attitude of voting for a resolution that would be a repudiation of the report by the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MUNDT. No; of course not.

Mr. DISNEY. The people in my State are interested in this matter and I should like some light on it.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be happy to comment upon that. In the first place, our investigation cannot be a repudiation of any report, because we hope to consult the facts and bring in testimony, and after that conclude our resolutions. We have no idea where these resolutions will lead at this time. We are neither dedicated to the repudiation of the report nor to its endorsement. We expect to engage in neither a whitewash nor a witch hunt. We simply expect to pursue the facts wherever they may lead and to let the chips fall where they will.

As to Senate Report 310, the Senators who have signed it themselves are somewhat skeptical about some of the 33 recommendations which it includes.

I have a letter here which Senator THOMAS, of the gentleman's State, wrote to a man in the Indian Agency at Anadarko, Okla., in which he says, in commenting on this report:

The report mentioned was agreed to by a subcommittee of the Indian Affairs Committee and the attorney for the committee was ordered to prepare the text for the report. The report was intended to outline a long-term plan for the liquidation of the Bureau and just how the dates calling for the boarding schools to be eliminated at the end of this fiscal year is somewhat of a mystery. It may have been that some members of the committee knew of this provision but it was not called to my attention and of course had I known that these dates were inserted I would not under any condition have signed the report.

In a later paragraph he says:

You can readily see how easy it would be for some secretary to put me in a most embarrassing position if statements were made in any communications which did not conform to my viewpoint and policies. This is actually what happened in the report that was published.

The report that was published is in direct conflict with evidence submitted to us by Secretary of the Interior Ickes and also by Indian Commissioner Collier. On most of the 33 points at issue, Mr. Ickes and Mr. Collier say one thing and Senate Report No. 310 says something else. It is impossible for the House Indian Affairs Committee, without having the authority to study the problem and investigate it, to pass intelligently on this kind of a controversy. We would either have to say to the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, "You are wrong, you have misrepresented the facts," or we would have to say to Mr. Collier and Mr. Ickes, "You are wrong, you have misrepresented the facts"; and we cannot be put in that kind of a position.

We are assuming that they are both right in certain aspects. We are assuming that they are both talking about different things in part, but there is no legislation growing out of the whole Senate report, and our committee proposes to bring in some kind of recommendation for legislative action.

I would like to say this to my Democratic friends, because I think there is a reasonable question that you might ask, and that is, Is there any reason why we should vote for a resolution brought in here by a Republican which might propose to investigate an administrative agency? Let me answer that question.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will answer that question. I do not care whether it is a resolution, an appropriation, or a tariff bill if it is a good one; I do not care which side of the aisle it comes from.

Mr. MUNDT. Fine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As a Representative of my district and State, I am also a Representative of the 48 States of the Union, and I will vote for anything that is beneficial to them.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you. The resolution as brought in here came into being in part as the result of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing Congress to do something about the Indian problem, our State being a typical State having a large Indian population. Subsequently I offered this resolution. If it is approved, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, will be in charge of the investigation and will be chairman of the investigating committee. And, as is right, the investigating committee will have more members of the majority party on it than of the minority party.

I might add this further thing, that this is a friendly, fact-pursuing investigation. It does not go out to repudiate anything or to persecute anybody. It has the unanimous support of the Committee on Indian Affairs. It has the support of Mr. Collier, the Indian Commissioner, who, like the committee members, is eager to have the facts brought out so that we can know what kind of legislation is desired. This is not an effort to expose a situation or to persecute an individual, it is simply an at-

tempt to evolve a constructive Indian policy which will lead to better conditions for the Indian.

There are 10 general problems which we hope to study. May I just mention those 10 briefly. We may not, of course, have time to go into all 10 of these and the list does not bar the inclusion of other matters, but it will indicate some of the matters our investigation will consider, if it is approved.

No. 1 is, as a matter of definite policy, to determine what is an Indian. When does an Indian pass from his special status and take his part in the white man's society? Mr. Collier tells us it requires an act of Congress to define this. We cannot intelligently recommend to you such an act of Congress until we have had an opportunity to investigate and study the facts.

No. 2 is to bring to a conclusion the interminable Indian claims coming before this body. There are now over \$700,000,000 worth of Indian claims pending, in which the Indians make claims against the Congress and against the Government. We hope to arrive at some formula and some basis for putting a stop date on those claims. Those which are meritorious should be paid, and those which are not meritorious should be outlawed. Under existing conditions, all claims are delayed and deferred, and some attorneys apparently look upon Indian tribes as perpetual clients.

Third. There are now 23,000 American Indians in the armed services of this country—a larger percentage of Indians having entered the service incidentally than of any nationality represented in our Army, Navy, and Air Forces. An additional 25,000 to 30,000 are away from home working in our defense industries. Something must be worked out to provide for the readjustment of these Indians to productive, independent, self-supporting peacetime living after the war.

Fourth. The Wheeler-Howard Act has now been in operation about 10 years. Some Indian tribes have voted themselves completely under the provisions of this act, some have voted to remain entirely out, and still others have voted to accept certain provisions of the act and to reject others. No opportunity has been provided for subsequent votes and for tribes to change the status they decided upon with their original votes. Such opportunity should be provided and investigation may well reveal that certain important changes are desirable in this legislation.

Fifth. In 1924 Indians were made citizens of the United States by an act of Congress. Nevertheless, many of them are still treated as wards and almost all Indians live under certain aspects of wardship status. This incongruous situation should be corrected and an examination should be made of all special Indian penal statutes to determine whether they can be repealed or made inoperative in many cases.

Sixth. The whole problem of Indian heirships needs to be opened up and its operations revamped. Today some Indians have equities in 30 or 40 widely

scattered pieces of property and these equities run as small as \$3 to \$5. Something must be done to consolidate these holdings and to make income and principal of some value to the individual Indian.

Seventh. On some Indian reservations no adequate protection is provided for the wildlife resources of this country. In some cases neither Federal nor State protective laws apply. A correction should be found for this situation.

Eighth. The relationship of Indian lands to State and local taxes should be investigated and redefined. In some cases it is now impossible for tribes to secure all the land needed to support their people because of the ruinous impact of more tax-free land upon the local taxing bodies. Thus, both the Indians and the white citizens in Indian country are the victims.

Ninth. The possibility of establishing an advisory continuing Indian council should be explored, such council to work with Congress, with the Indian Office, and with the Indians themselves in developing and supporting the administration of a program of advancement for the Indians. Thus, the shock of changing Indian administrations would be softened and a continuing program could be developed which would not be abruptly altered every time there is a change of political administrations.

Tenth. We should examine the feasibility of transferring more of the Indian services such as school, health, agricultural supervision, vocational training, etc., to the administration of the individual States with grants in aid from the Federal Government. In some localities and with some tribes this might result in better treatment, more rapid advancement, and reduced costs to the Federal Government. In all events more opportunities for advanced vocational training should be provided for the Indians. We must increase the Indian's earning power before we can decrease his dependency upon the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing list is suggestive of the great need for the investigation proposed in the Mundt resolution. Other even more important problems may be developed as we get into the investigation, if it is authorized. It may also develop that some of these 10 will present difficulties too mighty to overcome but we can do nothing unless we make the effort. The American Indian is a great citizen. He is the original American. He deserves better treatment than has been accorded him by his white conquerors during the past 200 years. Let us decide today to take the step I am proposing as an effort to bring equity to the first victims of aggression on the North American Continent—the aboriginal Indians from whom we took by force and trickery the best terrain in all the world. I earnestly believe that the passage of the Mundt resolution today will be a step in that direction, and will help not only to improve the living conditions of the American Indian but also provide suggestions for reducing the present high costs of maintaining the Indian Bureau.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this particular resolution is very badly needed. It goes much further than trying to evaluate the points that were brought out in Senate Report 310. As a matter of fact, it gets to the basis of our entire Indian policy. As was stated a few minutes ago, the eventual end of that policy should be taking the Indians out of the status of wards and making them complete citizens in every sense of the word.

I have studied rather carefully Senate Report 310. Regardless of anything else that may be said, it hardly seems to me that it is the basis for a reevaluation of our policy regarding the treatment of Indians.

There are two things we are specially anxious to do. One is to see that at the present time the American Indians are given decent and fair and just treatment. When complaints have arisen and when points have been raised that such treatment is not taking place, it seems to me there is need for a thorough check up on the whole problem of Indian Affairs.

In the second place, any policy must look forward to an eventual termination of the wardship of the Indians of this country. Up until about 1929, the Indian Bureau was just about the most badly mismanaged bureau in the United States Government. Antiquated personnel and antiquated equipment were being dumped into it. Starting about 1929, a revolutionary change took place in that Bureau. During the past 14 years it has gradually become one of the more efficiently operated bureaus of American Government.

I think it is noteworthy to point out in that connection that it has so operated under both Republican and Democratic administrations. It is not partisan in any sense of the word.

Let me cite just one illustration of the achievements of this particular Bureau. In 1929 the Indian death rate was 27 per thousand annually. At the present time it is 13 per thousand annually. The cutting in half of the death rate during that time seems to me to be a noteworthy achievement.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am curious as to whether or not I heard the gentleman correctly. Did the gentleman say that the purpose of this resolution is to stop the Indians from being wards any longer and make them all full citizens?

Mr. OUTLAND. I said that the eventual hope of our Indian policy, it seems to me, should be that; not for the immediate purpose of the investigation, no.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The improvement in the death rate is due to the fact that the Indians were not

treated as private citizens but were very carefully taken care of as wards of the Government.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; but I am sure that my friend would agree with me that after the Indian Bureau has been able to help the thousands of Indians to help themselves, the eventual aim should be that they should become free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, probably no resolution for an investigation will come before this Congress that has a deeper meaning for a larger proportion of any Member's constituency than this has for mine. One person in eight in my district is enrolled in an Indian reservation, and entitled to Indian rights. There are five Sioux reservations in the district.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] raised the question as to whether or not this resolution should be adopted, upon the grounds of expense that it may entail. I cannot imagine that this select committee, created by this resolution, would expend over five or ten thousand dollars in its total expenditures, and if it spent twice that much, it should yield results that would save many, many times that amount.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] also raised the question as to whether this was the proper time for an investigation such as the one proposed. Let me say in reply to that, that the Indians, who have led all minority groups in the country in the rate of voluntary enlistment in the armed forces, are entitled to this study as a matter of justice. They are entitled to have the Four Freedoms established here at home.

The gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] intimated that everything that had happened before 1929 had been bad, so far as the Indian is concerned. Let me say that the time of greatest prosperity, so far as the Sioux Indians were concerned, was before 1929, and not since then. I wish the time permitted me to say something more about that. I disliked the gentleman's remark in particular because of the uncalled for reflection upon all Commissioners before 1929. It happens that a distinguished gentleman from South Dakota, a former Member of this House for 14 years, Hon. Charles H. Burke, was Commissioner of Indian Affairs, during a portion of the twenties. His constructive administration of that Bureau does not deserve the implications of the gentleman's remarks. An Oklahoma Member on this floor today has said to me that Charlie Burke was the best friend the Indians ever had as Commissioner.

Now, this resolution is proper because procedure in Indian affairs needs to be adjusted to the progress the Indians have made and the place they are capable of taking in American life. Let me illustrate. Every Sioux Indian who is serving as a private in either the Army

or the Navy is getting at least \$50 a month salary as a soldier or a sailor. He spends it as he pleases. He buys War bonds. He saves part of it. But when he comes to his reservation, if he has lease money deposited to his credit at the agency, he will have to come, hat in hand, and wait at the convenience of some clerk in the Indian agency, to submit a work program to know whether or not he can draw and spend his own money—probably far less in a year than the amount he has been receiving and spending in his own right in a single month.

Is it any wonder that the Indians wonder whose freedom they are fighting for? But they do fight and they go willingly and proudly, because they love their country.

I would like to see Congress pass a bill of emancipation for the American Indian. It should provide for the continuing of the benefits that have been promised the Indians by treaties and by the laws of the Congress, and also should provide a bill of rights that would permit the Indians to act in full the citizenship which was promised him by the Citizenship Act of 1924, passed during the Coolidge administration.

This resolution should be passed in order that the House Committee on Indian Affairs may proceed with full powers in a study of what should be done to enable the Indian to take his proper place in American life. The limited time for debate on the resolution does not permit a full discussion today of the various items that should be considered, so I shall ask permission to extend my remarks in that regard at a later date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the resolution will be adopted. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] says that no Member of this House has a deeper interest in the implications of this bill than he and his district. I say to the gentleman that I am running him a close second in that respect, because in the State of Arizona there are 50,000 Indians. That number does not happen to be 1 in 8, but 1 in about 10. Also, the economic life of Arizona Indians is intimately linked with the well-being of my State.

I think if there is any one thing misunderstood, it is this matter of our relation as a nation to the American Indian throughout our history. For decades and decades we handled the Indian tribes and treated with them as though they were foreign states, states within a state, and we made treaties with them, treaties which were usually broken. It is a sad chapter, much of this complete story about our dealings with the American Indian, and yet it has some good phases. As a nation we have wanted to be humane.

I call attention to one thing, that out of the 400,000 Indians in this country today, about a third of them we are told are men and women who could take their

places among American citizens, on an equal standing with all others. A large number, perhaps another third, are reservation Indians who are not now able to take their place among the white citizens and get along satisfactorily. They must continue for awhile, at least, as wards of the Government. Then, of course, there is a middle group on the border line. It is our duty as a Congress to study this whole question and see how we are able to induce those who are competent to assume the full duties of citizenship to be merged into our citizenship, leaving the status of others unchanged. That is the purpose of this resolution.

As I have so often said before to the Indian Affairs Committee of the House, "There are Indians and Indians." But that I referred to the vast differences in attainment among the various tribes throughout our country. I have known personally many Indians, especially in Oklahoma, who are college graduates and as wards of the Government had to ask permission to do the most trivial business acts. I have known, as many of you have known, high class members of the Cherokee Nation who held membership in this honorable body and in the other branch of Congress. And I know of many Indians as outstanding State officials and other Indian officials who were not predominately of white blood. Yet many reservation Indians have not had sufficient schooling to be entrusted to take care of themselves.

One reason for that may be that we count a man an Indian if he has only a small amount of Indian blood, no matter how much education he may have nor how capable he may be in doing his own business. I feel very positively that the friends of the Indians in Congress ought to subject this whole American Indian problem to close study with the view of releasing all from the governmental guardianship to a sphere of greater freedom as soon as it is to the benefit of the individual and the well being of society to do so.

With some reservation Indians this greater degree of freedom must not come too soon. I do not know the situation in South Dakota, but considering all our Indians, I doubt whether most of them are now ready to pass out of a condition of wardship. Certainly those far Western States like my own could not look with anything but apprehension upon the Government's withdrawing its guardianship as some have so thoughtlessly suggested. That is why I urge the adoption of this resolution for a study.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, my first direct contact with the Indians was through a nursing group which was asked to make a survey of public-health nursing in the United States. Among other places visited were the Indian reservations. The conditions were not good, but the survey was the beginning of better things. Apparently what was needed was a challenge to the service.

My service on the Indian Affairs Committee brought me into closer touch with Indian problems and I have deeply re-

gretted that membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee prevents my continuing my earlier work.

Any study of the American Indians shows that from the beginning it has been the Indians' unfortunate lot to be subjected to governmental experiment after experiment.

The first, which sprang largely from fear of the Indian, was the plan of extermination.

The second was the idea of concentration. In other words, segregate the Indian and let him live his old tribal life.

The third experiment was the introduction of the Allotment Act, which has been abolished.

The fourth is embodied in the Wheeler-Howard Act. It has been presented as a method of decreasing control by the Federal Government and granting greater self-government to the Indians themselves. But it would seem as if acceptance of the act changed the status of the Indians from that of involuntary wardship to voluntary wardship, making his last lot more grievous than his first. This needs illumination. Such a survey as this resolution contemplates would furnish it.

I think it high time that we knew just how well this last method has worked. Are we integrating our Indians into our general population or are we not? We should know exactly what we are doing. It would seem to me an admirable time for us to very quietly examine into the situation of our Indians. They can be most useful citizens when they have opportunity so to be. They are a very loyal group in spite of their difficulties. We know that the percentage of Indians in the Army is extraordinarily high and that they are fighters. All of these qualities could be of increasing value to the United States. Let us remember that the Indian, after all, did own this country. We took it from him and we have an obligation to ourselves to see that he has a real chance to participate in complete citizenship. Let us make certain that the methods now being used are doing everything possible to integrate the Indian into our corporate life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of House Resolution 166, introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Like the gentleman from South Dakota, I have quite a few Indian constituents in my district and I feel that I know their many problems. I have the honor to represent Indians that are members of the Winnebago, Omaha, and Santee Sioux Tribes. They are good citizens and they have contributed substantially to the welfare of their State and Nation. Many of them have rendered military service in previous wars and many others, among them sons of the older veterans, are today with our armed forces throughout the world. Many of them have achieved distinguished heroism in this war.

It is my custom to visit my Indian constituents yearly or oftener if possible. I

join them at their council meetings and I visit them individually so that I may be informed about them. I find them tremendously interested in public matters. They participate in government. They vote and in spite of their many hardships under white man's rule, they are patiently waiting for legislation that will right the wrongs that have been done them. I subscribe to their natural feeling of entitlement to equality of treatment among citizens. If, by the passage of this resolution, the House of Representatives can advance the welfare of American Indians, let us vote for it un-animously.

There are many matters affecting the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Sioux Indians that I would like to discuss in the House. There are jurisdictional questions, many varieties of Indian claims, tax adjustments, and many other questions. But I feel that if this resolution is passed and this investigating committee functions effectively, we can acquaint that committee with the principal Indian grievances.

Something has been said here about the cost of this proposed committee. It has been represented to me that this committee can develop much needed information about many Indian problems that we cannot or will not otherwise get. I doubt if the cost will be high. I believe that a good job on the committee's part may even save money in addition to improving the welfare of Indians.

The United States Government is, at this moment, spending a large sum of money on the publication of a handbook on South American Indians, designed to help South American Indians. We have not done anything like that for our native Indians in many years. I opposed this South American expenditure on several occasions because I felt our native Indians are entitled to first consideration.

Let us vote for this resolution and urge the committee, should the resolution pass, to be thorough in its inquiry into all phases of Indian grievances so that the Congress may apply itself to the permanent betterment of our native American Indian citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND], for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record on the subject now under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, to one who knows the history of the Indians, no legislative proposal can awaken keener interest than one which has for its purpose the improvement of the status of the Indians and the rendering to them of a larger measure of long-delayed justice.

Among the citizens of Alaska are approximately 33,000 people who are given the generic name of Indians but who really embrace, by race, some 12,000 In-

dians, 20,000 Eskimos, and 1,000 Aleuts. Their legal condition is the same and, therefore, it may be proper to refer to them as Indians because in law they have been treated as the Indians of the several States.

While I am not in accord with some of the statements contained in the preamble of the resolution, it is to be noted that the preamble has been stricken and is no longer part of the measure now under consideration so that a vote in the affirmative will be a vote for the resolution without the preamble.

There is nothing extraordinary about the resolution. Its purpose is to bring about larger knowledge on the part of Members of Congress as to present conditions among the Indians. The proposal is to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House, or a subcommittee thereof, to conduct an investigation to determine whether the changed status of the Indians and the conditions under which they now live require a revision of the laws and regulations affecting the Indians, and to prepare recommendations to Congress for the enactment of any needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the Indians. In my judgment, such action is highly desirable. It is true that the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I have the honor to be a member, can gather and has gathered a vast amount of information about the Indian races or tribes of the States and Alaska. But there is really no substitute for an inquiry on the grounds. Witnesses who come before the committee from the several States and from Alaska, no matter how honest or intelligent, are not able to give to the members the really penetrating insight and detailed knowledge of conditions which are so necessary to enable the members of the committee to draft any desirable legislation and then to explain and defend it on the floor of the House when the legislation is brought up for consideration here.

Moreover, it is obvious that conditions are not the same in every State or every community, or every tribe or association of Indians. In fact, conditions widely vary, and legislation that may be suitable for the Indians of South Dakota, for example, may not be at all suitable for those of Arizona or California or Oregon or Alaska, and this wide variance in circumstance and condition among the Indians of the United States, including Alaska, makes it the more necessary that there should be in every instance possible a comprehensive and detailed inquiry on the ground where all the knowledge available can be brought forcibly to the attention of those making the inquiry.

It has been suggested that since a similar committee has made similar investigations in another body there is no need for the enactment of this resolution. That argument, although substantial, leaves out of sight the fact that the House is a coordinate legislative body and that it is the duty of the House to form its own conclusions upon the evidence that shall be presented to it in favor of or opposed to any legislation. In a matter of such importance, it seems indispen-

sable that the House should make its own inquiry, through its own agency, and thus be in best position to arrive at its own conclusions.

The proposal to have the investigation made by the House Committee on Indian Affairs or a subcommittee is a salutary one. That committee, under the leadership of its able, distinguished, and eminently just and fair-minded chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], is surely, upon all grounds, singularly well-fitted to undertake the work.

The money appropriated for the purpose should be ample to permit a thorough inquiry into all phases of law and economics which affect the Indians. A hasty investigation embracing little more than "a lick and a promise" will be all but valueless. What the Indians need, what the Nation needs, and what Congress, itself, needs is a comprehensive body of reliable knowledge and information—a body of fact—relative to the Indians and their circumstances and environment and what may best be done to give them any assistance that they need and to which they are entitled by law or justice.

I earnestly hope that no one will vote for this resolution upon the theory that it is going to effect an enormous saving of appropriations for the Indians. On this feature of the matter I join in the opinion so forcibly expressed by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. FRZPATRICK] during this debate on the resolution, namely, that if full justice is done to the Indians the appropriations for them will be greatly augmented instead of being reduced. In Alaska alone, although large advances have been made in recent years both in the volume of appropriations and in the efficient administration of the Office of Indian Affairs, much greater amounts should be now provided in order to reduce and eventually control the appalling ravages of tuberculosis among the native peoples of Alaska where the incidence of that terrible disease is more than 12 times that of the people of the United States as a whole.

It has been properly observed that the record of the Indians in the present war is one in which we can all take pride. So far as Alaska is concerned, I am sure there is not among the natives a single case of even mental disloyalty to our cause and to our Nation. The Alaska Indians and other native races serve in the armed forces willingly, cheerfully, and efficiently. While they would be the last to suggest that they should have any extra compensation for their loyalty, it is only becoming that there should be rendered to these descendants of a people who once owned the whole country, all of the land and the forests and the lakes and the rivers and the mountains, the things that are theirs in right and justice at the hands of our Government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Lynn Telegram News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my talk this morning I would like to add a letter dated March 9, 1944, from the War Production Board from Arthur G. Eaton, Director, to myself, and a statement of the War Production Board regarding the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 166 has for its purpose an investigation into the problems of the Indians, wherever situate, by the House Committee on Indian Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof.

The Indians cannot be treated as one kind of people owing to the various tribes, their different languages and the disparity of conditions under which they are living. As an illustration, 90 percent of the Navajos of Arizona cannot speak English, whereas 90 percent of the Flat-head Indians in Montana can speak English. Time will not permit an elaboration upon the various diversities of conditions, languages, and so forth. Suffice it to say at this point that no one standard can be set up for the welfare of all of these groups of people.

A report has been submitted, known as Senate Report 310, and the same has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, and we doubt the efficacy of the recommendations therein contained. The adoption of it by the Congress would abolish and liquidate the Indian Department and put the Indians on their own, so to speak. Such a procedure would be a violation of the treaties with the Indians sincerely entered into. And, moreover, the States having the largest Indian populations would find the financial responsibilities impossible. We must not overlook the fact that the Indians have been driven westward from the productive Eastern States to designated reservations and then when it was found on those reservations that the lands were of particular value from agricultural and mineral standpoint they were, in many instances, deprived of such lands.

So, as a result of our policy, we find many of the Indians living in poverty and squalor. On the other hand, we have many Indians carried on the rolls who should no longer be charges of the Government. We have many on the rolls classified as Indians with but very little Indian blood and who are just as capable of caring for their own affairs and themselves as the whites. It is interesting to note that technically there are 11,500 employees in the Indian Service. About 2,500 are Indians. Three hundred of these employees are in the Chicago and Washington offices. If the number of Indians who are absolutely capable of self-government were taken from the rolls necessarily the staff of employees could be and should be materially reduced and perhaps the number should be reduced anyway.

EFFECTING A TREMENDOUS SAVINGS

On this one phase of the Indian problems I might say that our committee of the House has in mind, instead of the abrupt liquidation called for in Senate Report 310, the gradual, timetable liquidation of the various tribes according to and depending upon the ability of those tribes to be assimilated into the general economy of the country and when I say "assimilated" I do not necessarily mean that any one tribe is to lose its identity as a political, social, or even economic entity if it does not desire to do so. In other words, segregation is not necessarily nonassimilation. The terms are not necessarily incompatible. Such a program would merely entail the exclusion of those tribes and all of their affairs, when and if able, from any greater degree of Federal aid and assistance and control than their white neighbors were receiving. There are some tribes, such as the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, who, I believe, would prefer neither to be assimilated nor helped. The Pueblo tribes are thousands of years old and prefer their own culture and Christianity and I do not believe that 100 years from now will see their economic or social conditions changed very much.

There have been claims presented by Indians and Indian tribes against the Government, alleging that Indian treaties have been violated by the Government, going into the hundreds of millions of dollars. These claims are always coming up, and they cloud the minds of the Indians. The Congress neither allows them nor repudiates them. As a rule these poor people never get a chance to go into court to have their claims adjudicated, and if something is not done in this regard, the Indians will still be at the doors of Congress asserting their claims a century from now. A policy must be worked out in conformity with the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1940, if we are going to do justice by the Indians.

A law was passed in 1834 which bars the sale of liquor in any form to any person who is an Indian. This law follows that man wherever his course takes him in this country. Whoever sells or gives liquor to any person with any Indian blood in him today violates the law wherever such sale or gift occurs. You cannot solve this problem by one act of Congress, as in many places local options should be the rule and local ordinances regulate the sale and gift of liquor. In my own State I believe the Indians would like to see the law wiped out entirely. Such a law, under the conditions in my State, amounts to an absolute discrimination against these great people. Investigation into the field must be made to determine the proper course in this regard.

What is termed the "land mess" that occurs in all allotted areas? For instance, an allotment was given to Indians—men, women, and children. They, in time, have passed away and left heirs. Their equity passed on into the third and fourth generations, and maybe the fifth. Sometimes these equities come to five or ten dollars in value. No procedure has yet been suggested as to the answer in

this matter. No title can be given to a purchaser so long as this chaotic condition is permitted to exist, and no leases can properly be made. The result is that it has been generally referred to as the "Indian land mess," and the Government is compelled to expend over a million dollars a year in management of just such estates which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs says is pure waste. This phase of the problem will require legislation and field work. For instance, on the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota, they are trying to work out a consolidation scheme. Field work should be done there to see what the method is and what the results have been. On the Fort Peck Reservation in my State of Montana, one-half of the personnel in the Indian department in that section is used in trying to work out this heirship problem, and up to date their efforts have been futile.

The Indian appropriation bill seems to me to be anything but sensible. It carries something like, as I am informed, 1,000 appropriations. A study should be made to simplify the appropriations for the Indians, making it flexible so the amounts could be used where needed most. Today appropriations are made for specific things.

We should investigate the reservations to find out if self-government is working under what is known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. Ten years have gone by since this reorganization act was passed. The people on these various reservations know whether or not this is working properly and what, if any, changes should be made.

We have in this country and Alaska approximately 400,000 Indians. It is costing the Government in the neighborhood of \$32,000,000 per annum to administer the affairs of the Indian department. Prior to this administration it was costing in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000 to administer this department; so the cost of administration has really been going down during the past 12 years, but it can be materially reduced if we make the proper approach to all of these problems as a result of deliberate action based upon information gotten direct from the reservations and the Indians.

This investigation has for its purpose two primary objectives: First, to rehabilitate and restore the American Indian to his proper status and second, to do away with the useless expenditure of money, the expenditure of which is doing no one any good and perhaps harm. On the first phase of it, the American Indian is discriminated against. As Senator Thomas P. Gore, former Senator from the State of Oklahoma, once said:

The root of the whole trouble is that the Indian has no existing right in the court. As a tribe, as a member of a tribe, he has no right in the court trying to protect his tribal assets or himself as a member of his tribe. You have heard of a man without a country. The Indian is a man without a court. I am not exaggerating that. The Indian has no forum in this land where he can vindicate his constitutional rights.

It is well to point out that 18,000 of the descendants of the great Indian chiefs

are today fighting on every one of our battle fronts. In some Indian jurisdictions 30 percent of the able-bodied men between 18 and 38 are on the firing lines. In others it will run from 60 to 70 percent. Since the war their production of farm products has been increased nearly 100 percent. The home front is fighting and is working to win this war. In my own State, over night, the Crow Tribe offered all of its resources and all of its manpower to the Great White Father. Even the Indian cowgirls tried to enlist in the service. They did the same in New Mexico, California, and every other State where Indians live. I could take up your time by the hour in going over the records of the heroism of many of our soldiers, red in color. It is reported that in the State of Arizona a boy who wanted to enlist traveled over 100 miles over wintery and wind-swept roads to get to a place where he could enlist, braving storms and taking a chance with death. He was overtaken by a snowstorm and with resultant death it is said he froze into an American legend.

Hitler, the Germans, and the Japs, know the mettle of these boys. The Indian as a soldier in the white man's wars was discovered in 1918. In that year, before the surrender of Germany, Gen. Karl Von Prutch said:

The most dangerous of the American soldiers is the Indian. He is brave above all else. He knows far more about camouflage, inherited from his ancestors, than any modern soldier that has the benefit of science and great laboratories. He is a dead shot. He needs no orders when he advances. He is an army within himself. He is the one American soldier Germany must fear.

Let us take Joe Longknife, an Assiniboine Indian from my State. He was at Bataan. He was decorated with the silver star, with the following citation:

Private Longknife was the leading scout in his platoon. On approaching the enemy position under heavy small arms fire he noticed the enemy to his immediate front and also to his flank. He immediately opened fire and with excellent marksmanship killed 10 Japs with 16 shots. He then crawled back to his platoon under heavy fire and informed his squad leader of the threatening enemy position on his front and flank. His action saved his platoon from possible ambush.

In north Africa they still talk about Ken Scissons, of Rapid City, S. Dak. Ten Nazis in 4 minutes of Commando action outside of Bizerte is his record. The official citation reads:

In December 1942, during a raid near Tunisia, upon the ambush of his unit by the enemy, Private Scissons, seeing two of his comrades attempting to crawl to safety, did, without regard to his own life, engage the enemy with his rifle and draw their entire fire upon his position. Only after his comrades reached safety did Private Scissons attempt to withdraw. His coolness and courage under fire and his desire to sacrifice himself, if necessary, for the safety of his comrades are a profound inspiration to the members of the armed forces and reflect the highest tradition of our Army.

Do you not think we had better take stock and see what we are doing for these people and see whether they should not be given a chance to be free Amer-

ican citizens as you and I are? A bloody war was fought in this country for the freedom of another race.

As to Senate Report 310, let me quote from a letter I received from an Indian who is superintendent of the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana. He is the only Indian holding down such a position in the United States today:

If the recommendations of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate were executed tomorrow morning, within 1 year from this date you will have Indians who will be unwanted public charges and applicants of the poorhouse in each county and State in which we find them. This is a harsh statement to make, but I know that it will be the situation that will obtain 1 year hence. On account of his total inexperience in business matters he will lose his lands by mortgage foreclosure and otherwise, also in trades for automobiles. You, then, will have a real problem. The States wherein they are found will have real problems, akin to those social problems now being experienced by the European countries.

In view of the conditions obtaining throughout the Indian country at this moment, certainly most of the recommendations of the Senate committee should be held in abeyance for some future time when the conditions of the Indians would warrant their adoption by Congress. Let me take this reservation as an example of what would happen if the 32 recommendations of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee were adopted: Suppose I were ordered by the Commissioner to issue patents in fee to all of the Indians, and I proceed as instructed and fee patents were issued right and left to the Indians. I know only too well that within a very short time these beautiful river-bottom lands, capable of producing from 12 to 25 tons of sugar beets per acre, 4 tons of alfalfa per acre, oats, barley, etc., in abundance, would be in the hands of non-Indians, either through failure to pay taxes, real estate loans made to them that they cannot lift when the repayment time arrives, or outright loans in which foreclosures will be the order of the day right and left. The Crow Indians, who own, perhaps, one of the best Indian reservations in the United States, will be paupers in 12 months from the date of the issuance of patents in fee to each and every one. Socially they are ostracized from white communities; politically the same thing is true; economically they are the forgotten people. Every kind of a discrimination is practiced against these people on account of race. This serious situation seems to have been overlooked entirely by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate when they made their recommendations, some of which are very good, others very disastrous.

The Supreme Court of the United States has this to say:

These Indian tribes are the wards of the Nation. They are communities dependent on the United States; dependent largely for their daily food; dependent for their political rights. They owe no allegiance to the States, and receive from them no protection. Because of the local ill feeling, the people of the States where they are found are often their deadliest enemies. From their very weakness and helplessness, so largely due to the course of dealing of the Federal Government with them and the treaties in which it has been promised, there arises the duty of protection, and with it the power (May 10, 1886, 30 L. Ed. 228).

It is proper at this time, in connection with Senate Report 310, to review some recommendations made by the Senate committee in 1933, with reference to

some of the recommendations made in 310.

The Senate committee, in 1933, made a report which presumably was to be controlling policy. In order that the dilemma of administrative officials may be more fairly brought out, I should like to place some of the recommendations of these two reports alongside each other.

Senate Report 310, 1943, recommends:

(10) Eliminate the rehabilitation of Indians as Indians; (15) transfer Indian education to the States, annual savings in excess of \$5,000,000; (21) eliminate Indian agriculture extension; (23) cease the purchase of land; (24) eliminate all Indian boarding schools.

In contrast with this blanket recommendation to dispense with all services for Indians, the Senate committee in 1933, had the following to say:

The committee recommends that the United States provide the relief by meeting its obligation to its own wards to the extent of providing in substantially full amount the money required for education, health, law enforcement, and indigent relief.

The committee recommends specifically—

that the United States by appropriate legislation shall declare that it is its policy to meet the full expense for the progressive development of the Indian citizens.

The Senate committee's report in 1943 recommends:

(22) Eliminate Federal trust over all individual lands, including those in inheritance status. This will free the Indian owners to become respectable citizens—

And, of course, throw the lands onto the tax rolls. The committee in 1933 had the following to say:

Two suggestions are frequently encountered, that the tax-exempt character of the Indian land be altered and the land made taxable as rapidly as treaties with the Indians will permit. * * * It is disapproved because it is impracticable and would inevitably result in the loss to the Indian of his property.

At the time House Resolution 166 was introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota, Congressman MUNDT, which, in turn, was referred to the Rules Committee, I was personally exploring the field of Indian problems with the objective in mind of introducing a similar resolution. When this resolution came up before our committee, after considerable discussion and hearings, it was reported on unanimously and I am supporting it. I believe that if a thorough and sincere investigation is made, with no political ax to grind; with letting chips fall where they will, that a great good may come out of it and perhaps many injustices that have occurred in the past may be rectified or at least give the Indians a square deal in the future, and an annual saving of millions of dollars be effected.

It has been said that inasmuch as there is an investigatory body in the Senate investigating Indian problems that there is no need for a like body in the House. This is a separate body of the Congress. We are entitled to place our own interpretations on the facts as

we find them. That interpretation may differ from that of the Senate and the facts as they found them. I might say that Senate Report 310 was filed some time ago, and I think it is significant that no bill has been introduced in the Senate to bring about the cure or the solution of the Indian problems as set forth in the many recommendations of said report.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House going on 8 years. I have listened to testimony concerning conditions on Indian reservations from about 20 or 25 States in these United States. Almost without a single exception the story is one of poverty and neglect and living conditions that are almost unbelievable. To my good friend from Missouri, I at one time made a statement on the floor of the House that I thought he was prejudiced against Indian bills. I would change that statement since I have learned to know the distinguished gentleman from Missouri better. I will say this, now, that I do not believe the gentleman understands the problems of the American Indian in this country.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am always glad to yield, if it is not for too long.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman states he has heard testimony from Indians in about 25 States of the Union. Can the gentleman tell me whether he has ever brought a resolution in or a bill on this floor to benefit or improve the conditions of the Indian as the result of that testimony? And if he has heard it, then let the gentleman tell me why, he did not—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield no further. Yes. Resolution after resolution has been brought up on the floor of this House to help the Indians and the gentleman has stood at the bridge and prevented their passage. That is what the gentleman has done. But I choose to believe the gentleman does not understand the Indians' problem. Of course, the gentleman always argues that. He is adroit and clever.

Mr. COCHRAN. Not one would benefit the Indians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who are fighting these bills for the Indians do not know their problems. I have seen the Indians living in squalor on reservations. I have known the Government of the United States to take from the Indians nearly everything they had of value. I have seen some of the best lands taken from the different tribes and sold to the white man. What was the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek about, where 200 women and children were massacred by the soldiers? It was because gold was discovered in the Black Hills country. Read the history of it, and you men with red blood in your veins will at least try to see that the Indians get a square deal from here on. Read the history of Custer's last stand in Montana, in my district, and you will find there a connection with the gold that was discovered in the Black Hills. Those Indians were on their own

ground. It was easy for the Government to give Indians a lot of land, but when something of value was discovered, a way was found to take it away from them. As a result, many of them are living in poverty upon land that human beings ought not to be forced to exist upon.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. I am going to vote for this resolution in the hope that something will really come of it, but I personally will be very deeply disappointed if this is just going to be another investigation committee and if it dawdles around and does not do a real job of this. I hope the gentleman will have something to say about the whole proposition after this resolution is voted, if it is, keeping in mind that Members of the House do expect something to come out of it. There is plenty to be done, in my judgment. In my district, in practically every county we have Indian county officers. The Indians have been coming in and joining the white population and becoming fine citizens. The purpose of the resolution, I presume, will be to get out of the old rut of keeping the Indians as Indians right on down the years; bring them in with the white population and assimilating them, until they become regular American citizens. I think the committee ought to bring in a comprehensive program, else there is no use having the investigation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say that is just exactly what we propose to do. In my previous statement I have said in a different way just what the gentleman recommends, which I regard as very helpful.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman knows I have been trying to get some time and have not succeeded. We have some 40,000 Indians in my State and we are somewhat interested. Do you propose that most of the restrictions and regulations limiting the rights and freedom of action shall be removed? It happens that some of those restrictions have protected the Indians and their property. If you take away the property restrictions, the Indians will lose all their property in a very short time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right—we must proceed step by step—to bring about assimilation of the Indians with the whites and the American way of life.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is this resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The committee will have charge of the work and I will assure the gentleman the Indians' rights will be protected.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But this is stating the policy, that the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action shall be removed. We do not subscribe to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no; as I said, it must be a slow process, otherwise we would do more harm than good.

We do not propose to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The resolution says that you do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The resolution provides for an investigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is true that I have no Indians left in my district except the great white father at Hyde Park, whom I predict will not be the big chief much longer. At one time the Hudson River Valley and the Delaware Valley, both of which are in my district, were the headquarters of the famous Delaware Indians of the Leni-Lenape Tribe, which all of you have read about in *The Last of the Mohicans* by Fenimore Cooper.

My only connection as far as the Indians are concerned is that I am a member of the Red Men in the city of Beacon. But I have taken this time because my boss, the only boss that I recognize—I have been in this House many years and I have followed many leaders, but in all that time I have had only one boss—and that boss has ordered me to appear here today and speak in behalf of this resolution. She is a daughter of a former Democratic Congressman from New York State but let no Republican get excited as she is even more against the New Deal than I am. I was further informed that if I did not do so, I would be in the dog house when I got home for dinner tonight. So I have risen in these few brief moments to speak in behalf of the resolution, which I think is nothing more nor less than a square deal and a fair deal for the American Indians. And why not? Why should we not have an investigating committee? Why should not the House investigate the vital problems affecting 400,000 Indians, and come back in 60 days with some concrete and constructive recommendations? I have faith in the ability and the competency and intelligence of the Members of this House. I do not care whether the Senate has spent 12 years investigating the conditions of the Indians or that it has failed to do anything about it.

I am voting for this resolution because I think it is the sound and wise thing to do and that it will get results and improve the conditions of the Indians. Furthermore let me call your attention to the fact that thousands of Indians today are in our armed forces not only in Italy but all over the world with our combat troops, fighting with distinction, bravery, and honor as American citizens.

I believe the American people will agree that Congress should put into effect the "four freedoms" in our own country before spending \$1,350,000,000 to afford relief for people in foreign nations. Why can we not afford some relief to those American Indians who are in need and distress and in poverty-stricken circumstances? I do not know whether this resolution will cost the United States one penny or some Indian wampum, and I do not care if it does, if it actually improves the condition of the Indians. There may be certain tribes that are poverty-stricken, that need relief; there may be others that do not. I rise therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in it and also because my boss has ordered me to do so.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amended preamble.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COCHRAN) there were—ayes 71, noes 21.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently on the count just made there is not a quorum present. The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays, 100, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—200

Allen, La.	Dawson	Hope
Anderson, Calif.	Day	Horan
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dewey	Howell
Andresen, August H.	Dilweg	Hull
Andrews	Disney	Izac
Angell	Dondero	Jackson
Arends	Dworshak	Jeffrey
Arnold	Ellis	Jensen
Auchincloss	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Anton J.
Barrett	Ellsworth	Johnson, Calvin D.
Bates, Ky.	Elmer	Johnson, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, J. Leroy
Bell	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Okla.
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Judd
Bennett, Mo.	Fenton	Kean
Bishop	Fernandez	Kearney
Blackney	Fish	Keefe
Bloom	Fitzpatrick	Kefauver
Bolton	Gallagher	Kerr
Boren	Gathings	Kilburn
Boykin	Gavin	King
Bradley, Mich.	Gearhart	LaFollette
Brown, Ga.	Gillette	Landis
Brown, Ohio	Gille	Larcade
Brumbaugh	Goodwin	Lea
Buffett	Gordon	LeCompte
Busbey	Granger	Lemke
Canfield	Grant, Ala.	Lesinski
Carlson, Kans.	Grant, Ind.	Lewis
Carrier	Green	McCormack
Carson, Ohio	Hagen	McCowan
Case	Hale	McGregor
Chipperfield	Hall	McKenzie
Church	Halleck	McLean
Clason	Harness, Ind.	McWilliams
Coffee	Hartley	Mansfield,
Cole, Mo.	Hébert	Mont.
Cole, N. Y.	Heidinger	Martin, Iowa
Compton	Hinshaw	Martin, Mass.
Crawford	Hoeven	Michener
Cunningham	Hoffman	Miller, Conn.
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	
	Holmes, Wash.	

Miller, Nebr.	Robinson, Utah	Stewart
Miller, Pa.	Robison, Ky.	Sullivan
Mopkiewicz	Rockwell	Sundstrom
Mott	Rogers, Mass.	Taber
Mundt	Rohrbough	Talbot
Murdoch	Rolph	Talle
Norton	Rowan	Taylor
O'Brien, Mich.	Sabath	Tibbott
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sadowsky	Tolan
O'Connor	Sauthoff	Towe
O'Hara	Schifler	Troutman
O'Konski	Schwabe	Vinson, Ga.
Outland	Scott	Voorhis, Calif.
Patton	Scrivner	Vursell
Peterson, Fla.	Shafer	Walter
Peterson, Ga.	Sheridan	Weaver
Pittenger	Simpson, Ill.	Welch
Pracht,	Simpson, Pa.	Wickersham
C. Frederick	Slaughter	Wigglesworth
Pratt,	Smith, Maine	Willey
Joseph M.	Smith, Wis.	Wilson
Reed, Ill.	Sparkman	Wolcott
Reed, N. Y.	Springer	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rees, Kans.	Stanley	Wolverton, N. J.
Richards	Stefan	Woodrum, Va.
Rizley	Stevenson	

NAYS—100

Abernethy	Fulbright	Merritt
Barden	Gore	Mills
Beckworth	Gossett	Morrison, N. C.
Bland	Graham	Murphy
Bonner	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Brehm	Griffiths	Norrell
Brooks	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Bryson	Gwynne	O'Neal
Bulwinkle	Hancock	Patman
Burchill, N. Y.	Hare	Poage
Burgin	Harris, Ark.	Price
Byrne	Hess	Priest
Camp	Hill	Rankin
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Carter	Johnson,	Rowe
Chapman	Luther A.	Russell
Clark	Johnson,	Sasser
Clevenger	Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Sikes
Colmer	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Cooper	Kilday	Snyder
Cox	Kinzer	Spence
Cravens	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Crosser	Kleberg	Thomas, Tex.
D'Alessandro	Kunkel	Thomason
Doughton	Lanham	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	Ludlow	West
Elliott	Lynch	Whelchel, Ga.
Elston Ohio	McCord	Whitten
Fisher	McMillan	Whittington
Flannagan	Mahon	Winstead
Folger	Mansfield, Tex.	Worley
Forand	Mason	Wright
Ford	May	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—128

Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Marcantonio
Andersen,	Gerlach	Morrow
H. Carl	Gibson	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Monroney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Morrison, La.
Barry	Gorski	Mruk
Beall	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Bender	Leonard W.	Myers
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Newsome
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Norman
Burch, Va.	Hart	O'Leary
Burdick	Hays	O'Toole
Butler	Heffernan	Pace
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Pfeifer
Capozzoli	Herter	Philbin
Celler	Hobbs	Phillips
Chenoweth	Hoch	Ploeser
Cooley	Hollifield	Plumley
Costello	Jarman	Poulson
Courtney	Jennings	Powers
Curtis	Jonkman	Rabaut
Davis	Kee	Ramey
Delaney	Kelley	Ramspeck
Dickstein	Kennedy	Randolph
Dies	Keogh	Rivers
Dingell	Klein	Robertson
Dirksen	Knutson	Rodgers, Pa.
Domengeaux	Lambertson	Rogers, Calif.
Douglas	Lane	Satterfield
Drewry	LeFevre	Scanlon
Durham	Luce	Short
Eaton	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Fay	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Feighan	McMurray	Somers, N. Y.
Fogarty	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Fuller	Madden	Stearns, N. H.
Fulmer	Magnuson	Stockman
Furlong	Maloney	Sumners, Tex.
Gale	Manasco	Tarver

Thomas, N. J.	Ward	White
Torrens	Wasielewski	Winter
Treadway	Weichel, Ohio	Woodruff, Mich.
Vorys, Ohio	Weiss	
Wadsworth	Wene	

So the resolution was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:
Until further notice:
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Floeser.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Short.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Miller of Missouri.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Mruk.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Newsome with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Butler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment striking out the preamble to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the title, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Strike out the words "create a select committee" and insert in lieu thereof "authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order heretofore granted, the gentle-

man from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because there was no other legislative business for the day, permission was obtained to speak at this time.

In the Detroit News of February 3, 1944, there was printed the following:

C. Pat Quinn, president of the C. I. O. council, disclosed that a resolution condemning HOFFMAN for "seditious statements and activities" was passed by the council Tuesday night.

The resolution declares: "This Fascist-minded Congressman has thus climaxed a long record of pro-Fascist activities and by such seditious incitations has laid himself open to immediate Federal action under the Espionage Act, which places such utterances as this in wartime as treason and aid to the enemy."

The statements reflect upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and raise the question of personal privilege.

Time should not be taken to reply to this charge were I the only one interested in this question. As time goes on, practically every Member of this body, on the majority as well as on the minority side, will have like charges made against him. We know from past experience that at least two-thirds of the Members of this House and two-thirds of the Members of the other body have been openly and repeatedly charged with being antilabor, with favoring legislation which interfered with the war effort, with being, you might say, pro-Nazi. Therefore, the House and the Members of the House might now as well as later meet these charges and do what it can to expose the falsehoods.

ACTIVITIES OF C. I. O. POLITICAL-ACTION COMMITTEE

The C. I. O.—the political-action committee of the C. I. O.—should be the last to make charges of that nature, and it is my purpose today to place in the RECORD facts and circumstances undisputed, which show that the C. I. O. itself has been, and is now, engaged in a campaign which has in the past and which today does hinder the production of munitions of war.

The activities of some of the C. I. O. leaders tend to create discontent. They promote disorder. They instigate riots and create a condition fertile for civil war. Here is an old circular which was used by me in the last campaign when in my district the C. I. O. in published advertisements wanted to know whether I was fighting Hitler or the C. I. O. In the papers of the district I replied with the statement that I was fighting both of them. The reasons why I was fighting Hitler were evident to all. And these pictures, some of which I published, showed why I was fighting the C. I. O. I have copies of this, and I think I will have enough for any Member who wants one. If any Member here is assailed during this campaign for nomination or

election by the C. I. O., you can present to the people of your district a photograph of what the C. I. O. does and the kind of activities it carries on. Now, do not misunderstand, no broad, general charge that the C. I. O. is composed of disloyal men or women is made. The only claim is that a few of those at the top who control the actions of the C. I. O. are the ones who are doing these things.

C. I. O. MEMBERSHIP PATRIOTIC

There are hundreds of thousands of patriotic workers in the C. I. O.; but from 1937, when, in violence and bloodshed, in disregard of law and the constitutional rights of citizens, the sit-down strikes were brought by it to Michigan down to the present moment, many of its leaders have been dominated, whether they know it or not, by Communists working toward the overthrow of our Government by force. Some of the methods of the C. I. O. are those of the Communists. They seek to create discontent, promote disorder, instigate riots, and create a condition fertile for civil war.

The pictures which I hold in my hand are a reproduction of but six of many pictures taken at the time of the April 1941 strike at the Ford plant. Keep that date in mind.

According to testimony given in the United States District Court at Detroit, two of the five U. A. W.-C. I. O. men who were beating unresisting Melvin Bartling, a timekeeper, were Communists, and copies of their membership cards in that organization are in my possession.

Not one of the five shown in the picture was an employee of the Ford Motor Co. All were members of Briggs Local, U. A. W.-C. I. O., 212. All were trespassers on Ford and public property.

JOHN L. LEWIS OBJECTED TO COMMUNISTS

Long prior to that strike, John L. Lewis, who had caused an investigation to be made, in Senate Document No. 14 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, made the following statements:

Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first real step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American continent.

The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.

Lewis also said:

It is purely a revolutionary organization and makes no pretense at legality. * * * This party has at its head the supreme executive revolutionary committee in America, responsible only to * * * officials of the Communist International.

The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States.

Within the last month, the same John L. Lewis, in an exclusive interview to the

Washington Times-Herald, speaking of the Communists, said:

Their technique is simple. The American Communists limit their membership to only the cleverest schemers they can find. Then they worm their way into key places in local chapters of unions. In this way they control whole organizations which our public, therefore, thinks have "gone Communist." But the more the newspapers and our public shout about such a union as a Communist hotbed, the more misunderstood and abused the rank and file of the ordinary members feel—and the thing goes around and around in a vicious circle.

Oh, they're clever; believe me, I know. When I was organizing the C. I. O. we picked up a lot of Communists as we grew—including Harry Bridges. But if I had not resigned the chairmanship and left the C. I. O. in 1940, I can tell you the Communists would have been weeded out.

Instead, as anyone might expect who has seen them throw their weight around inside labor organizations, the Communists dominate the C. I. O. today. Philip Murray today is the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive committee. Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now—or die.

This is the way communism takes hold. This is the way it endangers the labor movement, and our country. For the same thing happens in governments. Communism has an antinatural and basically antieconomic quality. History shows that communism is only compatible with primitive and undernourished economic surroundings. In its control and destruction it does not distinguish error from truth, good from evil, justice from injustice. It does not care for history or the experience of humanity, for freedom, or for the dignity of man. And the last thing on earth the American Communists are interested in is the American way of life.

As Lewis said:

Agencies of the Government like the N. L. R. B. have for years been aiding the C. I. O. to force the employees into their organization.

Now get this—if you read the RECORD, you know that statement is true. Where is the pay-off? The pay-off this year came when the C. I. O. in their national convention endorsed the New Deal candidate for a fourth term, as rotten a political deal as ever was made.

Communist membership in the United Mine Workers, headed by Lewis, is barred by the constitution of that organization.

REASON FOR C. I. O.'S CHARGES

It is understandable why the C. I. O. charges me with sedition or with treason, for, with all due modesty, may I state that publicity given to it and some of its actions has resulted in ending some of its strikes.

Time after time, from 1937 on, have I, from the floor of the House and publicly, called attention to the fact that the C. I. O., that the Communists which it harbored, were following a policy which would destroy our Government.

But what right, logically, has the C. I. O. to charge anyone with either sedition or a hindering of the war effort?

The record of the C. I. O. has been one—and down to this moment it is one—of lawlessness and violence; of utter and complete disregard of the constitutional rights, of the moral rights, of other citizens.

The whole case against it, its greed, its selfishness, is proven beyond argument by the fact that it attempts to force everyone who would work in a defense industry to contribute to its funds.

RECORD AND METHODS OF THE C. I. O.

When it could not win its point by argument, it has not hesitated to use force. By coercion, by intimidation, and by violence, as well as by persuasion, it has collected millions of dollars, and today it is using that fund so collected to besmirch, to defeat, every Member of House or Senate who ventures to oppose its will. It seeks to become a dictator of American political action.

There are many who believe that the President's unstatesmanlike veto message on the tax bill was due to the influence of Philip Murray, who objected to the inclusion in that measure of a provision which required unions, as well as other organizations, to file with the Treasury a statement showing the amount of their income.

Agencies of the Government, like the N. L. R. B., have for years been aiding the C. I. O. to force employees into that organization. In return, the C. I. O. is out in support of the fourth term.

Notwithstanding the no-strike pledge given by the C. I. O. shortly after the beginning of this war, the most casual reading of the daily press shows that strikes in C. I. O.-controlled factories and industry have been of almost daily occurrence. Everyone who reads the papers knows this charge to be true and for many of the strikes there has been not the slightest excuse.

Now, it is true that, within the past 10 days, undoubtedly alarmed by the wave of public indignation which is about to overwhelm it, the C. I. O. through some of its officers has consented—note that word "consented"—to the discharge of certain employees in the Ford plant who were disrupting production, who brought about a strike.

But let me give you just one incident, which is typical of all too many. Two men employed in the Edgewater branch of the Ford Motor Co. as testers were able to do a certain job in 15 minutes. Union officials told them they must take 45 minutes. When they failed to loaf for 30 minutes, they were expelled from the union and, under the union's contract with the company, their discharge was demanded. The company refused to discharge them and a row followed.

But why enlarge? Similar incidents are familiar to most of the Members of this House. They certainly are familiar to many of our people living in industrial centers.

C. I. O. CURTAILS PRODUCTION

The whole situation is portrayed by three letters which passed between the director of the Ford Motor Co. and the president of the union. Those letters read as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1944.

MR. R. J. THOMAS,
President, United Automobile, Aircraft,
and Agricultural Implement Workers
of America, C. I. O., 411 W. Milwaukee
Ave., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: In May 1943, two men, Neil Smith and John Elvin, were employed

by the Edgewater Branch of the Ford Motor Co. as road-testers. The operation upon which these men were placed had been taking 45 minutes to perform. They were able to and did do the job in 15 minutes.

Our information as to subsequent events is as follows: The ability of these men to do their operation speedily and efficiently in one-third the time it had formerly taken to perform the job immediately aroused resentment among their coworkers and officials of Local 906 of your union at the Edgewater plant. We are informed that some of the officials and a number of other members of Local 906 approached these two men and told them that they must take 45 minutes to perform the operation, and that when the men continued to perform it in 15 minutes, the members of the local attempted to intimidate them with threats of bodily harm and expulsion from the union.

After failing in every way to intimidate the men, the local finally made good its threat to expel them. On Monday, January 17, 1944, company officials at the Edgewater, N. J., branch, received a communication from Local 906 stating that these two men had been expelled from the union and could not, therefore, be retained in the employ of the company. No reason was given to the company or the men by the local for the expulsion.

It appears that the union, on these facts, is using the union-shop provision of the contract as a whip to force employees to slow down production.

As you know, during the negotiations which led up to the first contract between the union and the company, the company voluntarily gave the union the provisions of the union shop and check-off. Obviously, it was not intended or even contemplated that the very thing that the company gave you voluntarily for the purpose, as it believed at that time, of enhancing good relations between the company and the union would be used by the union as a weapon to coerce employees to slow down production.

While the case of these two individuals would seem relatively unimportant, it is, nevertheless, very important from the standpoint of establishing a precedent, and we certainly cannot permit the union to apply the union-shop features of our contract in a way that was never intended. The company must, therefore, refuse to recognize the notice of expulsion above-mentioned.

Recently, when I spoke to you of the misuse of the union-shop provisions by local officials to cripple the company's position during the last foremen's walk-out at the Willow Run Bomber Plant, you stated that the facts had not been brought to your attention and that, had they been, you would have taken appropriate action.

I am, therefore, bringing this to your attention in the hope that you will make a thorough investigation and, if the facts are as we understand them, take appropriate action to remedy the situation and prevent future recurrences. On the other hand, if it turns out that we have been misinformed, we shall appreciate your so advising us.

Very truly yours,

H. H. BENNETT,
Director.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT,
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORK-
ERS OF AMERICA (U. A. W.-C. I. O.),
January 24, 1944.

Mr. HARRY H. BENNETT,
Director, Ford Motor Co.,
Dearborn, Mich.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter dated January 20 relative to the action taken by the membership of local union No. 906, Edgewater, N. J., against Neil Smith and John Elvin, I want you to know that I have checked

into this matter and find that Local Union No. 906 acted in accordance with the constitution of our union as it deals with trial procedure of union members.

Furthermore, information given in your letter as to the events that led to the expulsion of Messrs. Smith and Elvin differs from the facts of the case as established by the local union trial committee, whose verdict was unanimously approved by the membership of the local union in attendance at a regularly called local union meeting.

Because of the seriousness of your complaint I gave my personal attention in getting to the bottom of the entire situation. I have conferred with the ranking officers of the local union, and I am convinced that the action taken was in the best interest of the war effort and the relationship between the company and the union. The findings of my investigation clearly indicate that the above-mentioned employees are only interested in self-advancement at the expense of the war effort. By that I mean that Mr. Smith and Mr. Elvin, according to the information at hand, deliberately falsified their reports in order that the record would show increased output. The method they are charged with using in doing this was to fill out their test reports on Army trucks without any check whatsoever. The union has substantiating evidence to this effect.

I might further advise you that during the month of September, prior to the filing of any charges against the aforementioned employees, Mr. S. Schillon, then in charge of labor relations, called representatives of the local union and Messrs. Smith and Elvin to his office allegedly for the purpose of clearing up the entire situation. The union representatives at that time expressed full agreement to any proposition that would increase the output on this particular job, providing, however, that such increased output would meet all specifications required by the Government.

Now let's see what happened in this case. Immediately following return to their jobs, all the men working as testers were informed by company supervision that unless they attained the same standard of output as Elvin and Smith, they would be subject to discharge. The union leadership became very resentful inasmuch as they felt that they were being framed by Elvin and Smith's actions into getting out work of inferior quality.

Consequently, the union, in order to protect its integrity and its membership, had no other course to pursue than rigid disciplinary action against the above-named individuals.

I might further point out that during the period of the meeting held in Mr. Schillon's office, there was no charge against any of the leadership of the local union regarding intimidation or any other attempt to curtail production.

In conclusion, it might be well to advise you that the union and the company are confronted with an immediate serious problem regarding the disposition of the controversy that now prevails. The union feels that the agreement between the Ford Motor Co. and the union is clear and specific. I refer you to section 2 of the 1942 Ford-Union contract under the caption "Union Shop."

If the company for any reason feels disposed to disagree with the union's interpretation, we must insist that in the interest of (and this I must repeat) the war effort, a quick decision be forthcoming and that the umpire, Dr. Harry Shulman, be permitted by agreement of the parties to make an immediate decision regarding the union's prerogative.

Very truly yours,

R. J. THOMAS,
President, International Union, U. A. W.-
C. I. O.

JANUARY 26, 1944.

Mr. R. J. THOMAS,
President, United Automobile, Aircraft,
and Agricultural Implement Workers
of America, C. I. O., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: I have your letter of the 24th with reference to the action of Local 906 at Edgewater, N. J., regarding the expulsion of Neil Smith and John Elvin.

Your investigation was evidently confined to conferring with the officers of the local involved. At any rate, you could not have talked to any disinterested persons with knowledge of the facts, such as the Army and Navy inspectors at Edgewater, because if you had you would have readily found out that these two men have had fewer rejects than a number of other testers who take more than twice the time to do the same work. Obviously, I would not expect the union officials responsible for this action to say that they suspended these two men, because they refused to slow down. A better-sounding reason would have to be concocted for public consumption. Yet the only reason these officials could think of to attempt to justify their unjustifiable action was to say that the men were not doing their work properly and were inefficient. They forgot, however, as you evidently also have, that under the Ford-U. A. W. contract the right to maintain efficiency and the right to discharge for inefficiency are the sole functions of the company, to which the union agreed in sections 11, 12, and 13 of the contract.

You state that at a meeting before Mr. Schillon, of the labor relations office of the company in September, these men made no charge against any of the leaders of the local union regarding intimidation. While that statement is true, it is only half of the truth. The important half, which you neglected to mention, is that the meeting in Mr. Schillon's office was held upon the complaint of these two men that they were being constantly harassed, annoyed, spat upon, and threatened by their cotesters, and that upon several occasions attempts had been made to "frame" their work, and trucks which they had sent to the shop for adjustments were tampered with in the shop in order to discredit these two men.

Mr. Schillon called the union officials and committeemen, who agreed to see to it that these annoyances would stop, and who also agreed to attempt to step up production.

In your letter you state that you are convinced that the action taken by the local was "in the best interests of the war effort and the relationship between the company and the union." No statement could be in more direct opposition to the truth. The process of reasoning by which you think that resisting attempts to increase production and crucifying any man who tries to increase production is helpful to the war effort is beyond comprehension, as is also your apparent belief that the union, by usurping functions of management, would enhance relations between the company and the union.

As a matter of fact, the local in question has not only resisted attempts to increase production but has actually decreased it below peacetime levels. While giving lip service to the war effort, the facts show that at this plant, which is assembling 158-inch trucks for the Army and Navy—a truck almost identical with the 158-inch truck assembled at this same plant for civilian use prior to the war—it requires 16 hours per truck for assembly exclusive of minor assemblies, whereas in 1941 the almost identical truck was completely (including subassemblies) assembled in 8 hours.

The management has constantly asked the union leaders to assist them in correcting this situation, and approximately 6 months ago Mr. Edmonds, manager of the Edgewater plant, took up this matter with Mr. Leonard,

who promised to do something about it. Not only have none of those promises so far materialized, but an attempt has been made to crucify two employees who were honestly and sincerely interested in the war effort.

In conclusion I wish to remind you that the union by its action in this case has knowingly and deliberately violated sections 11, 12, and 13 of our contract by applying the union shop feature in a way never intended nor contemplated. We shall be glad to submit the entire issue to the umpire on the question as to whether or not the union is violating those sections. While we are most anxious to have an early decision on this matter, we shall, of course, insist on a reasonable length of time in which to prepare the evidence for submission to the umpire.

Very truly yours,

HARRY H. BENNETT,
Director.

For days I could stand here on the floor and read into this RECORD case after case where the C. I. O. has either fostered, promoted, or failed to protest, strikes which time and time again have held up war production, have interfered with the ability of our men abroad, not only to destroy the enemy, but to protect their own lives.

I will give you just two—one showing you how the C. I. O. more than 4 years ago—in one instance for 24 calendar days; in the other, for 41 calendar days—held up the production and delivery of castings for airplane engines in process of construction at the Naval Air Factory, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, and the production and delivery of bearings.

The official disgraceful story is told in a reply dated October 20, 1939, from Charles Edison, then Acting Secretary of the Navy, to House Resolution 314, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, introduced by me. Read it; then hang your head in shame over the pusillanimity of an administration which will submit to such conduct on the part of any organization.

And do not think that the C. I. O. has not continued its obstructive war-hampering actions.

More recently and as late as January 9 of this year, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard, referring to C. I. O. strikes on the west coast, disclosed that those strikes were delaying convoys and troops which otherwise would have sooner reached those who are fighting for us in the southwest Pacific. Among other things, Bard wrote:

East Bay Local 1304 refused to permit its members to work on those week ends under conditions applicable to all other local labor. This refusal had the specific effect of disrupting work schedules on new vessels under construction and involving delays in several ship projects of extreme urgency. A further consequence was failure to effect repairs on Navy and Army vessels so preventing these vessels from meeting schedules controlling convoys required for shipment of men and supplies with the result that convoys were delayed and schedules of troop movements to ports of embarkation were seriously disorganized.

With a record of obstructing the war effort behind it, the C. I. O. leadership, led around by the nose by the Communists, should hang its head in shame and repent in sackcloth and ashes. When the people know these would-be political labor leaders for what they are; when they are once familiar with what they

have been doing and what they propose to do, the union men themselves will throw them out of office.

All of the smoke screen of false charges raised by the C. I. O. smear artists will never for one moment deceive the returning soldiers, who will remember that, while they were fighting in their fox holes thousands of miles from home, that organization was interfering with the production and the transportation of the arms, the ammunition, the planes and the guns, which were, which are, so sorely needed.

Putting it another way, while the men who have been drafted from the stores, the farms, the mills, and the mines, and the countrysides are fighting and dying, these unions, and R. J. Thomas is one of the officials who directs the policies, are hindering the production of the things the fighting men need.

If there is anyone who is guilty of conduct which tends to create dissatisfaction among the men of the armed forces who is it? Is it the man who criticizes some New Deal policy, or is it the man who holds up to the knowledge of those in the Army, the production and transportation of the things which they must have if they are to defeat our enemies and if they are to preserve their own lives?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to say right at that point that in 1943 there were more man-days lost than in 1942 by three times, because of work stoppages.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct; according to the figures of the Department of Labor.

The facts cannot be successfully contradicted. Here is the C. I. O. which presumes to accuse Members of Congress of seditious utterances, of treasonable activities, according to its own records and the records of the plant—its own records as to membership and the company records as to employment and production, taking twice as long in wartime to assemble a truck similar to the one which was assembled in peacetime in half the length of time.

What standing, I ask you, has the C. I. O. or the Committee for Political Action of the C. I. O., to charge anyone with slowing down the war effort, with doing, saying, or even thinking of anything which would aid our enemies?

The C. I. O. should first clean its own house before it ventures to criticize anyone else.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will agree that the "new orderites" are so hot in the prosecution of their campaign to communize America as to make it impossible for them to realize that there boils beneath their own feet public sentiment that is likely to explode at any time? And if the gentleman agrees that these "new orderites" showing the first sign of weakness, the multitude like a pack of angry wolves are going to rush upon them and tear them into tatters.

FALSE CHARGES BY JERGENS' HIRED MAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Anyone who listened last night to Walter Winchell could not help but realize that, yellow as he is, he realizes the change in public sentiment, and the Jergens Co., which hires him, ought soon to sense it, for if you ever heard a fellow start to alibi, start for the cellar, that fellow did last night; there is no question about it, he did.

However, he did, probably from force of habit, include a false charge or two in his broadcast. And, incidentally, do not rely upon the transcript of his broadcast. It has recently been found necessary for the Federal Communications Commission to add to its regulations on broadcasters a statement which you will find in the Broadcast News that hereafter these broadcasters must make an electrical transcription when they broadcast. The Commission, of course, should go one step further to get the inflections and insinuations. That transcription should be made at the time of the broadcast, not before the broadcast is put on the air. For example, I say: "Oh, yes; you're loyal? You are?" That is Walter's method of insinuating an evil thought where none is intended.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to quote in this connection a line from Joanna Boillier's De Montford, which runs:

Think'st thou there are no serpents in the world

But those who slide along the grassy sod,
And sting the luckless foot that presses there?
There are who in the path of social life
Do bask their spotted skins in Fortune's sun,
And sting the soul.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is one statement Winchell, in substance, made last night—I give the thought, not the words: The F. B. I. is investigating a Detroit motor magnate who is promoting strikes.

Mr. SHAFER. Fostering strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, "promoting" or "fostering" whichever it was. This morning into my office came an F. B. I. man. Oh, do not worry, he was not investigating me, but Walter will tell you, by inference at least, when he reads that he came into my office that he was investigating me, so I am telling you that I told the F. B. I. man to investigate Winchell and Pearson.

I asked the F. B. I. representative what, if anything, there was to the statement that the F. B. I. was investigating a Detroit motor magnate on the question of instigating or promoting strikes. He called the F. B. I. office and replied that the F. B. I. was not doing anything of the kind; that it might be possible that such an investigation was being made by the Department of Justice.

Then Walter gave us more news—I think he claimed it was exclusive—most of his stuff even though a week old is claimed to be exclusive—that MacArthur had an interesting and mysterious conference with the former head of the American Firsters.

What is the insinuation? Is it that MacArthur is disloyal? You have all read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in

the newspapers how when somebody operating under the War Department recommended a questionable article about MacArthur, it was challenged by a Member of the other body with putting out political propaganda. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, on the delivery of the speech, sent up a letter repudiating that kind of action.

What I would like to know is how long the Navy will permit similar smear tactics to go unchallenged. After the Army says it is improper and contrary to their policy and regulations to make an attack upon a general in the Army, how long is the Navy going to permit Mr. Winchell to continue his insinuations that MacArthur, who is leading our troops, our armed forces in the Pacific, is doing something that is disloyal? How long is the Navy going to let it continue?

The Navy has stripped Winchell of his uniform, of any duties he might have had; they have stripped him of his pay, but he is still, to the disgrace of the Navy and every decent man in it, carried on the rolls as a Reserve officer. He is carried there according to my understanding by virtue of White House influence. How long are they going to carry that man?

The Army code carries a section which punishes a man in the armed forces who is guilty of unmilitary conduct, of conduct unbecoming a gentleman. When I wrote the Secretary of the Navy pointing out conduct which would bring Winchell under that regulation, the Navy Department said that that did not apply to the Navy.

Being interpreted, that means that you cannot stay in the Army and be guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman, but you can be in the Navy and be guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman and remain there as an officer. I have prepared an amendment to the title governing the Navy which will add those sections which are in the title which governs the Army so that the two services may be on an equality in that particular respect.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I was just wondering if there would be anything disgraceful or unpatriotic or un-American for a general of our Army to consult with a man like General Wood, who is at the head of the America First Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly not. We all realize that when the men in the South Pacific hear that sort of insinuation one of two things comes to their minds: They are either disgusted or discouraged to think that here at home, while they are carrying on the battle, we permit that sort of charge to be made against a commanding officer. Do you suppose some of them think when they hear Walter Winchell make that kind of charge that there is something wrong with General MacArthur?

In my opinion they do not. That would be a proper inference, but Walter is so widely known for what he is that they do not pay much attention to him.

CRITICISM SEDITIOUS—?

Since the drive to override our constitutional form of government, remake America, and convince our people that Franklin D. Roosevelt is an indispensable man began, those who ventured to question the propriety of unconstitutional action without a constitutional amendment, the soundness of New Deal policies, or the purpose of the New Dealers, Communists, or fourth-termers, have been the targets of the smear brigade.

ROOSEVELT SAYS THERE IS NO INDISPENSABLE MAN

They ignore that Roosevelt himself pointed out there never was, never would be an indispensable man when, on March 2, 1930, criticizing the Republican administration, he said:

The doctrine of regulation and legislation by "master minds" in whose judgment and will, all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years.

Were it possible to find "master minds" so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices; men almost Godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand—such a government might be to the interests of the country.

But there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history.

More than 2 years later, on November 3, 1932, Roosevelt, candidate for the Presidency, said:

In speaking for the common purposes of all of those forward-looking men and women I have, I believe, avoided the delusion that this is a campaign of persons or of personalities.

To indulge in such a fantastic idea of my own individual importance would be to betray the common hope and the common cause that has brought us all together this year.

A great man (Wilson) left us a watchword that we can well repeat: "There is no indispensable man."

THE WOLF-PACK SMEARERS

The wolf-pack smearers, numbering among its more mangy members the foul-mouthed Walter Winchell, creator and disseminator of malicious falsehoods, assisted in his campaign of vilification by his sponsors, the Jergens Co., which, through Walter, sells some sort of lotion, starts off in full cry, determined to pull down and destroy everyone who even ventures a word of criticism of the New Deal, its candidates, or the Communists.

The members of the gang which has done and is doing so much to create disunity have long been at work. Prior to the 1942 campaign the New Republic, the Daily Worker, official spokesman for the Communists whose party slogan has been the overthrow of our Government by force, the New Masses, Marshall Field's PM, the Chicago Sun, the Luce publications, and other publications apparently more interested in other countries than in the welfare of America, some radio commentators and newspaper columnists, by falsehoods and half truths, attempted to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives.

NEW DEAL INTENDED DESTRUCTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

In the early days of the New Deal, Guy Rexford Tugwell, who was then in the favor of the President and of the First Lady, made this illuminating statement. I quote:

Business will logically be required to disappear.

The future is becoming visible in Russia. * * * Perhaps our statesmen will give way or be more or less gently removed from duty.

Perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without violent resistance. * * *

We have no reason to believe that the disestablishment of our plutocracy would be pleasant. These historical changes never are. We have, however, the duty of avoiding violence as the process goes on.

WALLACE, selected by Eleanor Roosevelt and the President as the President's running mate, among other things wrote that the New Deal was engaged in "making America over." Referring to such action he said, and I quote:

We may hope that such action can be taken as bloodlessly as the Constitution was enacted.

The President himself set the pace early in his administration by referring to respectable and respected businessmen, merchants, industrialists, in fact to all those who, through work, economy, and thrift, were able to provide old-age security for themselves as princes of privilege, economic royalists. He smeared and jeered at decent, honest, patriotic Americans for apparently no reason at all, other than that they were not dependent upon State or Federal Government.

More recently his Vice President WALLACE designated those who do business in New York's Wall Street, as Fascists.

For long, one Thomas Corcoran, familiarly known to the President as "Tommy the Cork," had the Presidential ear and many times presumed to speak for the President. On one occasion, he enlightened us as follows:

We know that a revolution is actually here. All we can hope to do is canalize it. Our whole conception of private property is going to be changed and all we can hope to do is help it to come about gently, without any general blow-up.

To a man representing a great insurance business, which the Government more recently has been attempting to take over, "Tommy the Cork" made this enlightening statement:

When we get through with you fellows, this business will be run by the Government.

The sit-down strikes, conceived by the Communists, were born in Michigan in 1937. They gathered strength and attained their objective because the administration refused to curb their lawlessness and their violence. The armed forces of the State, without rebuke from the President's man Friday—in fact, acting under his orders—gave them support. Some of those who carried on those strikes have since hindered and obstructed the war effort.

DEMOCRATS' OPINION OF NEW DEAL

The fallacies of the New Deal became so evident, the attempt to destroy the

confidence of the people in their Representatives in Congress became so vicious that respected leaders of the Democratic Party felt compelled to break their silence. Said Senator CARTER GLASS as early as June of 1937:

The last election was carried by people who were getting favors from the Government, people who were subsidized by the Government, people who were on relief rolls, and people who were sanctioning the invasion of private property and its occupation, as is being done now.

Again he said:

The New Deal, taken all in all, is not only a mistake, it is a disgrace to the Nation, and the time is not far distant when we shall be ashamed of having wandered so far from the dictates of common sense and common honesty.

Finally, even the Presiding Officer of the House, Democratic Speaker RAYBURN, evidently outraged by tactics of the smear artists, in March of 1942 said, and I quote:

Not from one section of the country but from every section of the country are coming letters and telegrams; many of them are very insulting. They come not from Democrats nor Republicans, but from every class and section.

They read: "Congress is playing politics." "Politics control the Army and the Navy." "Our war production has bogged down, and neither Government nor manufacturers nor labor is doing its job." * * *

Instead of these meetings breeding division and discord and discontent and disunity, it would be much better for the safety of the country and our war effort if they were turned into unity parades and the effort and the wrath that is expended there be applied to doing some of the work of trying to win this war.

Congress is being criticized, but Congress has given the President every law and every dollar he has asked for defense purposes.

Notwithstanding the fact that those who spoke for America, who pledged allegiance to our interest, were reelected and the smear gang's candidates were defeated, they still give utterance to dastardly falsehoods, continue to create dissension by charging with disloyalty all who will not bend the knee, bow the head, and give support to their unsound theories, their foreign-born ideology, their schemes for the surrender of our independence, for the scuttling of the Constitution.

PEARSON QUESTIONS ARMY'S HUMANITY

Only a week ago Sunday night, a radio commentator and columnist made a statement in substance that the wife of a soldier was turned away from an Army hospital while the dog of an officer was given treatment.

He said that the dog lived, while the wife of the soldier died, and he called on Surgeon General Kirk for an explanation. The purport and the purpose of that statement as made by Drew Pearson was to create in the minds of his listeners the disturbing inference that those in charge of the Army hospitals were more interested in treating dumb animals than in the treatment of the servicemen's dependents. It was a damnable lie, as Pearson knew when he uttered it. Its only result in the minds of the servicemen—of those who believed

it—was to cause discontent and discouragement.

Pearson and Winchell, both following the New Deal and the Communist Party line, in almost every broadcast say something by way of criticism of those who believe in this country, its institutions, and its future.

JERGENS SPONSORS DISUNITY CREATOR

Winchell, in particular, demands the prosecution for sedition of all those who disagree with his foul insinuations, made while he is paid by the Jergens Co., which asks you to buy its products, and while he is a Reserve officer in the Navy. He is a disgrace to any reputable manufacturer, an abomination to the Navy and to every decent member of it. He has been stripped of his uniform, of any pretended duty, and of his pay. Yet, because of Presidential favor, he retains his status in the Navy—a sawdust sailor so cowardly that he lacks the courage to walk abroad without bodyguard as do other Americans—millions of whom he described, because of the way they voted at the last election, as "damned fools."

How does the Jergens Co., selling lotion and other cosmetics, like to have its customers described as "damned fools"? Do those who buy Jergens' lotion and products realize what Jergens' hired man is calling them? Is it possible Winchell was thinking when he called citizens "damned fools," of the purchasers of Jergens' products, not of those who voted for successful candidates for the Senate and the House?

So, my dear hearers, if you have been purchasing Jergens' products, it might be well to write in and ask the company or the druggist from whom you purchase, whether Winchell was referring to you or someone else when you purchased something with the Jergens label on it.

COERCION, INTIMIDATION ADDED TO SMEAR

Neither the fourth-termers, the remakers of America, nor the Communists are satisfied with a smear campaign. To it they add coercion. It is common knowledge; in fact, it is a matter of record from the report of a committee of the other body, that money appropriated for the relief of the needy has been used for campaign purposes. It is a matter of common knowledge that A. A. A. and the funds at its disposal have been used to garner in the votes.

Several years ago those who borrowed from a Government agency were required to promise in writing that they would in no way criticize the New Deal agency which loaned them money until the principal borrowed and the interest thereon had been paid in full.

Just last week, I received a letter from a farmer enclosing a letter from the A. A. A. in one of the counties in my district which shows that organization hooking up the rationing of gas with support for the A. A. A. farm program. The letter from the farmer and from the A. A. A. reads as follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Enclosed is a form letter from our A. A. A. I have never received any payments or followed their program. My farm is 40 acres, one-half improved, of light soil, not grain land. My wife, 67, and I, 65, kept out of the red all through the Depression and we do all we can to win the war.

Last year the A. A. A. agent called. We tried following their plans, increased our potato acreage, which drowned out; replanted some and summer-fallowed balance; buyers seem to be holding off on reports of such a large crop.

The W. F. A. froze our grapes of about 100 bushels after I had them about sold. They told me they would send a man and truck to get my grapes at \$75 a ton, and he never showed up, so we took a loss after holding grapes for 18 days. About 6 weeks later I got a card to get my grapes released if they had not been released, which I had not.

We increased our chickens. You know about the feed and egg situation at home. A home-made tractor is more economical than horses for us, as we have to buy all our chick feed and would like to do our own planning and make both ends meet.

Now am I compelled to go to the A. A. A. for my gasoline? Last year the rationing board gave me my stamps. June 19, 1943, they returned my farm plan for changes, so I pigeon-holed it; seems like the same thing over this year.

Can I farm my own way if I do not ask for their payment and get what gas I need for my tractor?

FEBRUARY 18, 1944.

DEAR FARMER: As a front-line soldier of production you are being requested this year to produce even more food than your record production last year. Necessarily you must have the facilities to do your job efficiently.

One of the foremost of these is gasoline and fuel oil to operate your tractors and engines. The supply will not be sufficient to meet all civilian demands, but there will be enough for you to use in carrying on your farming activities.

Your local A. A. A. committee is cooperating with your local war price and rationing board in working out a program to assure you enough gasoline and fuel oil for the year.

This is what you will be asked to do. Your community A. A. A. committeeman will soon contact you to discuss with you plans for meeting the goals on your farm. He will ask you to sign the 1944 farm plan.

The form you fill out when the committeeman calls will be your application for gasoline and fuel oil for the year, based on your farming operations for 1944. It must be approved by the county A. A. A. committee before any action is taken by the local rationing board. It will be to your advantage to have the above-mentioned information ready when the committeeman calls.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN A. CHASE,
Chairman, Van Buren County A. C. A.

Note the last sentence.

Now the information sought above is pertinent to gas rationing, but why the implication that unless the farmer signs up with the agricultural program he will not get gas? Has it come to pass that here in America farm crops cannot be grown, cattle cannot be raised, milk produced, or fruit picked and marketed, unless the A. A. A. first gives its blessing?

Apples grew in the Garden of Eden before A. A. A. was in existence; undoubtedly long after it has followed other political theories, old Mother Earth will still produce food.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION CHARGED WITH POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Rural electrification is in theory a good thing, and it has brightened the lives of many a farmer, but like so many New Deal agencies, it, too, has been used for political purposes. That is not my criticism; it is the criticism of a loyal, con-

scientific Democrat, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]. Within the week he cited scandals in the R. E. A. which he charged warranted impeachment proceedings and submitted to a House Appropriations Subcommittee, evidence of a R. E. A. "conspiracy to capture rural America and perpetuate it in economic serfdom."

He further charged that R. E. A. was wasting millions of dollars and "saddling farmers with a mountain of debt." Among others, he cited a specific instance, saying, and I quote:

The farmers of Long Valley have paid an outrageously high price for a utility system that fell apart almost as soon as it was unloaded on them. The farmers accepted in good faith the written certificate that the project was self-liquidating.

No one denies but that R. E. A. has rendered an invaluable service to the farmers, but like suckers on a fruit tree which harbors scale, which year after year is visited by a horde of parasites, these New Deal agencies need trimming and pruning. They need spraying and pestilent-eradicating chemicals; many of them need disinfectants. All too many of them are lousy with grafters, with foreign-born parasites on the public pay roll.

PRESIDENT RELEASES BROWDER, WHO NOW SUPPORTS FOURTH TERM

The President, when he released Earl Browder from prison, issued the following statement on May 16, 1942:

Browder paid his fines of \$2,000 and has now been imprisoned for a year and approximately 2 months. The sentence imposed upon him was longer than the usual sentence imposed for offenses involving the fraudulent obtaining and use of passports.

The President believes that the premium of obedience to law has been sufficiently vindicated by the punishment already suffered by Browder and that the commutation of his sentence, which brings about his release at this time, just shortly before he will become eligible for parole, will have a tendency to promote national unity and allay any feeling which may exist in some minds that the unusually long sentence in Browder's case was by way of penalty imposed upon him because of his political view.

The President did not add to the people's confidence in his administration by the release of Browder. Especially is this true since Browder has come out wholeheartedly in support of his benefactor as a candidate for the fourth term in the White House. The release of a known Communist from prison and that Communist's political support and his party's support of the President looks too much like a political deal. The people have not forgotten, they cannot forget that Browder is the head of the Communist Party; that the party doctrine is the overthrow of our Government by force; that the Communists have done so much to, as John L. Lewis has said, undermine labor organizations, destroy the confidence which the people have in honest patriotic labor organizations.

INTIMIDATION

Apparently there is no limit to what New Deal agencies will do to stifle criticism of the New Deal. We are all aware that the New Dealers are determined to perpetuate themselves in power, to gov-

ern by rule, order, regulation, and directive. Anyone who has watched official Washington for the past 10 years can see the clear pattern of a dictatorship, of a government by man, rather than a government by law.

PRESIDENT PACKS COURT

The President, impatient with the decisions of the Supreme Court which made it possible for us to continue under a constitutional form of government, sought to pack the Court. He and some of his supporters made an effort to belittle the Court, which up to that time had the confidence of all our people. The decisions of the Supreme Court up until the coming of the Roosevelt regime had always been accepted and followed without question both by the people and the lower courts. Those decisions in the main had been consistent, but the President changed all that. Two of his ardent supporters sought to discredit the Court by referring to its members as "Nine Old Men."

Defeated in his desire to pack the Court by legislation, by resignation and death the President was enabled to appoint seven of the nine members of the Court. He, it may be said without intending any disrespect to any of his appointees, selected the new members because of their political philosophy, rather than because of their legalistic standing.

BUT ADDS TO CONFUSION

Notwithstanding his obvious packing of the Court with those to whom he attributed New Deal philosophies, the Court itself, has fallen into disagreement until today it is in a worse state of confusion than ever before and some of its members have charged in their considered opinions that the Court has ceased to be a guide for the administrators of justice in the lower Federal courts.

In a recent opinion, Justices Roberts and Frankfurter stated that a "tendency to disregard precedents" in recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court has left litigants and lower courts "without confidence that what was said yesterday will hold good tomorrow."

It was further said that reversal of previous decisions tended to make the law "a game of chance."

In their opinion, they further said that—

The tendency to disregard precedents * * * has become so strong in this court of late as * * * to shake confidence in the consistency of decision and leave the courts below on an uncharted sea of doubt and difficulty.

Defendants will not know whether to litigate or settle, for they will have no assurance that a declared rule will be followed. But the more deplorable consequence will inevitably be that the administration of justice will fall into disrepute. Respect for tribunals must fall when the bar and the public come to understand that nothing that has been said in prior adjudication has force in a current controversy.

According to the statement of at least one Justice, the highest court in the land is no longer a compass on which the judges of appeals and district courts can rely, and itself does not know what its next holding will be.

THE F. B. I. EFFICIENT

The Department of Justice has long been regarded as free from political influence. J. Edgar Hoover throughout the years, by efficient work and a legitimate flare for publicity, built up for the F. B. I. a reputation for efficiency, thoroughness, and fairness.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to hear the gentleman make that observation, because in my opinion Mr. Hoover's record speaks for itself. I do not think there is a more outstanding citizen in this country, and when Winchell tries to claim himself to be a friend of J. Edgar Hoover, it must be just as much of an offense to Hoover as it is to anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Every time Congress was asked for an appropriation for that Bureau, because they believed it was doing a good job a half dozen or more Congressmen, without any necessity therefor, would, from the floor of the House, praise and commend Hoover and the F. B. I.

But the searing, destructive influence of the New Deal, if current events be accepted at their face value, if the facts outlined in an editorial from the Hartford Day Spring, Van Buren County, Mich., be true—and I have no reason to doubt their truth—seems to be affecting even the activities of the F. B. I.

That editorial is attached hereto, marked "Exhibit A," and the reply of the F. B. I., made after investigation, is marked "Exhibit B."

Nor is there any reason why the F. B. I. should degenerate into a gestapo; do the dirty work of the New Dealers.

BUT NEW DEAL WOULD WRECK IT

For 4 long years, the New Dealers tried to get J. Edgar Hoover, tried to make the F. B. I. a subservient agent of the New Deal. But Congress, steadfast in its faith in Hoover and in the F. B. I., thwarted that move and today the F. B. I. has the opportunity of remaining a free, independent, investigatory agency solely because Congress came to its rescue.

There is not the slightest reason why that organization should permit itself to be hooked up with Walter Winchell or any of the other professional smear artists.

Beyond question, thousands of complaints come to the F. B. I. about subversive activities. We all receive now and again complaints from constituents who think that some individual in their community is originating or is circulating stories which affect the war effort adversely. Those complaints we pass on to the F. B. I. for investigation—always heretofore secure in the thought that a fair and impartial investigation and report would be made.

We are all familiar with the smear campaign which was carried on against Herbert Hoover, with the smear tactics of Charlie Michelson. Gradually, but quite naturally, and characteristic of the policy followed by the Communists, the smear campaign has increased in volume as the New Dealers and the Communists have gone unrebuked.

For several years, a man who is a disgrace to his race, who makes his money by spreading filth, false, and malicious

gossip, the natural tendency of which is to impair the morale of our fighting men, has claimed to be an intimate of J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the F. B. I.

Time and again, in his talks over the radio and through his column, he has insinuated that he had access to F. B. I. information which otherwise was secret. He has spoken time and again under circumstances which would lead his hearers to believe that he had the confidence of the head of the F. B. I., that Hoover met him on terms of social equality and, as a matter of choice, sought his society, enjoyed his company, and, by inference, his dirty gossip.

True, on occasion, when Winchell has made false statements purporting to have come from the F. B. I., Mr. Hoover has publicly denied Winchell's statements.

Nevertheless, so far as I am able to learn, Hoover has never categorically denied Winchell's claims to access to confidential information obtained by F. B. I. agents.

HOOPER SHOULD DIVORCE WINCHELL

In this statement I may be in error and, if I am, it will do no harm for Mr. Hoover to again deny that he or the F. B. I. furnishes or permits Winchell access to confidential information.

In the smear publications, Sabotage, Under Cover, and various newspaper articles, Members of both Senate and House have, by inference, been accused of disloyal conduct. The method is to associate their names with the names of known or suspected disloyal individuals.

Mr. Hoover is familiar with this method. Yet he permits Winchell, who is known throughout the country as the originator and distributor of false information, to publicly, week after week, to millions of American listeners, carry the impression that he—Winchell—and J. Edgar Hoover are buddies.

Hoover has always been able to get all of the publicity he needed, and it would be no arduous task for him to tell the American people the truth about his association or lack of it, his relationship, if any, with Walter Winchell.

No one believes for one moment that J. Edgar Hoover has any sympathy for the views or the methods of Winchell. Nevertheless, Winchell, using the methods of Avedis Arthur Derounian, alias John Roy Carlson, alias George Pagnanelli, alias Thomas L. Decker, alias John Correa, alias Rudolph Kibers, author of Under Cover—the power of association of names—to obtain some reflected degree of respectability and accuracy for himself, his broadcasts, and his column, links himself to the respectable head of the F. B. I. This, in reverse, is the method of the smearers.

Unless J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I. disassociate themselves from Walter Winchell, the public sooner or later will begin to think, from Winchell's statements, that they are acting in a common cause.

If the F. B. I. wishes to investigate claimed subversive activities, seditious utterances, it might do well to classify and check Winchell's statements to ascertain whether or not they create disunity, arouse antisemitic feeling, tend to

discourage our fighting men here at home and on the battlefield.

WINCHELL TRIES FOR VENEER OF RESPECTABILITY

Winchell and the other smearers like to use the old saying that birds of a feather flock together; that a man is known by the company he keeps. They used, and are using, that method to create in the minds of the people the belief that Senators and Congressmen are disloyal because they may have met some of those who have been indicted for sedition; because some who have been indicted, some who have been convicted, have circulated speeches made by the people's representatives.

There would be just as much sense, just as much logic, in claiming that the writer of a sacred hymn was a criminal because a jailbird passed it on to his fellow prisoners.

Throughout this country hundreds of thousands of persons are seeking seriously for the reason why Winchell, Drew Pearson—whom the President described as a chronic liar—and others are permitted unlimited freedom in creating disunity, while honest, respectable citizens out in the country are, upon complaint, immediately investigated by agents of the F. B. I.

The incident which I am about to cite is not typical, I am sure, of the F. B. I. and its methods, but it is indicative of the way in which the New Deal is extending its blighting influence throughout every Government agency.

It is time for J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I. to get an absolute divorce from Walter Winchell and the smear artists; to let the public know that they will no longer be responsible for the charges of disloyalty heaped against the people's representatives.

Free speech is one thing, but the use of a Government department to give it weight and political influence is quite another thing.

Winchell is using the Department of Justice for political purposes. It is time that the Department of Justice put an end to such use.

Already we have, so it is reported, some 10,000,000 in the armed service of the United States. We have millions of men and some thousands of women more than 3,000 miles away, fighting and dying on foreign soil and in hitherto unknown islands and seas, to, according to the President, carry in our time the "four freedoms" to the utmost ends of the world. One of those freedoms for which our flesh and blood are fighting and dying is freedom of speech.

SCHOOLBOY CLAIMS RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH

We have every reason to believe that hundreds of thousands—yes, perhaps a million—young Americans, who love life as you and I, who had or have everything in the world—friends, loved ones, home, children—to look forward to, will never return to the homeland which sent them forth.

They are told they are fighting so that others throughout the world may be free from want, free to worship, to enjoy a free press, and the right to speak freely. Yet, here at home, a 17-year-old schoolboy, who will fight for the right of free

speech, has his right to speak freely challenged; is charged with sedition and with traitorous conduct by a Government agent, because he ventured to exercise the right of free speech, to call attention to the President's failure to keep a promise.

The young man, who is a resident of the village of Hartford, with a population at the last census of 1,694, a month after he became 17 years of age, September last, enlisted as an air cadet, and, upon graduation in June, will go into training, hoping to become a member of a crew piloting a fighter or a bomber over Germany or the South Sea Islands held by the Japs.

Almost 6 months ago he offered all that he has—his life—all that he might look forward to—marriage, a home, children, and a happy old age with his family here in America—so that other people in distant parts of the world might have some of the blessings which we and our ancestors have enjoyed.

According to the editorial by Joseph N. McCall, publisher of the Hartford Day Spring, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A," the young man, in a class discussion of current affairs, referred to a campaign speech of the President, made in Boston on October 30, 1940. He then charged that the President did not tell the truth when he made that promise.

Some people will say, with some show of reason, that the President did not tell a falsehood; that he only made a promise and that subsequent events made it impossible to keep that promise. That argument is sound if, at the time the President promised that our boys would not be sent into any foreign wars, such was his intention and, if he had not, prior to that time, been following a course which he knew, or, by the exercise of ordinary diligence should have known, would make it impossible for him to keep his promise.

As to whether he and his administration had followed or were at the time following a policy which would inevitably lead to war will be discussed in a few moments.

YOUR BOYS ARE NOT GOING TO BE SENT INTO ANY FOREIGN WARS

There has been a studied effort to convince the American people that the President never made an unqualified promise that American boys were not going to be sent into any foreign wars. Both the President's wife and the smear artist, Walter Winchell—who by Presidential favor is retained as a Naval Reserve officer but without uniform, without pay, and without duty—have asserted that the President never made the unqualified promise and that his statement "your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars," had attached to it the qualifying limitation, "except in case of attack."

That there may be no further misunderstanding on this subject, let us put the facts on the record.

On October 23, 1940, at Philadelphia, the President said:

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

It is for peace that I have labored, and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life.

The foregoing I quote from page-495 of volume 9 of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Neither the First Lady nor Winchell, the scandal-monger and salesman for Jergens cosmetics, can change that record.

After making the statement at Philadelphia, quoting the Democratic platform, which pledged that—

We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

And after 7 days' reflection and deliberation, President Roosevelt went one step further, cut off the limitation and unequivocally promised the fathers and the mothers of America that their sons were "not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

In that speech, made at Boston on October 30, 1940—and I am quoting now from the same volume 9 of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, page 517—the President said:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

The President deliberately, and after he had time for reflection and after he knew the limitation made upon the promise contained in the Democratic platform, without qualification, to obtain political support, gave his solemn promise to the citizens of this country that their boys would not be sent into any foreign wars.

The President made promise after promise and into the RECORD tonight will go, under leave to revise and extend, some of those promises made by the President which he has not made any pretense of keeping and into the RECORD will go not only promises which have been violated but into the RECORD will go the instances of where he has not told the truth.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GORE. Did the gentleman vote for declaration of war?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did.

Mr. GORE. Then why is the gentleman complaining?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I voted for a declaration of war because there was nothing else to do after the Japs attacked at Pearl Harbor; however, I voted against every move which I thought would get us into that war and never did I, with a

promise on my lips to keep us out of war, do one act which was bound to get us into war.

While the President was telling us he was not going to get us into war, while he was telling us that our boys would not be sent to foreign soil to fight, he was having passenger liners fitted up to be used as transports. That is what he was doing, and, as he himself said, a man should be judged by what he does and not by what he says. The President said one thing and he was doing another.

I have not forgotten that just a few weeks ago the publisher of the New York Times said that we went to war when we voted lend-lease, for which the gentleman voted. Then is when we went to war, according to the publisher of the New York Times. There was nothing we could do when Japan attacked us but go to war.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. Of course, the gentleman is entitled to his opinion that the votes which he cast and the speeches which he made were supposed to keep us out of war. He is entitled to so interpret them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President so said.

Mr. GORE. I am speaking of the speeches which the gentleman from Michigan made and the votes which the gentleman from Michigan cast. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to view those votes and those speeches as steps to keep us out of war, if that is his belief; however, there are many people in the country who think that those were steps over a period of years most calculated to get us into war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right as to the right of one to his belief. I am finding no fault with anyone's opinion. I will put into the RECORD the statement where the President said that we could stay out of war if we had the courage to say "No." That is what the President himself said. I will give you the exact words in a moment.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not have to yield unless he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I could not resist.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have never been able to resist the gentleman when he has asked me to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, what lovers we are, almost like the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, and the Member from Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let the gentleman keep his associations to himself and I will keep mine.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why so touchy? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is a distinguished Member of this body, a member of the gentleman's party, a Member respected by all on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman just told me he liked me. If he wants to withdraw it, go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I enjoy my association with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us cut out the blarney. Go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman object to American soldiers being sent abroad to fight in this war?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To our American soldiers being over there? Certainly I do not object to reinforcements. I only wish the President, instead of sending everything across the Atlantic, had sent something down to the Philippine Islands to help out down there.

You remember what Churchill said. We had lost in the Pacific because we sent our aid—munitions and men—to the battle of the Atlantic. How many thousands of our boys down there in the Pacific were tortured and starved until they died because we helped the British and let our own men down there die for lack of food and medicine?

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote for the Guam appropriation?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

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

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true that the officials of the Army and the Navy advised against the fortifying of Guam?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure; that question of fortifying Guam is an old political catch question. The question of fortifying Guam was never before the House.

Mr. BREHM. The Navy said they could not hold it. Do not lay that on our doorstep.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will answer the gentleman from Massachusetts by saying I do not recall how I voted, but I will say this, that you would not have kept it anyway, when the British, with over 100 years and with millions of dollars expended, could not fortify and hold Singapore. What are you talking about, holding the Island of Guam?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is entitled to that opinion, but the question is, did he vote for or against the Guam appropriation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I told you I do not recall, but if I voted the way I intended to vote, I voted against it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And it was not a fortification appropriation; it was for dredging the harbor. The more we sprawl and spread ourselves out, the weaker we become. We could not hold the Philippines, if we would not give them reinforcements. Why are you talking about putting men on another island? Do you want more of them taken? Do you want more of them tortured?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that at the Washington Conference in 1922, under a Republican administration, they agreed that the Philippines would not be fortified. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman arguing now that everything the Republicans did was right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Are you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, and I am not swallowing the proposition that much of what the New Dealers have done is right. There might be away down under somewhere something in this program of re-making America, in this alliance with

labor leaders and with Communists in control of labor organizations in exchange for their votes—there may be possibly something of good but it is very hard to find.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. GORE. In complaining that the President—

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not complaining. I am just calling your attention to the record of the administration.

Mr. GORE. In criticizing the President—

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not criticizing him. I am just calling your attention to the record of the administration.

Mr. GORE. Well, in citing the record—

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. GORE. That aid did not get to the Philippines, does the gentleman remember whether or not he voted for or against the many measures here to increase the United States Navy which, if they had been passed, might have made it possible to get some aid there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you have quite a few "ifs" and "mights" in there.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman remember how he voted?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. A great deal has been said about who cuts defense appropriations. The Republican members of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in 1942, and before the election, asked to have placed in the record a yearly statement since 1924 showing (1) the amount of money asked for by the War Department for national defense; (2) the amount sent to Congress by the President through his Budget Director; and (3) the amount appropriated by Congress. That record was never published and was ordered locked up in a safe in the Appropriations Committee by the chairman. The reason it was not published was that it was the President who, through his Budget Director, had cut the Army appropriation, and not the Congress. Congress gave them more than the Budget asked for. These are the facts. If anybody doubts them, let him go back into the safe of the Appropriations Committee and get that record out. It is there under lock and key.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized. It is his own time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 20 minutes so that the gentlemen can answer each other on some of these questions, because I have not yet touched on the point that I wanted to make when I rose to the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is reluctant to recognize the gentleman for that request, because there are three other Members of the House who have special orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, Mr. Speaker, and that, may I say, has been the ruling of the present occupant of the chair on

various occasions; and I think the ruling is correct. But unfortunately for consistency the Speaker of the House when occupying the chair and on my making that point ruled the opposite. I do not like intimidation, but I have a couple or more questions of personal privilege here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where is the intimidation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The intimidation? If I do not get my additional time of 20 minutes or 10, I shall have to insist on raising the question of personal privilege again.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is intimidating the House?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to say that I, as the holder of one of these special orders, will be only too glad to accord with the gentleman's request that he have an additional 20 minutes, if he cares to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the House to the fact that there are three other special orders. It is a matter within the control of the House.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to proceed for an additional 20 minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Instead of 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REED of New York. Just in order to keep the record straight as to this remark about the Navy appropriation and how the gentleman voted on it, the gentleman will recall that when a two-ocean Navy was suggested and recommended to the President, he said anybody who was for a two-ocean Navy was stupid, just stupid, that is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I recall that, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] both recall that.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just before Pearl Harbor there was an appropriation bill in here to appropriate money to build 5,500 airplanes. A motion was made on the Republican side in the Committee of the Whole to reduce it to 1,000, and it was defeated. Later a motion was made to reduce it to 4,400-plus airplanes. That was defeated, and then a motion to recommit was made, and that was defeated. The entire consistent record of practically all the Members on the Republican side before Pearl Harbor was against everything that would go toward the defense of our country. If a majority of the Congress had followed the votes of the majority of the Republican Party, when Pearl Harbor happened this country would have been defenseless and we would have had to make any kind of a peace we could get.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, do not forget that what we did put over there

the administration lost, or at least we did not keep.

Let me say something else to the gentleman. The statements I will put in the RECORD tonight quoting the President will show that he was the most inconsistent of the lot, that no Member of Congress could have been as inconsistent as was he in his statements when his statements are compared with his acts.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, testified before our subcommittee in January 1939 that he had up to that time been following a policy of quality first and then quantity; that we were 3 to 5 years behind Germany in research and development in airplane construction. A month or two later, perhaps 6 weeks later, he came in and stated the reverse policy, that then he wanted quantity without regard to quality.

The facts of the case were these—we Republicans agreed with General Arnold that in the construction of airplanes quality should come first and then quantity. That we should not build obsolete planes. That our boys were entitled to the best possible planes. That it was suicide to send a boy up in an obsolete plane. The President proposed that we build 5,500 planes, 3,300 of these were to be operated, approximately 1,000 in reserve, and 1,250 more were to be built and stored. We Republicans on the committee and on the floor did not oppose the construction of the 3,300 planes despite the fact that they would be obsolete. We did not oppose a normal reserve. We did oppose the construction of 1,250 of these obsolete planes which were to be put in storage. In October 1940, a meeting was held in the War Department office on Constitution Avenue. There were present at that meeting the Secretary of War, some 15 or 20 Army officials including the Deputy Chief of Staff and a number of Members of Congress. I asked for information at that meeting as to the actual number of planes built. I was told to write a letter. I wrote that letter. The President had stated that we were to retain 50 percent of all planes for our own use and send 50 percent to Europe over a 2-year period. I asked the War Department whether we were to have the first 50 percent of the planes produced or the last 50 percent produced over a 2-year period; second, whether we were retaining 50 percent of combat planes, 50 percent trainers, or all trainers and no combat planes. I also asked specific information as to the number of planes of each type actually built. This letter was published at the time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was given the information subsequently, but was not permitted to publish it at the time. The facts, however, were that we were keeping practically all training planes and no combat planes. The record, I believe, will verify this statement. The planes that we sent to Europe were obsolete. They had no armored pilot seats, no self-sealing gasoline tanks, they lacked fire power, climbing power, and speed. These were the planes that we were told were left lying on the docks in England unused

because they were obsolete. I said then and I say now that we made a mistake in not continuing General Arnold's policy of quality first and then quantity. It is suicide for a flyer to go up in an obsolete plane as against planes that have modern appliances and modern protection.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. And on that very point my recollection is very clear, that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] insisted before this House on a matter then before the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee, for the Army, that the policy of the Nation should be that, as stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], we should take that money and use it to build experimental plants and develop a decent plane, and it was that policy announced on the Republican side which finally gave rise to the development of these airplanes you have now, and had we followed the policy announced by the distinguished majority leader of spending that money in building a lot of planes which would have been obsolete before they were built, before they left the ground, we never would have had a decent aviation policy in this country, and everybody knows it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. And the gentleman read the statement in the newspapers of Captain Foss, that, thank God, now he could go over there and be on a plane that was not old, like the Grumman Wildcats, which the Japs went by like a bat out of hell.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Those planes had no self-sealing gasoline tanks, they lacked fire power, climbing power, and speed, and they had no protection for the pilot seat. I made the statement at that meeting in October 1940 that the entire French Air Force, with every American plane in it, was wiped out by the German Air Force during the first 10 days in the battle for Belgium. No one contradicted me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me now to return to this question of the investigation of the F. B. I. of the schoolboy at Hartford, Van Buren County, Mich., because he made, among others, the statement that the President was untruthful.

The young man at Hartford is patriotic. As stated, a month after he became 17, he enlisted as an air cadet and is only awaiting his graduation from high school the coming June to enter the armed service of his country.

When President Roosevelt assumed office, this young man was no more than 6 years of age. Beyond question, he is familiar with the story of Washington and the cherry tree; with the statement attributed to Washington, "Father, I cannot tell a lie." Perhaps he belongs to the "horse and buggy" days, when people believed that a promise made was to be kept. Perhaps he had accepted the statement of President Roosevelt that a campaign promise was "a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power."

Perhaps the boy had heard of the President's statement in a radio address on May 7, 1933:

I am going to be honest at all times with the people of the country.

In any event, the young man is little more than a boy, although he will play a man's part in the war. And no one should criticize him because he did not at the moment realize the difference between a promise and a false statement. Many people believe that a promise made, but not intended to be fulfilled, is an untruth.

PRESIDENT SAID HE OPPOSED WAR

That the President intended the people of America to believe that he was opposed to war and that he would not send their sons to fight in any foreign wars is made evident by his prior utterances on the subject of war and of the Nation's policy toward war. To list just a few of them, note the following statements by the President:

On December 28, 1933:

The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention.

On January 3, 1934:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe.

On January 4, 1935:

The maintenance of international peace is a matter in which we are deeply and unselfishly concerned. There is no ground for apprehension that our relations with any nation will be otherwise than peaceful.

On June 12, 1935:

As a nation we have been fortunate in our geographic isolation, which in itself has partially protected our boundless resources. It is in full appreciation of our advantageous position and of our own devotion to the cause of peace that our Nation's defense system has always reflected the single purpose that that name implies.

On October 2, 1935:

The American people can have but one concern and speak but one sentiment: Despite what happens in continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain, as long ago the Father of our Country prayed that it might remain, unentangled and free.

As President of the United States I say to you most earnestly once more that the people of America and the Government of those people intend and expect to remain at peace with all the world.

On October 16, 1935:

I have pledged myself to do my part in keeping America free of those entanglements that move us along the road to war.

On November 11, 1935:

The primary purpose of this Nation is to avoid being drawn into war. * * *

The new generation, unlike us, have no direct knowledge of the meaning of war. They are not immune to the glamor of war. * * * Fortunately, there is evidence on every hand that the youth of America, as a whole, is not trapped by that delusion. They know that elation and prosperity which may come from a new war must lead—for those who survive it—to economic and social collapse more sweeping than any we have experienced in the past.

America must and will protect herself. Under no circumstances will this policy of self-protection go to lengths beyond self-protection.

On January 3, 1936:

The United States and the rest of the Americas can play but one role: through a well-ordered neutrality to do naught to encourage the contest, through adequate defense to save ourselves from embroilment and attack, and through example and all legitimate encouragement and assistance, to persuade other nations to return to the ways of peace and good will.

Within democratic nations the chief concern of the people is to prevent the continuance or rise of autocratic institutions that beget slavery at home and aggression abroad.

On August 14, 1936:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations.

I wish I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion.

On October 13, 1936:

We have sought for security from war with other nations. * * * We propose, of course, no interference with the affairs of other nations.

On October 14, 1936:

All major wars have brought about major disturbances in our social and economic machinery. The late war has been no exception. We rejoice here that these problems are being met and solved without impairing our faith and confidence in the people's ability to do it themselves by the peaceful processes of democratic representative government.

On October 14, 1937:

The Nation knows I hate war, and I know that the Nation hates war. I submit to you a record of peace.

Today there is war and rumors of war. We want none of it. But while we guard our shores against threats of war, we will continue to remove the causes of unrest and antagonism at home which might make our people easier victims to those for whom foreign war is profitable. Those who stand to profit by war are not on our side in this campaign.

In September 1939:

I give you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

I believe that American vessels should, so far as possible, be restricted from entering danger zones. * * *

The second objective is to prevent American citizens from traveling on belligerent vessels or in danger areas. * * *

Under present enactments such arms cannot be carried to belligerent countries on American vessels, and this provision should not be disturbed.

To those who say that this program (embargo repeal) would involve a step toward war on our part, I reply that it offers far greater safeguards than we now possess or have ever possessed to protect American lives and property from danger. It is a positive program for giving safety. This means less likelihood of incidents and controversies

which tend to draw us into conflict, as they did in the last World War. There lies the road to peace.

On October 23, 1940:

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life.

On October 28, 1940:

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right? We made it clear that American investors who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent, and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

Later, the President asked for the repeal of the Neutrality Act on the theory that its repeal would assist in maintaining peace, keep us out of the war.

PRESIDENT SAID WE COULD KEEP OUT OF WAR IF WE HAD COURAGE TO SAY "NO"

If it be said that force of circumstances, the attack by Japan, forced us into the war and that therefore the President's promise that our boys would not be sent to fight in any foreign wars could not be kept, let it be said that, while that may be true and that war was unavoidable, yet the President placed no such limitation upon his promise and as long ago as August 14, 1936, he told us:

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

That statement shows that he either did not know what he was talking about or that he did not have the courage to say no, for we did not keep out of the war.

It is not my purpose to make any argument as to whether we could or could not have stayed out of this war. My sole purpose is to show that the schoolboy who said that the President was untruthful had, under our form of government, the right to make that statement in view of political events and statements.

Perhaps the young man who charged that the President did not tell the truth when he made the promise that American youth would not be sent to fight in any foreign wars did not rely solely upon the President's words, plain on their face; made deliberately by a candidate for the highest office in the land; nor upon the sincerity of the views expressed in the words just quoted as to the President's attitude toward war and our Nation's participation therein.

Perhaps, in justification of his charge, the young man sincerely believed that

the promise was not made in good faith. Perhaps he measured the President's promise with the yardstick of the President in mind, when, on the 19th of September 1932, as a candidate for office, he said:

But remember well that attitude and method—the way we do things, not just the way we say things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

WAR PREDICTED IF ROOSEVELT ELECTED

Perhaps the young man had in mind previous events which led some of us to the conclusion that the policy of the administration was day by day and step by step drawing us nearer to war, to predictions that war would come if the President's policies were followed.

Permit me to cite from news releases sent out by me and published in the papers of my district a few of these events.

Note this prediction of August 17, 1940:

The President asked authority to call out the National Guard for military training. I know of no one opposed to that procedure. Unfortunately, the President also asked—and he jammed through Congress—authority to send the National Guard on active service anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. An amendment to limit that service to the continental United States was voted down.

If military training was the purpose of calling out the National Guard—and certainly they need the training if we are to prepare for adequate defense—there was no reason for giving the President authority to send the Guard into South America, where we have never been asked; where we are sure to get into trouble.

You and I know that, if the Guard is sent to South America and there they become involved in military strife, the Regular Army and the Navy must be sent to aid them. Our national defense will not be strengthened by scattering our forces all over the Western Hemisphere when we are so ill-prepared here at home.

The President's demand for authority over the National Guard is further evidence of his determination to involve us in the World War. In my judgment, he should not be given the power to make war until the people, through Congress, have declared war. For months now, he has assumed to act as a dictator and it is because of his sayings and his actions that our danger from abroad has been greatly increased.

Weeks before this the President had transferred 50 American destroyers to a foreign nation, even though section 33 of title 18 of the United States Criminal Code expressly provided that—

It shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war * * * with any intent * * * that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation.

Over my signature in some of the papers of the District on September 5, 1940, more than a year before the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, appeared this statement:

If Roosevelt is reelected, under the guise of defending ourselves, we will be sending our Navy to foreign waters, our soldiers to foreign lands, and we shall be in a war of aggression.

Again, on September 26, 1940:

The drive for war centers here in Washington, where the President called for a voluntary propaganda organization—as though the New Dealers were not doing plenty of that now.

In Washington theaters some Government employees wildly cheer pictures of Roosevelt signing the conscription bill, which takes the boys from their homes; boo and hiss pictures of Willkie, who promises they will never fight on foreign soil. (These cheerers are safe in Federal jobs.)

Yes, the drive to involve us in the war is on in dead earnest. Under the guise of helping Great Britain, the President has sent her, in violation of our solemn promise to the world, warships, planes, artillery, trucks, ammunition. All well and good as long as we remain out of the war, you say? But be not fooled. He intends to send American soldiers, when once we are completely involved.

On October 16, 1940:

Roosevelt has promised that he will not send American soldiers to foreign soil, but experience has demonstrated that his promises, after election, are easily forgotten.

On January 9, 1941:

The local press contains many items carrying the assumption that we are in the war. Public polls begin to indicate a growing sentiment for war. Why? Because a deliberate and widespread effort is being made to create the impression that war is inevitable; that we are already in the war; and that no loyal persons will question the wisdom of continuing on a course which will result in sending an army to Europe.

This talk of "destroying the Axis Powers," if made in good faith, can only mean sending an army to Europe.

•On March 11, 1941:

Do you know—

That the Bethlehem Co. is converting American liners into transport ships? (Is the purpose to fit them to carry troops?)

That the administration is asking that the National Guard, called to train for 1 year, be kept for an additional 6 to 12 months?

That the administration has defeated all amendments to the lend-lease bill, which would limit the power of the President to send American ships or men to fight in World War No. 2?

On March 27, 1941:

Two weeks ago I told you about American liners which were being converted into transport ships for troops.

American warships are being painted to resemble Britain's warship, the *King George*, and on the high seas, in the combat areas, it will be difficult for German U-boats to distinguish them from British warships. Can you think of an easier way of getting an American warship torpedoed?

It may be that the Hartford school boy, when he said that the President was untruthful in making the promise that our boys would not be sent to fight in any foreign wars, was of the opinion that the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, was not the beginning of the war. Others, with a far wider experience, years of judging the trend of national and international events, have had that thought.

PUBLISHER OF NEW YORK TIMES SAID LEND-LEASE A WARLIKE ACT

Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times, and a member of the central committee of the American Red Cross, speaking at a meeting of the American Red Cross in New York on January 31, 1944, for the purpose of giving aid to our prisoners, among other things said:

I happen to be among those who believe that we did not go to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I hold rather that we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we had gone to war when we made the lend-lease declaration. * * * That declaration was an affirmative act on our part, and a warlike act.

There were many of us in America; there were some of us in Congress, who believed that sending ships with munitions of war to belligerent nations—that the carrying out of the lend-lease program—meant war, even though we were told by the President and outstanding members of his party that the repeal of neutrality legislation, that the transfer of the 50 destroyers, that the adoption of lend-lease, were all efforts to keep us out of war.

It is a tribute to the intelligence, the judgment, of the American schoolboy that this country boy in the little town of Hartford apparently was as accurate in his conclusion as to the result of the New Deal policy as was the president and publisher of the New York Times.

It may have been difficult for the young man, knowing, as did many other Americans, that the administration was following a course which must end in war, to believe that the President's promise not to send our boys to fight in foreign wars was made in good faith.

Again, the young man may have had in mind other promises of the President which had been violated. There is an old Latin maxim, "Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus"—false in one, false in all—which the boy may have known.

PRESIDENT'S PROMISES NOT KEPT

The President has made many, many promises to which he made no pretense of adhering. All can recall many of these promises. They are familiar in almost every household of the land. Let me cite just a few.

The President and his party had promised in substance that it would not go off the gold standard. On September 12, 1932, Patrick J. Hurley, then Secretary of War, charged that, "If the Democrats are elected in November and take office on the 4th of March, they will follow the program of the House of Representatives and not the Chicago platform." He further charged that the Democratic administration would go off the gold standard.

Answering the charge that, if the Democratic Party succeeded at the November election, the United States would be driven off the gold standard, on November 2, 1932, Senator CARTER GLASS said that, if Hurley made the charge—

He is totally unfit for official responsibility and the President should have booted him out of office before breakfast time the following day. * * * This alleged declaration if made by this strutting trumpeter of the President was not far short of treason.

Two nights later, on November 4, Candidate Roosevelt himself, after referring to the words of Senator GLASS quoted above and upholding his position, said:

It is worthy of note that no adequate answer has been made to the magnificent philippic of Senator GLASS the other night, in which he showed how unsound this position was. And I might add, Senator GLASS made a devastating challenge that no responsible Government would have sold to the country

securities payable in gold if it knew that the promise—yes, the covenant—embodied in these securities was as dubious as the President of the United States claims it was.

Yet, Roosevelt having won the election, within less than a month after taking office repudiated the Nation's solemn contractual obligation to redeem its promises in terms of gold and the United States went off the gold standard. The Democratic platform promise and the promise of the President was not kept.

In his first campaign, the President had a great deal to say about the Nation's then \$4,000,000,000 debt and about excessive Federal spending. Among other things, he said:

It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped and that rigid governmental economy shall be forced by a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income.

We must eliminate actual perfunctions of Government—functions, in fact, that are not definitely essential to the continuance of government. We must merge, we must consolidate subdivisions of government and, like private citizens, give up luxuries we can no longer afford.

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign.

We are not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington, or, to put it another way around, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services which are neither practical nor necessary. In addition to this, we are attempting too many functions and we need a simplification of what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all our history—one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs or reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

On my part I ask you to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expenses of the National Government.

Revenues must cover expenditures by one means or another. Any government, like any family, can for a year, spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse.

Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits. Let us have equal courage to reverse the policy of Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency.

Now the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy. For over 2 years our Federal Government has experienced unprecedented deficits in spite of increased taxes.

This simply means that one-third—33⅓ percent—of the entire income of our people must go for the luxury of being governed.

That is an impossible economic condition. Quite apart from every man's own tax assessment, that burden is a brake on any return to normal business activity.

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy or, as now, in broad cessation of employment.

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign. In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business.

In March 1933, the President said:

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger. * * * We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of the Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy.

And the Democratic platform of 1936 contained this statement:

If these problems cannot be effectively solved by legislation within the Constitution, we shall seek such clarifying amendment as will assure to the legislatures of the several States and the Congress of the United States, each within its proper jurisdiction, the power to enact those laws which the State and Federal legislatures, within their respective spheres, shall find necessary. * * * Thus we propose to maintain the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

A definite promise that the Constitution would not be ignored.

No citation of facts or of figures is needed to show that long before any appropriations other than normal ones for national defense were made, the President and his administration had entered upon and carried on a campaign of wild, reckless, wasteful, extravagant expenditures, and he continued to borrow to meet those expenditures, even though, before he became a candidate, he had pointed out the folly of such a course when he said, on September 9, 1931:

Right now we have to consider how to meet such an emergency (depression times). Shall we meet it according to the example of our Federal Government, which feels itself obligated to put out \$800,000,000 of long time bonds to cure the defects of a budget whose revenues have not come up to expectations? I think we should be very foolish and recreant to our trust if we should follow any such precedent. We don't know what the future holds for us. This depression is today's problem. Men of all parties are agreed that this need exists and must be met. I think most of us are agreed, too, that we cannot and must not borrow against the future to meet it. We must share now out of what we have but not out of what we expect to have some day in the future.

His ego inflated by the acclaim accorded him, the President not only stated—

I should like to have it said of my first administration that, in it, the forces of selfishness and of lust for power met their match. I should like to have it said of my second

administration that, in it, these forces met their master—

But, in 1936, added these boastful statements—

RECOVERY COMPLETE, BUT ONE-THIRD NEEDING RELIEF

Recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing, emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget is on the way.

The Government has sought and found practical answers to the problems of industry, agriculture, and mining.

Factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full.

But by January 20 of 1937, the President sang a different song, set to a different tune. Listen to his words:

I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.

I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.

I see millions denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot and the lot of their children.

I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions.

I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.

And on March 4, 1937, he said:

Here is one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed—now.

And, on March 9, 1937, he added for good measure:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis—the need to meet the unanswered challenge of one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

"Factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full"—all the President's creation, according to his view—had reduced to ill-nourished and ill-clad and ill-housed a third of our population. Was it because he planned it that way?

WASHINGTON BUREAUCRACY IN FULL CONTROL

Let us forget the President's unkept promises. To record them would be but a waste of time, for the majority of our people now know that the President just does not keep his promises, although some still claim that the failure was due to circumstances beyond his control. That theory might be accepted, had he not told us that—

After 34 months of work, we contemplate a fairly rounded whole. We have returned the control of the Federal Government to the city of Washington.

In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

And had he not also said:

Yes; we are on the way back—not by mere chance; not by a turn of the cycle. We are coming back more soundly than ever before because we planned it that way, and don't let anybody tell you differently.

UNTRUTHFULNESS

Was the schoolboy at Hartford, Van Buren County, Mich., the boy who has offered his life in the service of his country, untruthful when he said that the President was untruthful?

PRESIDENT PROMISED TO SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTION

Of our Constitution the President, on June 10, 1936, said:

The Constitution provided the best instrument ever devised for the continuation of these fundamental principles (of Federal Government). Under its broad purposes we can and intend to march forward, believing, as the overwhelming majority of Americans believe, that it is intended to meet and fit the amazing physical, economic, and social requirements that confront us in this generation.

On July 4, 1937, in his proclamation on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Constitution—September 17, 1937—he made this statement:

We shall recognize that the Constitution is an enduring instrument, fit for the governing of a far-flung population of more than 130,000,000, engaged in diverse and varied pursuits, even as it was fit for the governing of a small agrarian nation of less than 4,000,000.

On three occasions, the President has taken this oath:

I, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God.

As the President so well said, let his acts, rather than his words, speak.

Did he keep his promise to uphold the Constitution?

He attempted to gain control of the Supreme Court by the unconstitutional method of increasing its membership.

Laws which were held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court were forced through Congress with his approval.

Rules, orders, regulations, and directives which deprived the citizens of their rights, of due process of law, have been enforced by agencies created by him, operating under his control.

THEN ASKED CONGRESS TO FORGET IT

He has not hesitated to boldly demand that Congress pass legislation of doubtful constitutionality. On July 5, 1935, referring to the Guffey coal bill, about the constitutionality of which there was a grave question, he wrote:

I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation.

PRESIDENT SAID HE DID NOT COMMENT ON PENDING LEGISLATION BUT FORGOT HIMSELF 17 TIMES

In refusing to state his position on the Overton-Russell amendment to a bill pending in Congress, the President said he had made it a rule not to state his position while measures were still before Congress. This was in September of 1940.

That is a statement as to a fact. It was not true. The President did emphatically state his position on the court-packing bill, on the Guffey coal bill

as just cited. On the wage-hour bill, he had said:

I still hope that the House, as a whole, can vote on a wage-and-hour bill—either by reconsideration of this action by the Rules Committee itself, or by the petition route. As I have suggested before, I hope that the democratic processes of legislation will continue. That is my personal view.

The following is at least a partial list of instances when he did state his position on pending legislation—all in 1940.

The President authorized Representative Dunn (Democrat of Pennsylvania) to make public a letter approving the Vandenberg reapportionment bill then pending in the House Census Committee.

January 19 the President objected to the elimination by the House of funds for the National Resources Board and the Office of Government Reports.

February 2, the President expressed opposition to the action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting farm-relief estimates.

March 2: The President criticized Congress for delaying improvements to the Panama Canal.

March 5: The President permitted himself to be quoted directly in opposition to the Tobey resolution, which would have eliminated from the census schedule inquiries on individual income. He said:

The whole thing is obviously a political move and nothing else. Everybody accredited to Congress knows the motive for the opposition is political.

At this same conference, he also urged passage of the Hatch Act extensions bill, then pending before the Senate.

March 8: The President endorsed the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill then in conference and opposed the views of Secretary Woodring and Secretary Wallace on suggested revisions.

March 15: The President again denounced the Tobey census resolution.

March 26: The President authorized Senator Harrison to say that he opposed any amendments to the trade-treaty extension bill.

April 2: The President opposed Senate committee action in adding new authorizations to the rivers and harbors bill.

April 2: The President authorized Representative Cole to make public a letter from him suggesting modification of a bill pending in a House committee which would establish partial Federal control of oil production.

April 5: The President urged that funds to bring back the Byrd expedition be added to a bill then pending before a Senate committee.

April 5: The President opposed the Logan-Walter bill, which had passed the Senate and was before the House committee.

May 6: The President again endorsed the Hatch Act extensions when the bill was still before the House committee.

June 4: The President endorsed a congressional move to increase defense taxes and put the program on a pay-as-you-go basis. The bill was then before the Ways and Means Committee.

June 14: The President approved the Cummings resolution, extending the sug-

ar control bill for 1 year, and expressed the hope that it would be passed in the form approved by the House Committee on Agriculture.

July 27: The President discussed the problems involved in a bill, approved that day by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to permit the use of American ships in the evacuation of the British children.

Was there not some excuse for the young man thinking that perhaps the President did not always state the truth?

As a matter of fact, it is the duty of the President, in his messages to Congress, to advise Congress not only on the state of the Union, but as to any needed legislation. So why did he say that he had made it a rule not to state his position while measures were still before Congress?

PRESIDENT SAID HE DID NOT TAKE PART IN PRIMARY ELECTIONS—BUT HE DID

On August 7, 1937, Presidential Secretary McIntyre, at Hyde Park released the following statement:

The President repeated for the thousandth time that he has not taken part, is not taking part, and will not take part in any local primary election except his own home town and home county.

Now we all know that the President did take a very active part in the purge campaign by which he sought to prevent the election of some Democratic candidates.

On June 24, 1938, in a fireside chat, he said:

As President of the United States, I am not * * * taking part in Democratic primaries. As the head of the Democratic Party however * * * I feel that I have every right to speak.

An open admission that politically he was a Mr. Hyde and a Dr. Jekyll, and he did bring about, with the aid of the Communists, the defeat of a Democratic candidate, John O'Connor, who was at the time chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules of the House.

Speaking on the same platform where sat a Democratic candidate for Senator, he in substance told the audience that the Democrat should be defeated.

And, in a 1942 campaign, here was the administration's test for candidates:

The President says he will support any liberal candidate selected by the leaders of New York State, provided he had supported his—

The President's—
war policy 100 percent before Pearl Harbor.

Was he truthful when he said that he would not take part in a primary election outside his own State; when he said that he would not, as President, take any part in an election?

Was he just an individual—not the President of the United States—on his purge trip throughout the South and the Southwest? Did he not travel on a Government train, paid for by Government dollars; eat food paid for with the taxpayers' money?

DID NOT KEEP PROMISE TO LABOR

On November 14, 1941, while the coal strikes were in progress, the President said:

The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

The Government will never compel this (remaining) 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

But, on Sunday night, December 7, 1941, a special three-man arbitration board appointed for the purpose by the President, by a 2 to 1 vote, gave John L. Lewis the closed shop in the captive coal mines—another promise violated.

SAID HE WOULD NOT BE A CANDIDATE—BUT HE WAS
On March 4, 1937, President Roosevelt said:

My great ambition on January 20, 1941, is to turn over this desk and chair in the White House to my successor.

That must have drawn a laugh from the New Deal politicians.

Then came the Democratic Convention of 1940, where Senator BARKLEY stated he was authorized to say that the President had no desire or purpose to continue in office.

HIS FRIENDS' OPINION

Two of the President's warm personal friends, both of whom have passed beyond, both known as careful, accurate reporters, commented on that statement.

Listen to these words of Raymond Clapper, reprinted in the United States News of August 7, 1940:

What shakes me is that statement which President Roosevelt authorized Senator BARKLEY to make to the Democratic National Convention.

This—that he, Mr. Roosevelt—"has never had, and has not today, any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President, to be a candidate for that office, or to be nominated by the convention for that office."

I simply do not believe that. Mr. Roosevelt can cite no action that he has taken to support it.

The urge to power and glory is an overwhelming thing when it takes hold of a public man. Only such an urge could have betrayed Mr. Roosevelt into the monumental and historic deception which he now places on the record. This is a page that I would rather have never read.

Note that Clapper, the President's friend, said: "I simply do not believe that"; then characterized the statement as a deception.

Should the schoolboy of Hartford be criticized because he ventured the statement that the President was not truthful?

In the same publication, on the same date, Hugh S. Johnson, also a personal friend of the President and a one-time intimate, referring to BARKLEY's statement, said:

There is only one word to characterize that, but it ought never to be applied to a statement by a President—nor deserve to be applied.

Everyone who knows the President—and I used to—knows precisely the reverse of that. So, on all the facts, does the whole country. It wasn't at all necessary to secure the nomination. Its only purpose was for the campaign—to deceive the people on a flagrant violation of the third-term tradition and this Hitlerized nomination. Thus this convention of the party to which my fervid loyalty

always ran and my father's and my grandfather's, for over a hundred years, this convention starts that party off to the keynote of the most cynically barefaced lie in American political history.

Read again the last sentence quoted above, and then give reason, if any there be, why a representative of the F. B. I. should accuse a schoolboy of Hartford, Mich., who is known in his community for his loyalty and his patriotism, for his courage and his outspokenness, of seditious conduct, of acts bordering on treason, because he expressed his opinion that the President was not truthful.

According to the press, on November 4, 1940, and prior to the election, the President made a definite promise that he would not be a candidate for a fourth term. Speaking to his neighbors and to a radio audience, he said:

You will have a new President in 1944.

At Beacon, N. Y., after saying he had just come "to say how do you do to a lot of old neighbors," the President said:

It is the last time very obviously that I will do this as a candidate for office—but you can be quite sure that, in all the years to come, my heart will be in Dutchess County, where it always has been.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT TO CONGRESS

On January 25, 1944, in the very first paragraph of his message to Congress vetoing the so-called soldiers' vote bill, the President said:

Our men—

Meaning those in the armed service—cannot understand why the fact that they are fighting should disqualify them from voting.

A moment's reflection will show that the bill did not "disqualify" anyone from voting; it did not take from anyone the right to vote.

The servicemen's opportunity to vote was lessened by the fact that he was away from home or that his State did not provide for absentee voting. And the bill sought to overcome the obstacles to voting.

In the same message, the President charged that he considered the legislation "a fraud on the soldiers and sailors and marines now training and fighting for us and our sacred rights. It is a fraud upon the American people."

That statement, as everyone who has read and understands the bill knows, was not true.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT CHARACTERIZED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Hartford schoolboy is not alone in the conclusion that the words of the President cannot always be accepted at their face value.

Both Houses of Congress passed a tax bill. It went to the President and he vetoed it, sending to House and Senate a message so inaccurate, so filled with misstatements and false charges, that 80-year-old Representative DOUGHTON, a Democrat who has been in Congress since 1911, arose in righteous indignation and challenged the truthfulness of the President's veto message.

Advocating the adoption of the legislation, notwithstanding the veto, the

gentleman from North Carolina, among other things said:

I resent deeply the circumstances, the methods, the reasons, and the language of this veto message. It does not, as a state paper should, concern itself with the central question; it extends far beyond the necessities of the occasion to make gratuitous slaps at the Congress and contains political platitudes which are not only erroneous and unfounded in fact but are subject only to the construction that they are intended to discredit the Congress and to impair the confidence of the American people in their chosen representatives.

The issue is simple and clear. It is: Shall the people of this Nation retain, as they zealously sought to do in the Constitution, a complete and direct control over the taxes they are to pay, or shall we permit a group of irresponsible individuals to thwart the will of our people?

Two other Democrats of unquestioned standing, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], both Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee, likewise pointed out, not only the inaccuracy, but the unfairness, of the President's veto message.

The House overrode the veto by a vote of 3 to 1.

The President's veto message was so vitriolic, so unfair and, to put it charitably, so inaccurate, that the President's spokesman, the Democratic leader of the other body, who has served continuously in the Congress for 31 years, advocated overriding the veto. Among other things, the gentleman from Kentucky said:

In order still further to belittle the amount of revenue provided in this new tax bill the President has resorted to one of the most unjustifiable methods of calculation it is possible to conjure up, which obviously was handed to him by a mind more clever than honest.

Referring to another statement in the message, the gentleman said:

It simply is not an accurate statement of the facts, and everybody knows it.

Again:

Mr. President, no man could have made that extraordinary statement who has sat in tax committees in the Capitol of the United States. If it was made by anybody who ever sat in a tax committee, it was a deliberate and unjustified misstatement in order to place upon Congress the blame for universal dissatisfaction with tax complexities, and in order to produce the illusion that the executive departments have in vain protested against this complexity.

Once more:

In his effort to justify this veto message, the President has gone forth with a searchlight and magnifying glass to find inconsequential faults.

Let me quote again:

In his effort to belittle and discredit Congress throughout his veto message the President says:

"It is not a tax bill but a tax-relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy."

That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members of Congress may do as they

please; but, as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down.

Mr. President, let me say, in conclusion, that if the Congress of the United States has any self-respect yet left, it will override the veto of the President and enact this tax bill into law, his objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

The following day, the gentleman resigned as the President's leader of the Senate and was immediately unanimously reelected as leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate—and there is a distinction between the two positions, for, while heretofore the gentleman spoke for the President, in obedience to the President's wishes, hereafter he will, in the other body, represent the majority party therein, if he follows his announced course.

THE WRECKERS MUST BE STOPPED

The wreckers of national unity, the would-be destroyers of public confidence in constitutional government, the villains of the Congress, must be exposed for what they are.

When so exposed, the American people will no longer tolerate them nor their sponsors, like the Jergens Co., which all too long has maintained on its pay roll one who, by one newspaper article, was described as follows:

Another one in the forefront was Walter Winchell, pitchman for the Andrew Jergens Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, manufacturers of hand lotion, and the high priest of New Deal vilification. Winchell goes on the air almost every week prejudging the defendants in the Washington sedition cases, asserting that some one or another of them is guilty as charged. Ordinarily, this would be contempt of court in any land.

And by another:

It is a compliment to the intelligence and the morals of newspaper readers in New York that the Post has the smallest daily circulation in the city, 182,000. The Post is owned and edited by Mrs. Dorothy Schiff Backer, the pinko daughter of the late Mortimer Schiff, international banker. By the same logic that has led the smear brigade to describe as a violent anti-Semite anyone who finds fault with Mr. Winchell's taste or Judge Rosenman's politics, Mrs. Backer could be described as a violent anti-Catholic in view of her paper's unconscionable attack on Senator WALSH.

Walter Winchell, commander of the latrine detail in the New Deal's smear detachment, whose radio salary is paid by the Andrew Jergens Co., of Cincinnati, heralded publication of this scandal on the radio by declaring that it would involve one of four noninterventionist Senators whose names begin with the twenty-third letter of the alphabet.

The New Deal's sponsorship, the administration's support, of these smear artists, can no longer be concealed. Nor can the American people be deceived by the false charges of a gang so patently engaged in preparing the soil for the success of the Communists' efforts to overthrow our Government.

The pattern which the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action, backed by its millions of dollars; its co-workers in the Communist Party; the Winchells and the pinko press, are deliberately weaving is plainly discernible.

The purpose is to create discontent, disunity, a lack of confidence in constitutional government; a disregard for equal justice under law; a government here in Washington by departments, bureaus and agencies.

While we are engaged in a war; while the attention of our people is distracted from Washington by their efforts to aid in the defeat of our enemies, all too many agencies of the Government, harboring Communists as policy-makers, by their restrictive, oppressive, and arbitrary actions, are stirring up the resentment of our people against the Congress by falsely charging that the Congress is responsible for what is happening.

The Congress is responsible in but one way. That is because it has failed to curb the activities of those who are carrying on this revolutionary campaign.

These would-be destroyers of our freedom and our liberty, of our prosperity and our happiness, can be found in all too many agencies here in Washington. They have functioned in the O. P. A., in the F. E. P. C., in the F. C. C., in the N. L. R. B., in the Labor Department, in the Department of Justice, in the Shipping Administration; in fact, in almost every administrative agency.

Morale-destroying pamphlets and books, as well as radio broadcasts, have been fed to the members of the armed forces, apparently without restraint.

WAR COLLEGE LIBRARY ENDORSES SMEAR OF M'ARTHUR

Just a few days ago, the Army War College Library, operating under the War Department, found itself embarrassed by an official bulletin on February 10, 1944, wherein was listed for general circulation in the Army an article entitled, "General MacArthur—Fact and Legend." The War Department bulletin contained this language:

A comprehensive and objective appraisal of the general as Presidential timber, with special reference to the character of his backers, and an analysis of his military reputation before Pearl Harbor and afterward.

The article was a smear article. It made an attack upon one of the Army's greatest four-star generals.

From February 23 to March 9, a letter to Secretary of War Stimson from a Member of the other body, calling attention to the article, went unanswered.

When the matter, however, was aired on the floor of the Senate, a reply was immediately forthcoming from the Secretary of War, who properly condemned the practice. Among other things, Secretary of War Stimson stated:

I need hardly assure you of my complete agreement with your statement that the War Department must be scrupulously careful to avoid the official distribution of partisan or prejudicial material to the Army, either at this time or at any other.

When an agency operating under the direction of the War Department itself can smear a commanding general, all must realize that the time to call a halt has arrived.

The prompt action of the Secretary of War is proof that publicity is an effective weapon and that, knowing as they do

that the people—the sound, conservative people—of our Nation have no sympathy whatever for their attempts to re-make America, the New Dealers will haul in their horns when attention is called to their actions.

NAVY SHOULD FOLLOW ARMY PRECEDENT

Is it not time that the Navy follow the example of the Army and kick out of the Navy service and deprive of his status as a Reserve officer the notorious purveyor of false information which can be used by our enemies to the detriment of our war effort?

In view of the fact that so many of the New Deal agencies are engaged in a smear campaign; recalling, as we do, that the F. B. I. has always borne a reputation for fairness and for thoroughness, for even-handed justice, permit me to now suggest that it repudiate or explain the acts of its agent who suggested to the Hartford schoolboy that his questioning of the veracity of the New Deal candidate for a fourth term was either sedition or an approach to treason.

There is no room here in America for a gestapo. There is no room here for a denial of free speech or a free press. Nothing will so disrupt the people's support of the war as acts of attempted intimidation and coercion on the part of those in authority here in Washington.

The O. P. A., throughout this land of ours, is resented because of its oppressive and unfair methods and rulings. Other agencies of the Government, because they have attempted to serve the New Deal rather than the people, are resented and in them the people have no confidence, nor will they to them give support.

F. B. I. SHOULD DISOWN WINCHELL

Recent elections have shown that the people no longer will submit to oppressive, arbitrary Government activities exercised without legal sanction.

If the F. B. I. desires to retain the confidence of the people, it must divorce itself not only from the mouthpiece of the Jergens Co., Walter Winchell, but from New Deal political control. If it does not, it will soon find itself, so far as the public is concerned, in the same category as other Government agencies.

The editorial reprinted at the end of this talk expresses the feeling of the people of the great Middle West whenever an attempt is made to coerce them.

If the F. B. I. and J. Edgar Hoover will follow the traditions which it has built up and heretofore maintained, it will always retain the respect of the people. But if it permits parasites like Winchell to attach themselves to it; if it yields to political domination, it will soon become just another New Deal agency.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman referred to the broadcast last evening by Mr. Winchell. I listened to that broadcast. It was quite different from any that I have ever heard before. I want to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that he has been pretty well posted on the

previous broadcast experience of Mr. Winchell, is he not of the opinion that, for at least the first time I have ever heard, Mr. Winchell started on the defensive and started to build a cellar for himself, a cyclone cellar, so to speak; that he is beginning to see the wrath of America rise in his direction and he is beginning to anticipate and try to guard against what he sees is inevitably coming in his direction? Could not the gentleman from Michigan see that interpretation of the speech that he made last night?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I listened to Walter last night, and I got the impression that, like every rat that deserts a sinking ship, he senses that the people are not with him; that they have caught on to his false, malicious propaganda; and that his foulness, his dirtiness, and his nastiness have so disgusted them that he no longer is the "great I am." But his sense of egotism is so developed and his mind is so warped and twisted, that having once started on that course it will be very difficult if not impossible for him ever to be decent, as are other Americans.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has referred to egotism. I wonder if he would accept the classic definition that the word "egotism" is the anesthetic which Nature provides in order to deaden the pain of being a damned fool.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has his opinion.

A JOB FOR THE F. B. I.

If the F. B. I. has surplus funds and extra time at its disposal, why can it not, instead of investigating, seeking to intimidate, to deny to a young man who is on his way to serve his country on the war front, the right of free speech, devote a little of its energy to rounding up and exposing the Walter Winchells, who do so much to stir up disunity, to spread dissension, create class and racial hatred, spread false, malicious charges, the purpose of which is to destroy the people's confidence in their Government?

Why not bring to light and expose the activities of the Communists who openly advocate the overthrow of the Government by force; who hold policy-making positions in the Federal Government, and who, by infiltration into labor unions, interfere with war production and transportation?

Let the F. B. I. clean the New Deal house here in Washington and elsewhere. The people of the country are sound, patriotic, and courageous, and neither need, nor will they submit to, intimidation, the denial of their constitutional rights.

In view of the foregoing, is it permissible to suggest that the F. B. I. and other agencies of the administration, including the Department of Justice, cease to persecute, to attempt to intimidate and coerce citizens who have lived long in their respective communities; whose acts are open and aboveboard; who are known as honest, law-abiding, loyal, patriotic citizens; and that they devote

their time and the spending of the taxpayers' money to their respective duties, as defined under the Constitution, exercise their powers within the Constitution, to the end that the defeat of our enemies may be brought about as quickly as possible, with the least possible suffering and loss of life?

Is it permissible to say, without being charged with sedition or traitorous conduct, that the reestablishment of the "four freedoms" here in America, the reestablishment of constitutional government, of equal justice under law, be given first consideration?

May we, without being accused of sedition or treason, call in question, criticize the acts of administrative, of executive officers?

If this administration, which has recently defied Congress, refused to give the information as to when or where or how the taxpayers' money was spent, administrative activities carried on—and the Jergens Company, engaged in selling cosmetics through its mouthpiece, Walter Winchell—who, figuratively speaking, hides under the White House porch—and the President's political allies, the Communists, can stifle all criticism; refuse to answer all questions, we have a dictatorship.

Fortunately, election day will soon roll around and, if the people of the countryside are permitted to vote and their and other votes are honestly taken and honestly counted, there is every indication that the day of arbitrary government by the new dealers will end; that the effort of the Communists and some of their friends to overthrow our Government by subterfuge will not be successful.

EXHIBIT A

Did you see the article on "gumshoe experts" in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post? Hartford had its own incident of "snooping" last week, by a man representing himself as an F. B. I. agent, that has set us wondering just how far these investigators may go in suppressing free expression of speech by implied threats that leave the investigated with the impression that he had better keep his mouth shut or run the chance of getting himself into trouble.

We have had no official news release from our Government advising us that the Constitution's Bill of Rights has been abrogated by Supreme Court decision, congressional action, or Presidential decree. We have had little reason to doubt that "freedom" as described in the first 10 articles of the Constitution is the right and privilege of every citizen of the United States. But our thoughts perforce return to consideration of this fundamental grant to democratic peoples in the light of an F. B. I. agent's visit to Hartford last Thursday.

A 17-year-old Hartford high-school boy this week walks in the shadow of doubt and suspicion because he freely expressed his opinion in a class discussion of current affairs—specifically because he labeled President Roosevelt a "liar." He has been questioned by an F. B. I. agent and has been left with the odious impression that for his own safety in the future he had better confine his opinions to less "seditious" statements. The Federal representative in order to impress the meaning of his word on the young man's mind, consulted the dictionary and read some such definition as appears in the one at hand: "conduct tending to treason."

How disgustingly absurd is such an implication! We are wondering if the F. B. I. is now investigating Senator Barkley for his speech before the Senate last week in which he also called the President a liar but in more refined words. Speaking of the President's statement issued with the veto of the tax bill, Mr. Barkley said, "It is a deliberate misstatement." The phraseology is not the same; the meaning is.

The Hartford youth's accusation was made in reference to Mr. Roosevelt's statement (before his last election) in which he asserted that no American soldiers would fight on foreign soil. What our young man said reached the ears of only his classmates, a few parents, and eventually the F. B. I.; what Mr. BARKLEY said reached the ears of the world.

It is true the Senator has proven his patriotism, and never more convincingly than in his "declaration of independence" last week. This young American, like so many others, has also proven his. He enlisted as an air cadet last September, within a month after he became 17 years of age, and expects to go into training when he is graduated in June.

He is anxious to serve his country just as 10 of his cousins are, and as his ancestors have in the past. Two uncles were in the last war, and one is serving the Nation today, a geologist of world fame, who was second in command on the first Admiral Byrd expedition to the South Pole. His parents, both born in the United States, are good citizens of this community; his great grandfather was a pioneer resident of Van Buren County. He is an active worker in the church, an intelligent student, a leader in school affairs. That he is faithful to his country, is obvious. He is the type of a straightforward, honest young man who will help our Nation develop great statesmen of clear vision during the next generation.

These facts could have been verified by the ambitious Federal agent without resort to threats and insinuating implications.

During the interrogation, the investigator asked where the youth had received his information on the Roosevelt not-to-foreign-soil promise. When informed he had read it in the newspaper, the F. B. I. agent asserted that one shouldn't believe everything he reads. When told he also heard Roosevelt make the speech by radio, the Federal man's reply was to the effect that: If I were you, I wouldn't discuss things I know nothing about; you're liable to get into trouble. Another statement credited to the agent was: That's practically treason; they put men in jail for less than that. There were questions about War bonds, Jews, home and school discussions on national affairs. All questions seemed to lead up to that concerning the President, said the young man, that being the last of a long list.

The significance of this investigation is much deeper than the embarrassment of one Hartford family. Basically, it is a challenge to democratic ideals of freedom. We are at war and are willing to accept regimentation to whatever degree necessary. It is not necessary to stifle free expression of opinion. Our Nation was founded by fearless, outspoken men. Nurtured by freedom of speech and press, our Nation thrived. Today men are fighting and dying to guarantee to future generations the right to enjoy these freedoms.

We cannot but be deeply impressed with the crude cruelty of investigations such as that in Hartford. On a Nation-wide scale, Government-sanctioned interference with free speech in the manner of this investigation would soon lead to repression of constructive criticism and a break-down of public confidence in our Government. We cannot permit our faith in democratic ideals to be compromised through such ill-advised, haphazard methods by protective Govern-

ment agencies. We cannot sacrifice democracy and save it too.

EXHIBIT B

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1944.
MR. JOSEPH N. MCCALL,
Publisher, Hartford Day Spring,
Hartford, Mich.

DEAR MR. MCCALL: The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under my administration since 1924, has existed solely for the purpose of discharging the responsibilities assigned to us by the President, the Congress, and the Attorney General—and we have endeavored to carry out these responsibilities in the American way.

Thus, I was concerned with the allegations in your column, Did You See, which appeared in the March 1, 1944, issue of the Hartford Day Spring. I can assure you that any statement that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is engaged in any program "to stifle free expression of opinion" is wholly unsupported by the facts and could arise only from a misunderstanding. If at any time any representative of this Bureau should exceed the bounds of his authority and attempt to stifle freedom of speech, prompt and decisive administrative action will result.

As you know, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is an investigative organization—it is our duty to receive complaints in matters bearing on the internal security of the Nation, investigate these complaints and present those facts to the prosecuting officials of the Department of Justice. We do not express opinions but do report what is told us by the citizens whom we contact. To avoid the injustices, the hysteria, and mob spirit that existed in World War No. 1, we asked citizens to furnish us with any information they might have pointing to a violation of Federal statutes or which affected the security of the Nation. Then we asked citizens to take no action after reporting the facts to us and not to circulate rumors. As a result of the fine cooperation which we have had from citizens and by careful investigations of everything that came to our attention there have been no acts of sabotage by enemy agents and espionage has been brought under control. To be sure, many complaints come to our attention which are found to be without basis, such as the report in Hartford from one of your citizens which prompted your inquiry. That report stated, "There has come to my attention an unwholesome condition in Hartford, which appears to have arisen from a Nazi-inspired source." We had no choice but to make a preliminary inquiry which I am happy to say revealed the complaint to be without foundation.

Special agents of the F. B. I. are under the strictest of instructions that in every inquiry they should consider the individual's standing in the community and should exercise every precaution to protect the individual's reputation from undue suspicion which might arise from the inquiry. At the same time, the agents are instructed to be thorough and to vigorously seek the facts which would establish the innocence or guilt of the individual about whom the complaint is made. In every instance, the agents are under instructions to be ethical, fair, and impartial. Facts, and only facts, are to be sought. And I am sure that the record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation speaks for itself. Beyond that, any other course of action would be a practical impossibility because of the background and training of our agents. They come from all stations of life and every section of the country. There are few colleges and universities in the land whose graduates are not found in the service of the F. B. I. Each is carefully investigated before appointment and if any question

arises as to their character, reputation, or integrity, every doubt is ruled against their appointment. So with this background I am sure you can see that anything so odious as impugning the freedom of speech would be alien to the characters of the men of the F. B. I.

I am the first to concede that the F. B. I. is a human organization and we do make mistakes, but we welcome having them called to our attention so that we can guard against making that same mistake in the future. Likewise there can be misunderstandings—we try to avoid them, yet at times they do occur, and we welcome having such matters called to our attention, for we stand on our record and have nothing to conceal.

If at any time in the future any question as to the program or policies of the F. B. I. should arise in your mind, I hope you will not hesitate to communicate with me because I consider the F. B. I. the servant of the people and strictly accountable to the people.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, Director.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICA AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely reluctant to take the floor today. I had hoped events would not make it necessary, but in view of what I fear is about to happen in Europe at any moment, and what has already happened in some instances, I cannot shirk what I sincerely believe to be my duty to the people of the United States, especially that great legion of foreign-born, loyal, patriotic Americans who have enjoyed and appreciate the blessings of our form of government, and have contributed so much to its success.

I have at no time had anything but praise for the wonderful deeds of the Soviet Army and what they have accomplished in this war since Hitler tried to overrun their homeland. But I will fight tooth and nail against those who exploit the heroism of the Russian people in order to undermine democracy and destroy it.

For 150 years America has stood as a beacon light of hope for the oppressed and downtrodden of the world, as the symbol of liberty and democracy. In my own district there is a veritable melting pot of nationalities coming from all corners of the globe, who have been attracted to these shores by the magic spell of American freedom and opportunity. In all earnestness and with full consciousness of the seriousness of what I am saying, I tell you that we face the danger of dashing the hopes of these loyal and hard-working American citizens to the ground.

These citizens of foreign birth are giving their sweat and toil to make bigger ships, faster planes, and more powerful guns to insure an early victory for our armed forces. They are buying bonds, and more bonds, to back up our war effort. More than that, they have given their beloved sons and daughters to Uncle Sam, their own flesh and blood, for the cause they hold dear. They have done all these things, willingly and without stint, in the belief that thereby they might safeguard here and abroad those

blessings of democracy which they so gratefully enjoy in this great republic of ours.

I cannot fully and adequately describe to you the alarm and despair which is gripping the many citizens of foreign descent. Hardly had they begun to rejoice at the prospect of the liberation of their loved ones in their native lands from Nazi enslavement, than they were faced with the ghastly alternative that these countries were apparently to fall victim to another sort of totalitarian enslavement.

First, Estonia, then Lavia, then Lithuania, then Poland, and now Yugoslavia, and little Finland, are all on the spot, to say nothing about Italy.

These are some of the countries to which we held out the Atlantic Charter as a pledge of self-government. These are the countries where many good American citizens first saw the light of day. There they have mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, and children. To them they have sent of their earnings, expressing the message that America spells hope, that America spells liberty from tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you from the third article of the Atlantic Charter, issued by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt, in August 1941 in which they gave their solemn assurance to "respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. Speaker, my constituents, and citizens throughout the country are asking why President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are not making good on the solemn pledges contained in the Atlantic Charter.

Picture, if you please, what is going on in the minds of these our fellow citizens. When the Communists tried to sow dissension and disunity among the foreign-born in America, they stood steadfast and loyal to the land of their adoption. Now it seems their loved ones are to be sold down the river to the totalitarian tyranny they had learned to know and detest.

Is America to be the broker in this nefarious bargain? That is what they are asking. I would be untrue to my oath as a Congressman did I not bring this to the attention of Congress.

I am no military expert, although I did my share at St. Mihiel and in the Argonne. Neither am I an impractical dreamer seeking to bring a quart of milk to every Hottentot. But I do believe in holding firm to our resolve that this war shall bring to the peoples of the world, and especially the peoples of war-torn Europe, that modicum of simple blessings which is inherent in democracy. I understand full well that in many cases we are forced by military necessity and expediency to make compromises and perhaps sacrifice some of the aims we have set for ourselves. I am ready to face such practical considerations on their merit in a sane and practical way. It is neither my purpose nor desire to take issue on this point.

I am deeply concerned, however, by the thought that there are some indi-

viduals high in the Government service, or high in its confidence, who are moved by no thought of the welfare and aspirations of the United States and her citizens, who are openly and avowedly interested rather in promoting the designs of a foreign power. The fact that this power found it expedient to join with us as ally in a common struggle against Nazi Germany after she was attacked, does not alter the responsibility of high-ranking American officials toward our own Government.

Entrenched in the Office of War Information, in the Office of Strategic Services, in the Office of Economic Warfare, in the Federal Communications Commission, and in other strategic posts, are those who are working night and day, not in the interests of our Government, but rather to pave the way for totalitarian domination of the United States and the European Continent.

As an example, let us look into the activities of one Louis Adamic, a Yugoslav by birth, who is loathed by his own people both here and abroad. Mr. Adamic has openly boasted of his powerful connections and influence in the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, and even the State Department.

Recently, he published in a Communist foreign-language newspaper an offer of employment in the Yugoslav section of U. N. R. A., directing applicants to apply to him. We all know the U. N. R. A. is destined to play an important part in deciding the future of post-war Europe, but no one can find out who authorized Mr. Adamic to advertise for employees.

Mr. Adamic has published in great quantities books, pamphlets, and propaganda material calculated to sway American public opinion. His articles have appeared in our most influential magazines. He has openly boasted of his success in molding American public opinion to his illicit purposes.

Joining with him in this deluge of propaganda has been the Communist Party, its press, its fraternal organizations, and the front organizations included in the All-American Slav Congress, organized in response to an appeal from Moscow. The policy we are following in hapless Yugoslavia today is the policy advocated, if not actually laid down, by Louis Adamic.

Who is Louis Adamic? Let us see what he stands for. I will give his views, in his own words. I quote from the Worker, official Communist Sunday paper, of December 6, 1942, on the occasion of Mr. Adamic's acceptance of the position of chairman of the Slovene National Congress, an affiliate of the All-American Slav Congress:

I feel honored to have been selected for this function. * * * There seems to be no doubt that the Osvobodilna Fronts Partisan troops have engaged the Axis in important battles. * * *

Nor is there any doubt that the commanders of some of the Partisan troops are Communist or men who are sympathetic to communism or to Russia or both, while the majority of the rank and file is not Communist, but strongly pro-Russian. It is more than probable also that in Slovenia and in the rest of Yugoslavia there are Soviet commissars or Soviet Army officers who are the advisers, if

not the supreme commanders, of the Partisan troops. * * * There is no doubt that Russia as a government or state is deeply interested in Yugoslavia as a whole and perhaps particularly in Slovenia, both in an immediate military sense and from the long-range view which may take in the post-war period. * * * I believe that the Congress should be deeply impressed by the fact that Soviet Russia is the only great power so far which has officially and unequivocally expressed itself in favor of a united Slovenia.

The following views of Louis Adamic are quoted from his book, *The Native's Return*:

I see now that the salvation of the Yugoslav people and other small backward nations in that part of the world lies, clearly and inescapably, in the direction of Russia. They will have to overthrow their present racketeer rule, form a Balkan or East European federation of collectivist national republics, and in some mutually satisfactory way attach themselves to the U. S. S. R.

Now I see why the Russian revolution was necessary, from the standpoint not only of backward, peasant Russia but of the world at large.

Again quoting from *The Native's Return*:

I believe that a majority of people forming the Yugoslav Liberation Front and the Bulgarian underground are eager or ready for sovietization. * * * If sovietization, with all it implies, does occur, it may be the simplest process. The Yugoslav federation would become a republic within the Soviet Union and would most likely be headed by Tito or Dimitroff.

Dimitroff was previously head of the Communist International.

While Mr. Adamic is glowing in his praise of the Soviet Union, whose interests I charge he is openly promoting above all others, although he is not registered as a foreign agent, which, in my opinion, he should be, his attitude toward the land of his adoption is cynical, to say the least. I now quote from his book entitled "Dynamite":

The story I present here is, as I see it, a criticism of your American capitalist-democratic civilization, the most severe criticism, it seems to me, that anyone could write. * * * America is at the crossroads. * * * Right or left? * * * But eventually it will be left, for in the very nature * * * it is a left or revolutionary country.

Mr. Adamic has a record of association with the following Communist front organizations, which shows indisputably where his real sympathy and loyalty lie:

- American Artists and Writers Committee.
- American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau.
- Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo.
- Film Audiences for Democracy.
- Films for Democracy.
- National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.
- National Committee for Peoples Rights.
- National Emergency Conference.
- Fight magazine—official organ of the American League for Peace and Democracy.
- American Writers Congress.
- Conference on Pan American Democracy.

A number of these organizations have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Louis Adamic also spoke in honor of George Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International, at a meeting held in Carnegie Hall, in New York, on December 22, 1943, together with Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, did it ever occur to you that for months and months all reports coming out of Yugoslavia after Germany overran that country, contained glowing accounts of Gen. Draja Mihailovich? Reports of how his guerrillas were the only forces in that section of the Balkans that were giving resistance to Hitler's hordes? How, because of their opposition, Hitler was not and has not to this day been able to conquer all of Yugoslavia.

Recently, as a result of the activities of Adamic and his henchmen, the exploits of General Mihailovich have not only been deleted from the American press, but he is now being undermined and slandered as a Nazi agent. Using all the arts of fiction and propaganda, Adamic and his group of trained seals are flooding the country with fabulous tales about a mysterious character, an avowed Communist, named Tito, and his Partisans.

Mr. Speaker, you or no one else ever heard of Tito and his Partisans until after Germany attacked Russia, and it is generally acknowledged that if it had not been for General Mihailovich, Hitler would have overrun Yugoslavia a long time ago.

On November 28, 1943, a United Press dispatch from London quoted the Yugoslav Partisans as announcing that the rail line from Sarajevo to Visegrad had been practically destroyed. Notwithstanding the fact that this dispatch gave credit to the Partisans for this work, another dispatch, dated December 6, 1943, by press wireless quoted a dispatch from the Woods and Mountain Radio Station of General Mihailovich to the effect that the blowing up of these bridges was done by General Miroslav Trifunovich, a commander in the Yugoslav Army under General Mihailovich, and that the complete destruction of the bridges was executed in the presence of Brigadier Armstrong, the chief of the British Military Mission, and Lt. Col. Siez, the chief of the American Military Mission. To my knowledge, there has never been a denial by anyone in authority of the truthfulness of this latter statement. I cite this as an example of the unreliability and the nondependability of many of the statements appearing in the American press, regarding the situation in Yugoslavia.

An example of the loose methods now being employed in selling Tito and his Partisans to the American people is to be found in the New York Times of December 22, 1943, in which is depicted a so-called Partisan hero, accompanying a story about Yugoslavia by Mr. Sulzberger. Unfortunately, those responsible forgot to note that they had used the same picture on October 12, 1941, to de-

picat a heroic Chetnik. The photograph is identical, even to the Chetnik insignia on the soldier's turban in both instances.

Because I had noticed particularly the United Press releases in the newspapers began the policy of carrying a great deal of information about Tito and very little about General Mihailovich, I made an appointment to talk with Mr. Earl Johnson, vice president and the active head of the United Press in New York City. I spent 2 hours with him in his office on the 27th of November. Mr. Johnson explained to me that their London correspondent who had been furnishing the reports at first, received his information in London from the Yugoslav Government in exile, headed by King Peter, but since they moved to Cairo, the Partisan representatives had established headquarters in London, and they were the only group available in London for releases.

Mr. Johnson also informed me that in an attempt to get reports direct from General Mihailovich, he had sent one of his best reporters to Cairo, where King Peter had given him permission to go to General Mihailovich's headquarters, but the reporter was unable to obtain transportation. This section of the Mediterranean is under the control of Great Britain.

Another recognized foreign correspondent has been trying for many months to reach the Balkans, in order to give a true picture of what is happening there, only to have innumerable official and unofficial obstacles thrown in his way.

As far as I know, there is no one in the United States who can positively identify Tito, or knows what he looks like. The picture frequently used in connection with any article about him is a facsimile said to be from a German poster offering a 100,000 reichsmarks reward for his capture, and it is a likeness of a certain Josip Broz, whom they believe to be Tito. Because the likeness of Josip Broz resembles in some respects certain features of Abraham Lincoln, many articles have been written comparing the two men. Naturally the Communists play up this angle, because for many years they have been capitalizing on the popularity of Lincoln.

Just to refresh your memories on a few incidents, the Communists formed the Lincoln Brigade during the Spanish Revolution, they have a camp for children near Chicago, called the Lincoln Camp, and only recently they have changed the name of their school in Chicago from the Workers School to the Abraham Lincoln School.

During the week of February 7-11 of this year, a publication which is distributed to school children in Detroit carried a half-page story on Tito, and accompanying the article was a picture of Abraham Lincoln. It is an insufferable slander on the character of our Abraham Lincoln to draw any comparison between him and Tito.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on this situation in the near future as it pertains to Poland, but the treatment Poland has been receiving parallels the

Yugoslav situation so closely, I feel compelled to make some reference to it at this time.

Have you forgotten how gallant, heroic Poland stood up and fought Hitler's powerful mechanized army, when she really had nothing with which to fight? Have you forgotten those solemn vows that were made that Poland would be avenged, restored, and made to live again?

Where are all those who professed their friendship, and wanted to do so much to help Poland? Now is the time to speak up and make your voices heard, for tomorrow may be too late.

The March 1944 issue of *The Sign*, a national Catholic magazine published by the Passionist Missions, Inc., in an article entitled "Atlantic Charter on Trial," had this, among other things, to say regarding Poland:

The happenings of 1939 are still fresh in most people's memories. It is too early to say with absolute certainty whether there was a Russo-German agreement stipulating that the U. S. S. R. and the Third Reich would attack Poland simultaneously, and that the new border between both totalitarian countries should run along the Vistula. All we know definitely is that the Soviet Union delayed her attack till September 17, and that military actions took place. The Soviet Union had waged an undeclared war against Poland, and this was publicly admitted by Molotov in his report to the Fifth Extraordinary Session of the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1939. The Soviet Union then proceeded to deport not only the Poles from that area but also the leaders of the Ukrainian and White Russian non-Communists parties. Nationalists and Socialists met an identical fate. A mock election took place early in 1940 which "proved" that 97 percent of the population desired Soviet rule.

One million six hundred thousand people were deported into the interior of the U. S. S. R. Of these, 230,000 were prisoners of war, 144,000 were able to leave for western countries via Persia, a few hundred thousand were located, but over 900,000 people are unaccounted for. They may or may not be alive.

The proposal to give to the Soviet Union East Poland and to give to Poland East Germany is so immoral and contrary to all principles of the Atlantic Charter that it need not be discussed in a Catholic periodical. It probably would prevent peace between Germany and Poland for all future times, a situation pleasing to Russia with its recrudescing Pan-Slavist tendencies, but against the interests of a Christian Europe.

East Poland in Soviet hands means the very end of the idealism of the Atlantic Charter and the end of Allied prestige. It would be the total negation of the democratic principle of self-determination. It would thoroughly undermine the confidence of the continental European nations in the Anglo-Saxon powers and their professed ideals.

Is it any wonder people all over the world are asking where is the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. Speaker, I defy any one of these individuals who did everything possible to undermine our form of government and sabotage our defense program until Hitler marched into Russia on June 21, 1941, to match my 25 years of work in Americanism, at all times putting forth my best efforts in behalf of our country and everything our Constitution guar-

antees. Since when do these June 21, 1941, superpatriots speak for true Americanism?

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that Louis Adamic is considered by many people in the United States, including myself, as far more dangerous to our American way of life than Earl Browder? A man like Browder, who is out in the open, I do not consider nearly as dangerous as a man like Adamic, who hides behind organizations of high-sounding names.

At the beginning of this speech I expressed my reluctance to make it, and that I had hoped events would not make it necessary. But in view of what I feel is about to happen in Europe at any moment, I considered it my patriotic duty to do so.

The event that I am now fearful will happen in Europe is that General Mihailovich and all his guerrilla forces that have and could add so much to the winning of this war, especially against Hitler, will be thrown to the wolves by denying them the matériel and supplies they so badly need to contribute their part on the side of the United Nations. It would not surprise me one bit to read in the papers any day that King Peter was recalled to London to serve notice on him that henceforth General Mihailovich and the government in exile can no longer look to the United Nations for help, but, instead, that only Tito and the Partisans will be assisted. If this comes to pass, in my humble opinion, it will be a sad mistake and will delay the final victory in Europe.

When we established these United States we assumed a gigantic responsibility to the millions who placed their faith in America and what she stands for. Let us make sure that faith is not shattered and that we remain true to our trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

UNNECESSARY POWER PROJECTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I always regard it as a privilege to have an opportunity to address this House and all of the Members therein. As I say, it is always a privilege to talk to them, to give the majority party an opportunity to save a little money which otherwise would be wasted—money of the taxpayers. I am only talking here today about an opportunity to save some \$52,000,000, and I am really concerned as to where all of the 216 Members of the majority party went—is there a \$100-a-plate dinner scheduled somewhere?—and where is that lone Democrat coming from who is going to move, by custom, the adjournment of the House? I have in the past had the privilege of addressing remarks on this subject of unnecessary power projects to somewhat larger audiences. At times on the majority side we have had as many as 5 present, at others 3, but unless at least 1 gentleman of the majority comes in who will have to move the adjournment of the House we may have

to waive the custom of this august body and exercise a hitherto unused privilege and request some Member of the minority to adjourn the House so that we may all go home for the day.

NONESSENTIAL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS: CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW THE POWER PROGRAM—A THIRD REPORT

Mr. Speaker, this is my third report to the Congress on the subject of nonessential Government power projects.

On September 17, 1942, I addressed the House on the wastage of critical materials embodied in the continued construction of entirely unessential public power projects. I itemized by name the projects to which I referred. Previous criticisms of extravagant power-need estimates had already brought down on my head from the New Deal's radical wing their usual epithet of "reactionary." In the tarnished lexicon of the left, anyone who demands to be shown is a reactionary.

I again addressed this House on December 2, 1942, at which time I reported on steps I had taken to publicize the unnecessary character of these projects and to bring about their abandonment. I reported that work on the projects had, after some maneuvering around, been suspended, thus releasing an immense quantity of critical materials for use in the building of warships, planes, and other war materials.

In my first speech on this subject, of September 17, 1942, I said:

The continuance of these nonessential projects involves the expenditure of a great deal of the taxpayers' money, which expenditure could well be deferred until the institution of the public-works program after the war, since money, too, is ammunition and ought not to be spent for any but the most essential purposes in wartime. To spend it for nonessential public-works projects is, in effect, to throw it away, in view of the crisis in the battle of production which now impends.

I am addressing the House today because I have information that the same crowd of New Deal spendthrifts whose efforts have been balked from time to time are at it again, and they plan to seize certain unexpended funds and to waste them upon nonessential public-works projects, not for the war effort but to promote their own particular post-war ideology. I am in a position to say, upon excellent authority, that the construction these boondogglers have in mind will provide power for which there will be no need whatsoever, at the very least, until 1952.

In this first speech I also warned:

The whole history of these projects warrants the public in concluding . . . that those who are charged with the completion of the projects can be expected to use every sort of pressure to raise the priority rating later and to wangle critical materials from every nook and corner in order to keep these New Deal projects going, and thus to assure the continuance of their nonessential, non-war jobs. . . . Thus, by its insistence upon the building of certain dams and completion of certain generator units at high priority ratings—while construction of other generator units continues at a presumably slower pace—our bureaucrats, to whom the war must seem very distant indeed, are actu-

ally depriving the war effort of materials of a most critical nature. Thus the completion of these dams means that some ships will not be built, some planes will not fly, some tanks will not roll.

WARSHIPS POWERED BY EQUIPMENT SAVED ON POWER PROGRAM

The last words proved prophetic: When I said that the completion of these unnecessary dams would mean that some ships would not be built, I necessarily had in mind the converse of that statement as well, namely, that if these nonessential projects could be halted more critically needed ships than ever could be constructed, and more planes and more tanks. As it turned out, successful halting of these nonessential projects had precisely the predicted effect. The Electrical World of February 19, 1944, in an article, quoted in full at the end of these remarks, said, in part:

The reddest face must be that of the New Republic magazine, which in April 1942, carried an article titled "The Power Lobby Comes Back," reading in part:

"Constantine Bary of (W. P. B.'s) Power Unit, is playing into the hands of reactionary Congressmen who gobble up the short-sighted power-need estimates he hands them, refusing to consider as war projects any which cannot be completed within the next 2 years. Bary and his pals are gambling thousands of lives on this bet that our war needs will be a thing of the past 2 years from now."

No doubt the Marshall's invasion fleet includes craft which are powered by the turbines, boilers, and generators which W. P. B. decided not to install at Ottumwa and points west—the power capacity saved in the big program slash of mid-1942 which was based, among other things, on Bary's short-sighted power-need estimates.

On December 2, 1942, I reported to the House that the Power Branch of the War Production Board having exhibited no interest in the statements made by me on an earlier occasion, I then communicated with the Acting Chief of the Power Branch on October 6, 1942, and October 20, 1942, demanding information as to whether these unnecessary power projects were continuing and if so, why? On the day following my last letter, namely, October 21, 1942, Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, announced in an official press release the revocation of priority assignments "on a large part of nonmilitary construction" and on October 24, 1942, the Acting Chief of the Power Branch confirmed to me that the cancellation of nonessential Government projects referred to more euphemistically as "non-military construction," included the projects itemized by me in the September speech as the T. V. A. and Department of the Interior projects and further advised me that he had been personally informed by the Corps of Engineers that they had also halted work on their projects. All of these statements were confirmed to me by the Acting Chief of the Power Branch in a letter dated October 27, 1942.

On October 28, being convinced that it would be advisable to make absolutely certain of the intention to abandon these

projects, I wrote the acting chief of the power branch:

Does this mean that all projects enumerated in the press release of August 22 (copy of which list I enclose) have been definitely abandoned for the duration of the war?

The acting chief of the Power Branch replied by letter dated October 29, 1942:

As to the projects listed in the press release of August 22 under the heading "Government projects proceeding on low priorities or unrated," as indicated in my letter of October 27, priorities have either been revoked or, as I understand it, are in the process of being revoked by action of the facilities committee.

I doubt whether anyone could say with absolute assurance whether or not it might be necessary before the close of the war to reinstate some of these projects. That question should depend upon future developments in the situation with respect to power supply and requirements.

You will note the escape clause contained in the last sentence. I have been wondering whether the future developments referred to with respect to power supply and requirements warranted the construction of additional power projects.

PRESENT CONSTRUCTION ADEQUATE

The facts show that present construction has proved entirely adequate to meet the power needs of the country and that the termination of these nonessential projects was both wise and timely. It develops, as will be seen at more length in the article from the *Electrical World*, which is included hereafter, that the power estimates of the War Production Board proved to be accurate within thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent. The power program, during this period of expansion, was in direct competition with the program for warships, synthetic rubber, high octane gasoline plants, and other critical programs. As the result of the able Mr. Constantine Bary's remarkably accurate estimate of the Nation's power needs, it is now clear that the power program in this competition with other essential war materials received and used just about what it needed. This means that because of the decision to suspend the unnecessary projects, it did not take steel, copper, plant space, or skilled manpower which it did not need, and thus did not use them to the disadvantage of competing programs.

This is not to say that the ideological New Deal public-power advocates deserve any credit; it is abundantly clear that constant pressure was exercised to obtain the completion of the additional and unnecessary power projects on which construction was stopped. Had new dealers succeeded with their extended power program, based upon erroneous estimates of the Federal Power Commission, then the power program would have taken away for nonessential uses vital war materials needed elsewhere.

I concluded my remarks on December 2, 1942, by saying:

One final word of warning: We can look for efforts from now on to get some of the suspended projects put back on the active list of projects to be completed, notwithstanding war demands. This will be done under the guise of war necessity, but they

will be the same Government projects which have been heretofore terminated as wasting critical materials and skills. * * * Without eternal vigilance we will certainly lose some of the ground gained.

I was right about the need for eternal vigilance.

On January 17, 1944, I wrote to the Bureau of the Budget to inquire as to status of appropriations unexpended but held in active condition presumably to meet emergency war requirements of electric power.

On February 1, 1944, I received a letter from the Director of the Budget enclosing copies of correspondence, which I set forth at this point in chronological order:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1943.
The Honorable HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: As you know, the War Production Board has recently found it necessary to stop work on certain electric generating projects of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the War Department. All of these projects had been authorized by the Congress and appropriations had been made for them.

Major new electric projects are among the chief competitors with our most urgent and important war programs, such as rubber, aviation gasoline, heavy bombers, warships, merchant ships, ammunition, and lend-lease. Because of the exceedingly tight situation as to critical materials, manufacturing facilities, and manpower for such programs, it has been necessary for us to operate and plan on the basis of close margins in the electric field.

In consequence, if changing conditions at any time during the next 6 months should dictate expansion of our existing power program, it would be necessary to reinstate some of the halted Federal projects on very short notice. In that event, any delay in resuming work might prevent completion of the project in time to meet power requirements in the area affected. We have planned our power program with a high degree of flexibility so that we shall be able to meet all contingencies, provided only that the operating Government agencies which we count upon to provide expansion will themselves be in a position to act with promptness.

In order that we may be prepared for quick action, as circumstances may require, I should like to enlist the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget in measures to make funds available to the Government power agencies so that the moment the War Production Board decides that any particular project must be reinstated, the money for that purpose will be immediately available. Until just before the decision to reinstate any project it is impossible to specify the projects or the total capacity which it might be necessary to have. However, on the basis of present outlook, there is a possibility that at some time prior to the end of this fiscal year, we should want to reinstate as much as several hundred thousand kilowatts of capacity for the Department of the Interior, several hundred thousand for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a substantial—although lesser amount—for the War Department, all to be selected from among the projects recently halted.

I shall greatly appreciate your advice as to what steps are necessary to be prepared, from a budgetary standpoint, for such a program. We shall, of course, be glad to go over this matter with you in detail; and, if desirable, I shall be glad to present to the appropriate committees of the Congress the urgent necessity for the measures I am recommending.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1943.
HON. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: We have your letter of January 12, 1943, advising of the possibility of renewing construction on some of the Federal projects recently halted by orders of the War Production Board. We have reviewed the funds available to the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the War Department for the authorized electric-generating projects and find that sufficient sums are available to make the obligations necessary for renewing and continuing construction until such supplementary appropriations as may be required are obtained.

As you know, work on projects stopped by the war production order is being brought to a close and men and construction material will soon be moved to other sites or disposed of completely. In the interest of economy, the saving of material and skilled labor, and the speedy completion of those projects necessary to meet war-connected needs, it seems to me that an early decision should be made with respect to those projects that are to be reinstated. You may be assured of my full cooperation in connection with the financing of such projects, whether by the release of presently reserved funds or by recommending supplemental appropriations.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE COY,
Assistant Director.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1943.
Mr. WAYNE COY,
Assistant Director,
Bureau of the Budget.

MY DEAR MR. COY: Mr. Nelson has requested me to reply to your letter of January 21 with reference to the funds required for renewing construction on Federal power projects recently halted by the War Production Board, should circumstances warrant such construction at a later date. We are pleased that you have found sufficient sums for this purpose until such supplementary appropriations as may be required are obtained.

It is recognized that some time and money have been lost through the halting of these projects, but in view of the greater need for materials and equipment in connection with other urgent programs, this sacrifice was a necessary one. We do not expect the situation will change sufficiently during the next several months to warrant any new decision, but we are following conditions as they develop. Before the middle of the year we will have better information as to whether some of these projects should be reinstated. We shall keep you advised concerning developments.

Very truly yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Power Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1944.
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCOTT: I have received your letter of January 17, 1944, in which you request advice as to the status of appropria-

tions which Mr. Donald Nelson requested be held in active condition to meet emergency war requirements of electric power. Your letter also requests copies of correspondence between Mr. Nelson and this office.

In the period of preparedness, prior to the declarations of war, funds were appropriated to the War Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to permit those agencies to construct various flood-control, reclamation, and navigation projects, at which appreciable amounts of hydroelectric power would be developed. However, as a result of the critical situation which arose in connection with materials, facilities, equipment, and manpower, many of these projects which did not lend themselves to early completion were suspended. Under date of January 12, 1943, Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, recommended that the appropriations for those projects be held for immediate use in the event the Board found it essential to the war program to proceed with the construction of any of the facilities involved.

Mr. Nelson's request has been adhered to by the Bureau of the Budget insofar as it has not been in conflict with the administration's fiscal program. The appropriations were generally made available solely for specific projects and available until expended. By and large, these funds were placed in reserve for obligation as needs developed. Certain of the appropriations, however, have been available for general programs rather than limited to specific projects, and, as it has not been consistent with budgetary policy to build up unnecessary balances of unobligated funds, these appropriations have, with the consent of Congress, been used to finance other projects which have been considered immediately urgent and essential to the prosecution of the war but which do not involve hydroelectric power development. This has been particularly true with respect to funds appropriated to the War Department.

The Budget for 1945 indicates that the Tennessee Valley Authority will have approximately \$19,262,298 unobligated on June 30, 1944, the greater portion of which is for power facilities, and the Bonneville Power Administration will have about \$24,969,339 for the construction of power transmission facilities. Most of the funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation for power facilities have been released to meet schedules approved by the War Production Board. The unobligated balance to be available to the War Department for power projects at the end of the fiscal year is estimated at \$7,525,883.

In accordance with your request, there are enclosed copies of the correspondence on this subject between this office and the War Production Board.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director*.

KEEP YOUR EYE ON THE \$52,000,000

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that the unobligated balances referred to in the Budget letter total \$51,757,520.

These unobligated balances amounting to nearly \$52,000,000 present an almost irresistible temptation to the public power planners who are hopeful that these balances can continue to be retained until such time as labor, material, and equipment are available for the construction of more and more unnecessary and presently unusable power projects.

Why unnecessary? Why presently unusable? Because the Government's own power forecasts assure that it will take 2 to 3 years after the end of the war to reach post-war electric loads higher than those which actually obtained in 1943. In some regions where the load

growth during the war has been very high, and this has especial application to the regions such as T. V. A. and Bonneville where most of the load growth during the war has been caused by war industries, it may take considerably more than 3 years after victory to produce loads higher than actually obtained in 1943. These conclusions are based on present construction without contemplating any additional construction whatever.

Why should these fifty-two millions of unobligated balances be held to tempt the spending brigades who are putting in a lot of time in Washington hotel rooms trying to find some way to use this money without regard to any war need but rather to a view to carrying out a long-range program of Government domination through control of public power?

As far back as January 12, 1943, it will be noted that Mr. Nelson referred to the possibility of the need for reinstatement of several hundred thousand of kilowatt capacity for the Department of the Interior, several hundred thousand for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a substantial although lesser amount for the War Department, all to be selected from among the projects recently halted. As a matter of fact, as of February 11, 1944, 13 months later, no additional kilowatt capacity has had to be reinstated for the War Department or for the Department of the Interior and only 130,000 kilowatts of capacity for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Why should these \$52,000,000 continue to be kept in escrow? These funds were appropriated by Congress at a time when the duly appointed agencies of the Government were concerned about the adequacy of power supply and so advised Congress. The shortage of power supply reported by the Federal Power Commission—see reports of 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942—was based on the power requirements of national defense and later war production. Congress, supporting the requests of duly constituted executive agencies, appropriated funds in amounts consistent with the seriousness of the situation. As reported by Mr. Nelson in all reports on power supply in late 1942 and in 1943, there is ample power supply to meet all needs through 1945. The funds were appropriated for war needs. There are no unsatisfied needs for war. There is therefore no reason for the funds to be held further.

Should not the unexpended appropriations be returned? They should be returned. Any use of these funds now in the type of facility for which they were appropriated will not be in accordance with the intent of Congress in making the funds available. Under the laws of this country executive agencies point out, a Government agency having appropriations must, as promptly as possible, proceed with the work. And the only reason the work is not in progress now is because priorities for releases must be had from the War Production Board. Any release of material, labor, or equipment would be the signal for the agencies holding these appropriations to proceed, citing existing authorizations as their au-

thority. This temptation to proceed at the earliest possible opportunity should be removed. The result of such construction will be in the interest of long-range Government power planning rather than the creation of power needed for war purposes. The original intent of Congress in making the appropriation, could thus be subverted.

TIME TO REVIEW THE POWER PROGRAM

Is not this the time to review the projects on their merits? Depending on war developments and timing of major offensives, the period will come when the only restrictions—those of the War Production Board—will be removed and all unexpended balances will be available for use as soon as labor, material, and equipment can be mobilized. For Congress to delay its review can well mean substantial loss of the taxpayer's money where facilities are started under the war emergency appropriations, only to be canceled belatedly by congressional action.

Much of the power capacity installed by the various agencies has been unable to provide under low-water conditions energy required to meet the needs of three-shift, 7-day week working programs. They were installed as war facilities, but with adverse water conditions were unable to meet the requirements of war without costly help from others. They have peaking capacity, but under adverse water conditions lack the energy—water—to make that power keep flowing as long as the war plants need it.

The United States Government has spent billions of dollars in this type of facilities during the war. The Government-owned power facilities have been expanded to almost 150 percent of their pre-Pearl Harbor installation. Congress has not investigated the propriety of these expenditures.

It has not compared the cost per kilowatt of net firm capacity against any other installed presently available means of generating power. Congress has not compared original estimates with actual additional amounts spent on individual irrigation, flood control, or waterway projects to combine power generation with the fundamental purpose of the installations.

TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE POWER PROGRAM DESTROYING SOURCES OF TAXATION?

Congress has not checked the effect on tax collections brought about by the nationalization of power facilities, formerly owned by tax-paying corporations and individuals and covering large portions of many of the States.

NEED FOR REVIEW NOW

Certainly the projects stopped by the War Production Board and for which funds are now being held, should be reviewed to ascertain their merit and that review should take place before the only key log in the dam, the authority held by the War Production Board, is released.

The determination of the merit of these projects, and of future projects, will require a review and evaluation of the expenditures that have been made, particularly because of the amounts of

money that have been spent in the war rush with no review by Congress.

Reverting to my earlier warning that this whole program will continue to call for checking and rechecking on Government bureaus, I have sent a letter under date of March 13, 1944, to Mr. J. A. Krug, Director, Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, in which I have requested certain up-to-date information, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1944.

Mr. J. A. KRUG,
Director, Office of War Utilities,
War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KRUG: The Government projects on the list attached to this letter were referred to in a press release on August 22, 1942, as "proceeding on low priorities or un-rated."

On October 21, 1942, an official press release, duly carried by the Associated Press, stated that Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, had given instructions to revoke priority assignments to a large part of nonmilitary construction for the Federal Government. On October 24, 1942, the Acting Chief of the Power Branch advised me that the cancellation on nonessential Government projects related to the T. V. A. and Department of the Interior projects referred to on the attached list and that he had been personally advised by the Corps of Engineers that they had halted work on their projects. This he confirmed in a letter to me dated October 27, 1942.

I should like specific information on the following points:

1. Has work ever been resumed on any of the projects on the attached list?
2. If so, when was the work resumed and to what extent has the work progressed?
3. From what source were such funds obtained and in what amounts?
4. What priorities were allowed on such construction and by whom?
5. If construction was resumed, what reason was given for the resumption and who approved it?

I would appreciate a detailed reply to this request at your earliest possible convenience.

With assurance of my best personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

AGENCY, PLANT, AND LOCATION

Tennessee Valley: Wilson Nos. 15, 16, Alabama; Watts Bar No. 4 (steam), Tennessee; Pickwick No. 5, Tennessee; Fort Loudon Nos. 3, 4, Tennessee; Guntersville No. 4, Alabama; Chicamauga No. 4, Tennessee; Wautaga Nos. 1, 2, Tennessee; Wheeler Nos. 5, 6, Alabama; South Holston Nos. 1, 2, Tennessee; Wilson (steam), Alabama; Fontana No. 3, North Carolina; Kentucky Nos. 3, 4, 5, Kentucky.

United States Engineers: Bluestone, W. Va.; Markham Ferry, Okla.; Wolf Creek, Ky.; Center Hill, Tenn.; Allatoona, Ga.; Norfolk No. 2, Arkansas; Fort Peck No. 2, Montana; Fort Gibson, Okla.; Denison No. 2, Texas-Oklahoma.

United States Bureau of Reclamation: Colorado-Big Thompson, Colorado; Anderson Ranch, Idaho; Keswick No. 3, California; Davis Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Arizona-Nevada.

Federal Works Agency: Pensacola, Okla.; High Point, N. C.

Bonneville Administration: Grand Coulee Nos. 7, 8, 9, Washington.

Numbers designate generator units in hydroelectric developments.

I will advise the House of any information received in reply to this request. I suspect that some of these proj-

ects were revived since it was felt that pressure on the Hill had lightened up somewhat and it will be interesting to see whether this is true. Perhaps I am unduly suspicious, but past experience would lead me to believe that my suspicions may be justified.

I also submit at this point the article in the *Electrical World* to which reference has been made.

WASHINGTON COMMENT

(By R. N. LARKIN)

ON THE NOSE

Stories of industrial miracles achieved under pressure of the war are legion. An equally astounding performance, concerning the electric power industry, came to light February 7, through a Federal Power Commission release listing the peak load on principal utility systems in 1943.

This is a story of long-range planning and estimating, of calculated chance-taking whose tangible results can be measured in fighting ships now in action—or almost ready to fight—which otherwise would be months away from the water, in rubber and high-octane gasoline plants producing for war instead of being merely under construction.

F. P. C. dispute

In October 1941 there was furious dispute as to the war requirements of electric power. The Office of Production Management, whose Power Division was then small, was arrayed against F. P. C. and other Federal agencies which foresaw only disaster unless power equipment was rushed to completion in tremendous amounts. F. P. C. had predicted a 1943 peak load of 42,715,000 kilowatts. O. P. M. set it at 37,400,000 kilowatts. The abuse which rained down on O. P. M.'s figure was heavy.

F. P. C.'s recent release set the 1943 peak load at 37,063,961 kilowatts. For the purposes of power supply calculation, however, the actual 1943 peak load was 37,252,000 kilowatts, which is the sum of all noncoincident peaks at the end of the year. Area peaks were attained from August through December. Since area power supply must be calculated on the number of kilowatts which will be required in a given area in a given year, the sum of all area peaks at the end of the year is the more valid figure for O. W. U. W. P. B.'s 1943 peak, calculated 27 months in advance, was high by four-tenths of 1 percent. F. P. C.'s prediction 30 months in advance was 14.6 percent high on O. W. U.'s actual peak.

Seventeen months after its original estimate of 1943 peak, in February 1943, a W. P. B. review came up with a 1943 peak of 37,250,000 kilowatts, so close to the actual 1943 sum peak that the difference can hardly be figured.

Again in July 1943, 6 months before totals were in, W. P. B. recalculated its estimated 1943 peak, setting it this time at 37,310,000 kilowatts. This estimate proved to be 13/100 of 1 percent high.

The significance of these predictions is immediately apparent when it is realized that the power program was in direct competition with such programs as fighting and cargo ships for boilers, turbines, valves, and generators, with synthetic rubber and high-octane gasoline plants for pumps, valves, and boilers. It competed with everything for steel, copper, plant space, and skilled manpower at a time when these things were tightest.

Acknowledgments

This long-term sharpshooting of such phenomenal accuracy was almost entirely the work of the Power Forecast Section of W. P. B.'s Power Division, later O. W. U., headed by Constantine Bary, on loan from the

Philadelphia Electric Co.¹ He credits five factors for its accuracy.

Part of it was luck. The original estimates, for instance, included 100,000 kilowatts of aluminum capacity, 100,000 kilowatts of steel capacity, and 100,000 kilowatts of special ordnance work which failed to materialize in 1943. The resulting overestimate was offset by cancellation of the coastal military dim-outs which added 300,000 kilowatts to the 1943 peak. There were other similar instances of sheer luck.

Part of the credit goes to executives of several operating utility companies who had the "pre-war vision" to finance the slow and painstaking research work on class-of-load characteristics over a wide range of energy use which was necessary for the calculations to have any basis of merit. It was as a result of this pre-war research that authentic relationships were established which were of real value in appraising the behavior of war loads.

Dr. Maurice Levin, formerly of O. F. M. and W. P. B., gets part of the credit. It was in several conversations with Dr. Levin that Bary got his ideas on the interrelationship between war loads and civilian load displacement which played a significant part in the forecasting of 1943 power requirements.

Part of the credit goes to F. P. C. which made available to W. P. B. comprehensive historic statistical data on utility system loads and energy output. This data was invaluable for trend analysis.

Part of the credit is due Bary for having developed methods of making load forecasts.

J. A. Krug, then chief of W. P. B.'s Power Division, and his staff brought to their jobs broad operating and engineering experience and the knowledge of the industry's problems which comes only with that experience. Their predictions and programs were assailed by some public and even a few private systems when W. P. B. compared its estimates with those of major groups of electric systems.

The power lobby

The reddest face must be that of the New Republic magazine, which, in April 1942, carried an article titled "The Power Lobby Comes Back," reading in part:

"Constantine Bary, of (W. P. B.'s) Power Unit, is playing into the hands of reactionary Congressmen who gobble up the short-sighted power-need estimates he hands them, refusing to consider as war projects any which cannot be completed within the next 2 years. Bary and his pals are gambling thousands of lives on this bet that our war needs will be a thing of the past 2 years from now."

No doubt the Marshalls invasion fleet includes craft which are powered by the turbines, boilers, and generators which W. P. B. decided not to install at Ottumwa and points west—the power capacity saved in the big program slash of mid-1942 which was based, among other things, on Bary's "short-sighted power-need estimates."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress of the United States, through appropriate committees, should review the entire power program, that the Congress should regain control over these unobligated balances, and should impose such further controls as would seem desirable on future spending for the construction of additional power projects. No longer can the argument of military necessity be used to justify the wildest kind of

¹Mr. Bary is the author of the analytical study of the behavior of electricity system loads following the war which appeared in the January 8 issue of *Electrical World* under the title "Post-War Loads on Electric Utility Systems."

estimates and excessive construction of various petty projects requested by administration favorites and diverted to favored sections of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters and correspondence referred to, together with certain lists of Government power projects and an article from the Electrical World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain figures pertaining to shipments on the Missouri River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SOLDIER VOTE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the law that was passed in the 1943 session of the general court regarding the bill passed to allow the soldiers, the men and women absentee voters, the privilege of voting, and also two letters of thanks from men who were overseas, because they were allowed to vote in the municipal election at Brookline, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the 1943 session of the general court, Massachusetts passed, so far as I know, the first law and blazed the trail which allows the absentee men and women overseas of our fighting forces to vote in all of the Federal, State, and municipal elections. It is a very fine thing that they did in blazing the trail. You will note that Massachusetts, as a result of popular demand and foresight, accomplished the very thing that supporters of the Federal ballot proposal have argued States would not do.

The Massachusetts act provides for the registration of men who reach the voting age while serving abroad or at distant camps. Their relatives can record them as voters. It also permits servicemen's relatives to have ballots mailed to servicemen who do not personally apply for them. When the special session of the general court advances the date of the primaries—a certainty—Massachusetts will have made it possible for all servicemen everywhere to vote.

The experience of the town of Brookline is informative and inspiring. In a recent Brookline municipal election, in which there were few contests and no unusual interest, 242 servicemen voted. A ballot sent to a soldier in London was back in 5 days; a ballot sent to a com-

missioned officer in India was back in 26 days; a ballot sent to a man in north Africa was back in 11 days; a ballot sent to a sailor on the Pacific Fleet flagship was back in 17 days; a ballot sent to a marine in the Solomons was back in 23 days; a ballot sent to a soldier in Alaska was back in 14 days.

In brief, Brookline reached the most distant points of the globe, and did it all in less than a month. If this had been a national election, with the Federal Government speeding the movement of the ballots, the time for the transmission of each could have been shortened by several days.

There can be no doubt about the honesty of the system which Massachusetts has demonstrated to be practical and appealing to the servicemen.

There is a very strong probability that the Green-Lucas bill is unconstitutional. It seems to me that the Green-Lucas bill is unconstitutional because the Constitution of the United States clearly and specifically gives exclusive control of ballots to the States and in no circumstances and for no purpose permits Federal control. Besides, the servicemen want and deserve a complete ballot and the right to vote for all persons listed as candidates.

If servicemen will vote in India for a school-committee aspirant in Brookline, surely they will vote for Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter sent by a serviceman to Mr. Arthur J. Shinnery, town clerk, Brookline, Mass. This serviceman is somewhere in Sicily:

I guess that you must be wondering what the reason is for you to be receiving a letter from somewhere in Sicily, and so here 'tis.

If you will notice, I have left out the line which is to be filled in with some sort of address, to which the official absent voting ballot is to be mailed, for my address is a little larger than the room on the application.

I must say that it really was a pleasure in receiving the ballot, for it is really wonderful the way the old town remembers all of us in the distant lands of the world. I can now brag even more about my town, for I really have the proof of the pudding in the application for the absent voter's ballot. Please let me thank you and wish you all well.

It will be seen that this letter expresses an appreciation of an opportunity to vote in just a municipal election.

The other letter addressed to Mr. Shinnery thanks him very much for sending an application for an absentee ballot and states that the writer will be very glad to have one sent to him.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1944.

DEAR MR. SHINNERS: Thank you very much for sending me an application for an absentee ballot. I shall be very glad to have one sent to me here.

I am now at Pearl Harbor, and the scenery here is very nice.

I hope you are well and that everything is O. K. in the town.

I will be very glad when this war is over and I can return to my old home town.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

If there is anyone has any doubt about the success of mailing a complete ballot

to the service men and women in order that they mark their ballots for every candidate running for office, I think this information proves that that person is wrong, and that the men and women will be overjoyed to have an opportunity to take part in the next election, which is only their just due. The Federal ballot would cheat the service men and women of two-thirds of their right to vote.

The Massachusetts absentee-voting law is as follows:

Chapter 390

An act relative to absent voting by residents of Massachusetts serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war and to the qualification of such residents as voters at certain elections

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. Except as herein provided, words and terms used in this act shall be construed in accordance with the definitions set forth in chapter 50 of the General Laws. For the purpose of this act, the word "kindred" shall mean spouse, father, mother, sister, or brother of the whole or halfblood, son, daughter, adopting parent or adopted child, stepparent or stepchild, uncle, aunt, niece, or nephew.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any contrary provision of general or special law, any legal resident of the Commonwealth while serving in the armed forces of the United States during the existing war between the United States and any foreign country and whose name is included in the current annual register of voters of any city or town therein, or who may be determined to be qualified as a voter thereof in accordance with section 8 of this act, may be furnished with an official absent voting ballot prepared in accordance with clause (a) of section 87 of chapter 54 of the General Laws, for, and may vote by means of such ballot at, any regular biennial State election or at any regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted, provided an application therefor is filed with the clerk of the city or town of which he is such legal resident and the same is certified by the registrars of voters thereof, in the manner hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. Application for an official absent voting ballot to be furnished to such resident for any such election may be made to the clerk of the city or town in which such resident is registered as a voter, or in which he has been determined to be qualified to vote as provided in said section 8, by any registered voter of the Commonwealth who is a kindred of such resident. The applicant shall state therein his name and that of the city or town in which he is registered as a voter, together with the street and number of his address, if any, the name of the resident in whose behalf the application is made, the place of his legal residence on January 1 of the current year, or on such subsequent date when he first became a legal resident of such city or town, and the address to which such ballot is to be mailed. The applicant shall also make a statement of his relationship to such resident, shall make oath to the truth of all statements in such application, and shall sign the same.

SEC. 4. The State secretary, or the clerk of each city and town subject to this act, as the case may be, shall seasonably prepare, prior to each regular biennial State election or regular annual or biennial city or town election, in such quantities as he shall deem necessary, all of the papers prescribed by said section 87 of said chapter 54, as amended, with such changes therein as may be required to give effect thereto. On the envelopes prepared for returning the official absent voting ballots furnished to any person determined to be qualified to vote under said section 8,

except as to his ability to sign his name and to read, there shall be provided a space for him to sign his name and there shall be printed five lines of the constitution of the Commonwealth in English. There shall be included in the jurat to be executed by the officer in whose presence such person makes his affidavit a statement setting forth that the affiant has signed his name in the officer's presence, and has read the said five lines in such a manner as to show that he was neither prompted nor reciting from memory, or was prevented by a physical disability from doing either.

Sec. 5. When an application is made for an official absent voting ballot as provided in section three and the same is filed with the city or town clerk, it shall be transmitted by said clerk forthwith to the registrars of voters of such city or town and, if they are satisfied that the statements therein are true and that the person in whose behalf the application is made is a duly registered voter of such city or town or has been determined to be qualified to vote therein at such election as provided in said section 8, they shall so certify thereon and return such application to the city or town clerk. If the person in whose behalf such an application is made is a duly registered voter, the clerk shall cause to be placed upon the voting list to be used at the election, to vote at which such application is made, the letters "SAV," in capitals, opposite the name of such voter. The said clerk shall then mail, postage prepaid, to such resident at the address designated in such application, such ballot together with all blank forms and envelopes required.

Sec. 6. Any such resident who has received an official absent voting ballot furnished in accordance with this act may vote by mailing the same to the clerk of the city or town where he resides. He shall mark such ballot in the presence of a commissioned officer in the armed forces, in a municipality or place other than the city or town in which it is determined that such voter is qualified to vote. Before marking his ballot he shall exhibit it to said officer, who shall satisfy himself that it is unmarked, but he shall not allow such officer to see how he marks it. Such officer shall hold no communication with such voter, nor he with such officer, as to how he votes. After marking his ballot he shall enclose it in the proper envelope provided for the purpose and shall execute in the presence of such officer the affidavit thereon. He shall then seal the envelope with the ballot therein and shall mail the same, postage prepaid, to the city or town clerk, on or before the day of the election in a municipality or place other than the city or town in which he has been determined to be qualified as a voter. The postmark, if legible, shall be evidence of the time and place of mailing.

Sec. 7. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the provisions of sections 86 to 103A of chapter 54 of the general laws relating to absent voting, and of sections 27 and 34 of chapter 56 of the general laws prescribing penalties for violations of laws relating to absent voting, shall, where pertinent, apply to absent voting under this act.

The provisions of section 95 of said chapter 54 relating to the duties of election officers at polling places with respect to absent voting ballots shall apply to ballots cast under this act. In addition to the duties prescribed by said section 95, the warden or his deputy shall, in comparing the statements appearing in the affidavits upon the envelopes in which such ballots are enclosed with the applications therefor, determine whether the statements appearing in such affidavits conform to those appearing in such applications, and whether the persons signing such affidavits have been determined to be qualified to vote at such election. All envelopes, opened and unopened, enclosing ballots re-

turned by persons determined to be qualified to vote at such election in accordance with said section 8 shall, instead of being retained and returned with the ballots cast, be enclosed and sealed in an envelope provided for the purpose of returning the same to the city or town clerk, and said clerk shall retain such envelope as long as he retains the ballots cast, after which he shall transmit the same to the registrars of voters who shall preserve such envelope for 5 years from the date of such election.

Sec. 8. Any legal resident of the Commonwealth who is serving in the armed forces of the United States during the existing war between the United States and any foreign country and who has the qualifications for voting prescribed by the constitution of the Commonwealth, but whose name is not included in the current annual register of the city or town of his legal residence, may be qualified for voting at any regular biennial State election or at any regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted upon the personal application of a registered voter of the Commonwealth of the kindred of such resident made to the registrars of voters of the city or town in which the right of such resident to vote may be claimed. Such application may be made not less than 20 days before the day of such election at any time during regular business hours or at sessions held for the purpose of registering voters for such election, and shall be upon a form prescribed by the State secretary. The person making such application shall state thereon his name, and that of the city or town in which he is registered as a voter, with the street and number of his address, if any; the name of the person in whose behalf the application is made, his place of legal residence when he entered the service, on January 1 of the preceding year, on January 1 of the current year or on such later date when he first became a legal resident of such city or town, and at the time of making such application, and the place and date of his birth, and shall make a declaration that such resident has legally resided in the Commonwealth 1 year, and in the city or town in which his right to vote is claimed 6 months, next preceding the election at which such right is claimed. The applicant shall also make thereon a statement of his relationship to the resident in whose behalf such application is made, shall make oath to the truth of the statements therein and sign his name thereto.

If the resident in whose behalf such an application is made claims to be a naturalized citizen, or to derive United States citizenship through the naturalization or citizenship of some other person, the applicant shall produce for inspection papers of naturalization, certificate of citizenship made under Federal authority, or any other papers upon which he relies to prove the citizenship of the resident, and, if the registrars are satisfied that the resident is a citizen, they shall make upon such papers a memorandum of the date of such inspection.

The registrars shall make and certify on the application made under this section a statement of their determination as to whether or not the resident in whose behalf the application is made appears to be entitled to be registered, except the ability to sign his name and to read in the manner prescribed by article XX of the amendments to the Constitution. In case it is determined that such resident is not entitled to be registered, the registrars shall give written notice thereof to the applicant and give him an opportunity to be heard.

If the registrars certify that the resident has the qualifications entitling him to registration, except that his ability to sign his name and to read as prescribed by article XX of the amendments to the Constitution has not been determined, he shall, nevertheless, be entitled to receive an official absent voting

ballot and application therefor may be made in the manner provided in section 3 of this act. Before permitting him to mark his ballot, the officer referred to in section 6 of this act shall require him to sign his name if he is physically able to do so, and to read in his presence and in such a manner as to show that he was neither prompted nor reciting from memory the five lines of the Constitution printed on the return envelop as provided in section 4 of this act. If he is unable to do either, and is not prevented by physical disability from so doing, the officer shall so certify on said envelope, and shall not permit him to vote but shall return the envelope with the ballot enclosed and unmarked, and the ballot shall not be counted.

Applications for qualification of residents as voters under this section shall be preserved by the registrars for 5 years and the registrars shall cause a suitable index to be made containing the name of each person determined to be so qualified, his place of legal residence, with street and number of his address, if any, at the time of making such application, the name of the military or naval unit in which he is then serving, and his rank, his place and date of birth, and, if he is a naturalized citizen or has derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of some other person, the facts appearing in such application relating thereto. Such index shall be preserved as a public record, but shall not be deemed to be a part of the general register of voters.

Persons registered under this section shall be subject to the provisions of sections 48 and 49 of chapter 51 of the general laws and, except as herein otherwise provided, to all of the provisions of said chapter 51 prescribing qualifications for voting. The provisions of sections 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of chapter 56 of the general laws prescribing penalties for offenses concerning the listing or registration of voters shall, so far as pertinent, apply to persons applying for registration under this section.

Sec. 9. The registrars of voters may cause an investigation of any application under this act to be made by a police officer who shall forthwith after such investigation report to them his findings with respect thereto, and for this purpose the board or officer in charge of the police force of each city or town shall give the registrars such assistance as they may require.

Sec. 10. The registrars of voters shall include in the voting lists prepared in accordance with section 55 of chapter 51 of the general laws for use at each regular biennial State election and at each regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted the names and residences on January 1 preceding, or subsequently, as the case may be, of all residents of their respective cities and towns who have been registered at any such election as provided in section 8 of this act and shall cause to be placed opposite the name of each such resident the letters "SAV" in capitals. They shall forthwith, following the twentieth day preceding any such election, give written notice to the State secretary, or the city or town clerk, as the case may be, of the number of residents who have been registered under this act in such city or town, and in each ward and precinct therein, and shall likewise furnish the said secretary with mailing lists of such residents before each such State election.

Sec. 11. The provisions of section 46 of chapter 51 of the general laws shall apply to all applications for registration under this act on behalf of persons who have all the qualifications of a voter, except that of age, and who will, on or before the day of the next regular biennial State election or next regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted, as the case may be, attain the age of 21 years.

SEC. 12. The State secretary shall forthwith, after the effective date of this act, prepare in such quantities as he may deem necessary, the following papers:

(a) Blank forms for registration application worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, a duly registered voter of the city or town of _____

(Name of applicant) (Name of city or town where applicant is registered as a voter)

residing at _____ in such _____

(Street and number)

city or town, do hereby make application for an official absent voting ballot for the _____ to be held in _____

(Name of election) (Name of city or town)

on _____, 19____, for _____, serving in the _____ with the _____

(Name of person in service)

rank of _____ and a duly qualified voter for such election at _____ in _____

(Street and number)

the city or town of _____ and, as I believe, entitled to vote at said election in ward _____, precinct _____, in the city or town of _____, said ballot to be mailed to _____

(Name of city or town)

I hereby further declare that I am the _____ of the person in whose behalf this application is made.

(Relationship) Signature of applicant _____, (Date) _____, 19____

Personally appeared before me the above-named _____ and made oath that the foregoing statements are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

(Registrar of voters)

(Not to be filled in my applicant) We, the undersigned, a majority of the registrars of voters of _____, hereby

certify that _____, in whose behalf _____

(Name of person in service) the foregoing application has been made, has been determined to be a duly qualified voter at the _____ election to be held in ward _____, precinct _____, of the city or town of _____, and is entitled to vote therein at such election.

(Four blank lines for signatures of registrars.)

(b) Blank forms of affidavit to be printed on envelope for enclosing official absent-voting ballot furnished to person whose name is included in current annual register of voters and serving in the armed forces of the United States, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, serving in the _____ with the rank of _____, do hereby make oath that I am a registered voter in the city or town of _____, Mass., at _____ in precinct _____, _____

(Street and number) ward _____; that the place where I now am is not the municipality in which I am registered as a voter; that I have carefully read the instructions forwarded to me with the ballot herein enclosed; and that I have marked and sealed the within ballot as stated hereon by the person taking my oath.

(Signature of voter) _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19____; and I hereby certify that when I was alone with the affiant he showed me the ballot herein enclosed unmarked, and then in my presence marked the same without my seeing how he marked

it, after which he sealed said ballot in this envelope. I had no communication with the affiant as to how he was to vote.

(Seal, if any) _____ (Name of officer) _____ (Unit) _____ (Military or naval rank) _____

(c) Blank forms of affidavit to be printed on envelope for enclosing absent-voting ballot furnished to resident determined to be qualified to vote as provided in section 8, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, serving in the _____ with the rank of _____, do hereby make oath that at the time I entered the military or naval service or on the 1st day of January I was a legal resident of _____ at _____; that _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number) on the first day of January of this year I was a legal resident of _____ at _____, and that I am now a legal resident of _____ at _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number); that I was born on _____ in _____; _____

(Date of birth) (City or town and State or country) that I am a citizen of the United States, and that I have been a legal resident of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 1 year and of the city or town of _____ 6 months next preceding the election at which I claim this right to vote.

(The voter shall then sign his name and read the following aloud to the officer taking his oath.) (Print five lines of the State constitution here)

I do hereby further make oath that the place where I now am is not the municipality in which I claim this right to vote; that I have carefully read the instructions forwarded to me with the ballot enclosed, and that I have marked and sealed the within ballot as stated by the person taking my oath.

(Signature of voter) _____

it, after which he sealed said ballot in this envelope. I had no communication with the affiant as to how he was to vote.

(Seal, if any) _____ (Name of officer) _____ (Unit) _____ (Military or naval rank) _____

(c) Blank forms of affidavit to be printed on envelope for enclosing absent-voting ballot furnished to resident determined to be qualified to vote as provided in section 8, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, serving in the _____ with the rank of _____, do hereby make oath that at the time I entered the military or naval service or on the 1st day of January I was a legal resident of _____ at _____; that _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number) on the first day of January of this year I was a legal resident of _____ at _____, and that I am now a legal resident of _____ at _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number); that I was born on _____ in _____; _____

(Date of birth) (City or town and State or country) that I am a citizen of the United States, and that I have been a legal resident of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 1 year and of the city or town of _____ 6 months next preceding the election at which I claim this right to vote.

(The voter shall then sign his name and read the following aloud to the officer taking his oath.) (Print five lines of the State constitution here)

I do hereby further make oath that the place where I now am is not the municipality in which I claim this right to vote; that I have carefully read the instructions forwarded to me with the ballot enclosed, and that I have marked and sealed the within ballot as stated by the person taking my oath.

(Signature of voter) _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me by the above affiant this _____ day of _____, 19____; and I hereby certify that such affiant has signed his name in my presence, or was prevented by physical incapacity from so doing, read aloud the five lines of the State constitution appearing hereon in such a manner as to show he was neither prompted nor reciting from memory, and that when I was alone with him, he showed me the ballot herein enclosed, unmarked, and then in my presence marked the same without my seeing how he marked it, after which he sealed the said ballot in this envelope. I had no communication with the affiant as to how he was to vote.

(Seal, if any) _____ (Name of officer) _____ (Unit) _____ (Military or naval rank) _____

(d) Blank forms of application for qualification of person in service as a voter as provided in this act, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, a duly registered voter of the city or town of _____, _____

(Name of applicant) (Name of city or town where applicant is registered as a voter)

residing at _____ hereby make oath that _____ is now _____

(Street and number) (Name of person in service)

_____ of the United States _____; that on January 1 of last year he was a legal resident of _____ at _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number) and, on January 1 of this year, of _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number); that he is now a legal resident of _____

(City or town and State) (Street and number) at _____; that he was born _____

(Street and number) (City or town and State) (Date of birth) or country)

and that he has legally resided in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for 1 year and in the city or town of _____ for 6 months next preceding the election at which his right to vote is now being claimed.

I hereby further declare that I am _____ of the person herein named in _____ (Degree of relationship) whose behalf this application for qualification as a voter at said election is claimed.

(Signature of applicant) _____ (date) _____, 19____

Personally appeared before me the above named _____ and made oath that the foregoing statements are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

(Registrar of voters)

(If the person in whose behalf the application is made is a naturalized citizen or has derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of another, the registrars shall record in the space below, from the papers presented by the applicant, the facts required to show the citizenship of the person in service.)

(Not to be filled in by applicant) We, the undersigned, a majority of the registrars of voters of the _____ of _____, acting under authority of _____

(Name of city or town) section _____ of chapter _____ of the acts of 1943, do hereby determine that _____ is _____

(Name of person in service) (is not) qualified to vote at the _____ (Name of election) to be held in ward _____, precinct _____ of the city or town of _____ on _____, 19____

(Four blank lines for signatures or registrars) (e) Blank forms of report of police investigation, worded substantially as follows: This is to certify that, after investigation, I find that, on January first of this year, _____

(Name of person in whose behalf application for qualification as voter is made) was a resident of _____, and that he is now a legal resident of _____ at _____

(City or town and State) (City or town and State) (Street and number) This information was furnished to me by _____ residing at _____ (Name of informant)

_____ (Place of residence of informant) (Signed) _____ (Police officer)

(f) Suitable forms of certificates of listing, notices of omitted, additional or corrected listings to assessors and collectors of taxes and notices to registrars of voters of other cities or towns.

SEC. 13. The registrars of voters in the preparation of their annual register shall remove therefrom the name of each person registered under the provisions of this act who does not re-register in person as a voter within 6 months of the time of his or her discharge from the armed forces of the

United States or of the termination of the existing states of war between the United States and certain foreign countries.

Sec. 14. If any part of this act, or section thereof, shall be declared unconstitutional, the validity of the remaining parts thereof shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 15. This act shall remain in force only during such period as the existing war between the United States and certain foreign countries shall continue and until a declaration of the termination thereof by the President of the United States.

Approved June 2, 1943.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JONKMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, for several weeks, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 14, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 15, 1944, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 4350.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the land grants subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 16, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184 entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2328 and H. J. Res. 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings non-mailable). Hearings will be held.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1285. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Selective Service System for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimates of appropriation amounting to \$63,573,000 (H. Doc. No. 492); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1286. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of amendment No. 1 covering the personnel requirements of the National Archives for the quarter ending March 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1287. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a short interim report of the operations of the Farm Credit Administration during the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1288. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration for the period July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1289. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Chehalis River and tributaries, Washington, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and by an act of Congress approved on June 13, 1934 (H. Doc. No. 494); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1290. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 5, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Cumberland River and Yellow Creek, with a view to improvement of Yellow Creek, in the vicinity of Middlesborough, Ky., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 25, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1291. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to \$19,174,000 and contract authorization for the fiscal year 1945 amounting to \$2,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 496); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1292. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Second Quarterly Report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning October 1, 1943, and ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1293. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a message received in the Department of State and directed to the Congress of the United States from the Congress of the Political Parties held at Bari, Italy, January 28-30, 1944; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2116. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment; with amendment (Rept. No. 1254). 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. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4377. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1253). 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. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4381. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4382. A bill to facilitate the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4383. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4384. A bill to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4385. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4386. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 4387. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4388. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4389. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 4390: A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political

activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended and extended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4391. A bill to amend section 409 (e) of the Social Security Act approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4392. A bill to create an office of demobilization, establish general policies for the operation of that office, provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, prescribe the jurisdiction of courts in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4393. A bill authorizing the Shoshone-Goship Bands of Shoshone Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4394. A bill authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 468. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4134, a bill to reestablish the grade of admiral of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 4003; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4395. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson & Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta Harvey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4398. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4399. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Verge McClure; 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:

5235. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of 1,560 citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional

District of the State of New York, protesting against any legislation which will prohibit or restrict the sale or manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5236. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Mabel Hamlin and 35 others, and Stuart K. Stairs, of Caribou, Maine, and 21 others, favoring enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5237. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. B. L. Haug and many other residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5238. Also, petition of Alletta L. Dillon and many other residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5239. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 21 residents of Butler, Pa., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082 which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5240. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Carl H. Hammack, of Bryan, and Mrs. Mabel Robertson, of Austin, Tex., favoring House bill 4269; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5241. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of members of Harry Higgins Post, No. 83, the American Legion, Ashland, Ohio, to immediately enact the Legion omnibus bill now pending on World War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5242. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of Genevieve Parlor, No. 132, Native Daughters of the Golden West, regarding evacuated Japanese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5243. Also, petition of the San Francisco Auxiliary, No. 1, B'nai B'rith, urging abrogation of Chamberlain White Paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5244. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Ladies Aid Society, of Bremen, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants, and better protection of men in training camps from effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5245. Also, petition of Alma Bishop and 50 other signers of Skowhegan, Maine, urging action to stop the manufacture, sale, and transportation of beverages for the duration by enacting into law the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5246. Also, petition of Hattie White and 27 other citizens of Wayne, Maine, urging favorable action on House bill 2082 for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants and better protection of our men in training camps from effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Lord, who didst come to save all men, redeeming them out of tawdriness into beauty, and out of heaviness

into joy: Look, we beseech Thee, with the eyes of Thy mercy, upon a war-torn world forgetful of Thy redemptive love. Though it has failed Thee in Thy purpose, help it to confront failure with courage, and to find in imperfection, not disillusionment but opportunity, not a fact in which to acquiesce but a problem to be solved under Thy guidance, knowing that because of Thy grace no failure need be final.

Thou knowest, O Lord, the enemies that surround us, the temptations that beset us, the darkness that engulfs us. Increase our valor in all conflicts of this mortal life. Renew our courage after every failure, that we may rise from the dust with a double portion of Thy grace to rededicate our lives to the ideals of justice and mercy, peace and love, with which Thou hast ennobled us, until as sons of God we come at last to Thine eternal Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 13, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 13, 1944, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that when the Senate convenes on Thursday I shall hope to be recognized to speak briefly about the services of the late Senator from Oregon, Charles L. McNary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, upon the recommendation of the respective chairmen of the committees as will be indicated, appoints as members of the Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources, authorized by Senate Resolution 253, agreed to March 13, 1944, the following:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; from the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]; from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]; and on his own initiative the Chair also appoints the